


Ex Libris
Lynn Townsend White, Jr.
Et Amicorum Suorum

In Memoriam
Roberti Valentine Heckscher
A. B. Harvard. 1906



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

HISTORY
OF
LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

HISTORY
OF
LATIN CHRISTIANITY;
INCLUDING THAT OF
THE POPES
TO
THE PONTIFICATE OF NICOLAS V.

BY HENRY HART MILMAN, D.D.,
DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.

VOLUME I.

NEW YORK:
W. J. WIDDLETON, PUBLISHER.

1870.

Cambridge: Presswork by John Wilson and Son.

BR
162
M63h
1870
v.1

PREFACE

TO

THE SECOND EDITION.

IN this edition I have carefully revised the whole ; but the corrections which I have thought it necessary to make are in general confined to the style and language. Excepting in a few instances, I have not myself detected any important errors or inaccuracies as to the facts in the history ; neither have such, as far as I know, been pointed out by friendly or unfriendly critics — not indeed that I have any right to say that I have met with unfriendly critics. The additions which I have made — in some cases derived from older books, which had not fallen in my way, but chiefly from books published since the appearance of the first edition — are almost entirely confined to the notes. Among these, besides the “Life of Mohammed,” by Dr. Sprenger, I may specially name one or two original pieces in the new volume of Pertz, “Monumenta Germaniæ ;” the “Chronicon Placentinum,” from the British Museum ; and the curious documents relating to the “Friends of God,” published by Dr. Carl Schmidt.

PREFACE

TO

THE FIRST EDITION.

THE History of Latin Christianity is a continuation of "The History of Christianity to the Extinction of Paganism in the Roman Empire." But Latin Christianity appears to possess such a remarkable historic unity, that I have thought fit, in order to make this work complete in itself, to trace again its origin and earlier development, and to enter in some respects with greater fulness, yet without unnecessary repetition, into its history during the first four centuries. On one extremely dark part of that history a book but recently discovered has thrown unexpected light.

The sentence of Polybius which describes the unity, and the plan of his History of Republican Rome, might be adopted by the historian of the Rise and Progress of Christian Rome. *"Οντος γὰρ ἐνὸς ἔργου καὶ θεάματος ἐνὸς τοῦ σύμπαντος, ὑπὲρ τούτου γράφειν ἐπιχειρήσαμεν τοῦ, πῶς καὶ πότε, καὶ διὰ τί πάντα τὰ γνωριζόμενα μέρη τῆς οἰκουμένης ὑπὸ τῆν Ῥωμαίων δυναστείαν ἐγένετο.* — l. iii. c. i.
"The work which we have undertaken being one, the

whole forming one great design, how, when, and by what means all the known world became subject to the Roman rule." Though the great sphere of Latin Christianity was Western Europe, yet, during the first seven or eight centuries, it is so mingled up with the religious history of the Greek empire; the invasion of Western Europe by the Mohammedans, and the Crusades, so involved it again in the affairs of the East; that, in its influence at least, it extended to the limits of the known world.

My aim has been to write a history, not a succession of dissertations on history; to give with as much life and reality as I have been able, the result, not the process, of inquiry. This, where almost every event, every character, every opinion has been the subject of long, intricate, too often hostile controversy, was a task of no slight difficulty. Where the conflicting authorities have seemed to be nearly balanced, I have sometimes, but rarely, admitted them into the text, not desiring to speak with certainty, where certainty appeared unattainable; in general I have reserved such discussions, when inevitable, for the notes. Even in the notes I have endeavored to avoid two things — a polemic tone and prolixity. I. — I have cited the names of modern writers, in general, only when their observations have been remarkable in themselves, as original, or as characteristic of the progress of opinion. II. — I have usually contented myself with quoting the authority which after due consideration I have thought

it right to follow, instead of occupying a large space with concurrent or conflicting statements. Nothing can be more easy, now that we possess such admirable manuals of ecclesiastical history (especially the invaluable one of Gieseler), than to heap together to immeasurable extent citations from ancient authors or the opinions of learned men. I notice this solely that I may not be suspected either of the presumption of having neglected the labors, or of want of gratitude for the aid, of that array of writers who — from the Magdeburg Centuriators, Baronius and his Continuator, through the great French scholars, Tillemont, Fleury, Dupin; the Germans, Mosheim, Schroeck, Neander, and countless others (where, alas! are the English historians of those times?) — have wrought with such indefatigable industry on the annals of Christianity. I have studied compression and condensation, rather than fulness and copiousness, simply in order to bring the work within reasonable compass.

PREFACE TO VOLUME IV.

FIRST EDITION.

I CANNOT offer the concluding volumes of the History of Latin Christianity without expressing my grateful sense of the kind and liberal manner in which the former portion of the work has been generally received. In these volumes I trust that I have not fallen below my constant aim—calm and rigid impartiality; the fearless exposure of the bad, full appreciation of the good, both in the institutions and in the men who have passed before my view. I hope that I may aver without presumption that my sole object is truth—truth uttered in charity; and where truth has appeared to me unattainable from want of sufficient authorities, or from authorities balanced or contradictory, I have avoided the expression of any positive opinion. I am unwilling to claim the authority of history for that for which there is not historical evidence. I would further remind the reader that if the course of affairs during these ages should appear dark, at times almost to repulsiveness, still in the dreariest and most gloomy period of Christian history there was

always an undercurrent of humble, Christian goodness flowing on, as the Saviour himself came, "without observation," the light of which we can discern but by faint and transitory glimpses.

Only one book, as far as I know, has appeared since the publication of the first part of my work, which has further elucidated any of the subjects treated in those volumes — the "Life of Mohammed," by Dr. Sprenger. After the perusal of that work, so much more full than any former history on the earlier and more authentic traditions of the Prophet, I have the satisfaction to find that though I might be disposed to add a few sentences, I find nothing in my own more brief and rapid sketch to alter or to retract. Moreover (I write with diffidence), it appears to me that Dr. Sprenger has hardly drawn the line, if it can be drawn, between the Historical and the Legendary in the life of Mohammed. I cannot but think that the Kôran, after all, is the one safe and trustworthy authority for the life, the acts, and the aims, of the founder of Islam.

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME.

INTRODUCTION.

| A.D. | | PAGE |
|------|---|------|
| | DESIGN AND PLAN OF THE WORK..... | 19 |
| | CHRONOLOGY OF FIRST FOUR CENTURIES..... | 32 |

BOOK I.

CHAPTER I.

BEGINNING OF ROMAN CHRISTIANITY.

| | | |
|---------|--|------------|
| | Roman Pontificate..... | 41 |
| | Epochs in Latin Christianity..... | 42-47 |
| | Growth of Christianity in Rome..... | 47 |
| | Obscurity of Bishop of Rome..... | 50 |
| 67 | Persecution of Nero..... | 52 |
| 95 | of Domitian..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| 114 | of Trajan — Ignatius of Antioch..... | 53 |
| | Church of Rome Greek..... | 54 |
| | African origin of Latin Christianity..... | 57 |
| | Church of Rome centre of Christianity..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| | of Christian controversy..... | 59 |
| | Judaizing Christianity — The Clementina..... | 60 |
| 196 | Pope Victor — Quarto-deciman controversy..... | 64 |
| 180-193 | Reign of Commodus — Marcia..... | 65 |
| | Montanism..... | 68 |
| | Monarchianism..... | 70 |
| | Hippolytus Bishop of Porto..... | 74 |
| 201-219 | Pope Zephyrinus..... | 75 |
| | Pope Callistus..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| 235-247 | Persecution of Maximin — Decian persecution..... | 80 |

| A D. | PAGE |
|---------|---|
| | Cyprian of Carthage..... 82 |
| 254 | Novatus — Novatian — Cornelius of Rome — The Lapsi..... <i>ib.</i> |
| | Cyprian's unity of the Church..... 86 |
| | Dispute between Rome and Carthage..... 88 |
| 258 | Death of Cyprian — of Pope Xystus..... 90 |
| 259-304 | Dionysius — Marcellinus — Marcellus..... 91 |

CHAPTER II.

ROME AFTER THE CONVERSION OF CONSTANTINE.

| | |
|---------|---|
| 312 | Conversion of Constantine — Pope Silvester..... 93 |
| | Donation — Edict of Milan..... 95 |
| 324-334 | Foundation of Constantinople — Division of the empire..... 96 |
| | Latin Christianity in Rome, and the West..... 97 |
| 325 | Trinitarian controversy — 1st period — Council of Nicaea..... 98 |
| 347 | 2d period — Council of Sardica..... 101 |
| 352 | Pope Liberius — Council of Arles — of Milan.... 102 |
| 357 | Felix Antipope — Constantius in Rome..... 104 |
| 367 | Damasus and Ursicinus..... 111 |
| | Monasticism in Rome — Saint Jerome..... 112 |
| 384-398 | Pope Siricius — First Decretal..... 119 |
| | Celibacy of the clergy..... 120 |



BOOK II.

CHAPTER I.

INNOCENT I.

| | |
|-----|--|
| | Rome centre of the West..... 126 |
| | Succession of St. Peter — Unity of the Church... 128 |
| 402 | Innocent I..... 134 |
| 404 | Innocent and Chrysostom..... 139 |

| A.D. | | PAGE |
|------|--|------|
| 405 | Siege of Rome by Alaric — by Rhadagaisus — Stilicho | 148 |
| 410 | Capture by Alaric — Innocent absent..... | 150 |
| | Restoration of Rome — Greatness of the bishop... | 161 |

CHAPTER II.

PELAGIANISM.

| | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| | Pelagianism — Pelagius in the East..... | 164 |
| | Origin of controversy..... | 168 |
| | Augustinianism..... | 170 |
| | Sacerdotal system..... | 172 |
| | Transmission of original sin..... | 174 |
| 417 | Death of Pope Innocent I. — Zosimus..... | 178 |
| 418 | Council of Carthage — Zosimus retracts..... | 182 |
| | Julianus of Eclana..... | 185 |
| | Semi-Pelagianism — Cassianus..... | 189 |

CHAPTER III.

NESTORIANISM.

| | | |
|-----|--|------------|
| | Nestorianism..... | 195 |
| 418 | Death of Zosimus — Disputed election..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| 419 | Edict of Honorius — Boniface Pope — Celestine I. | 198 |
| 428 | Nestorius at Constantinople..... | 206 |
| | Cyril of Alexandria..... | 210 |
| | Persecution of Jews — Hypatia..... | 211 |
| | Cyril against Nestorius..... | 216 |
| | Both parties look to Rome — Pope Celestine..... | 219 |
| 430 | Council of Rome..... | 221 |
| 430 | Nestorius excommunicated..... | 224 |
| 431 | Council of Ephesus — General Councils..... | 226 |
| | Memnon of Ephesus — Juvenal of Jerusalem..... | 231 |
| | Decree of Council — Arrival of Syrian Bishops..... | 236 |
| | Violent contest — Constantinople..... | 239 |
| | Council of Chalcedon — Pulcheria..... | 242 |
| | Nestorius abandoned..... | 244 |
| | Treaty of Peace..... | 247 |
| | Nestorianism proscribed..... | 251 |

CHAPTER IV.

LEO THE GREAT.

| A.D. | | PAGE |
|---------|--|------|
| 440 | Leo the Great | 253 |
| | Character of Leo — Sermons | 254 |
| | The Manicheans at Rome | 259 |
| | Affairs of Africa | 261 |
| | Affairs of Gaul — Hilarius of Arles | 269 |
| | Affairs of Spain — Priscillianism | 276 |
| | Illyricum — The East | 279 |
| | Eutyches — Eutychianism | 281 |
| 449 | Robber Synod of Ephesus — Death of Flavianus | 286 |
| 451 | Council of Chalcedon — Condemnation of Dios- corus | 291 |
| | Coequality of Constantinople and Rome | 296 |
| 452 | Attila — Embassy of Leo to Attila | 301 |
| 455 | Invasion of Genseric — Capture and pillage of Rome | 303 |
| 457-461 | The Emperor Majorian | 308 |
| | Three founders of Latin Christianity — Jerome, Am- brose, Augustine | 309 |

 BOOK III.

CHAPTER I.

MONOPHYSITISM.

| | | |
|---------|---|-----|
| | Monophysitism | 312 |
| 468 | Pope Simplicius — Close of the Western Empire | 314 |
| | Church in the East | 315 |
| | Simeon Stylites | 318 |
| 457-474 | Revolutions in Constantinople — Death of Marcian | 320 |
| | Zeno expelled by Basiliscus | 321 |
| 482 | Henoticon of Zeno | 323 |
| | Question of Roman supremacy | 324 |
| 483 | Death of Pope Simplicius — Decree of Odoacer | 327 |
| | Felix III. Pope — Excommunicates Acacius of Con- stantinople | 328 |

| A.D. | PAGE |
|--|------------|
| 484 Acacius excommunicates Pope Felix..... | 331 |
| Schism of forty years..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| Four parties in the East..... | 333 |
| 495 Macedonius Bishop of Constantinople..... | 334 |
| 505-6 Tumults in Constantinople — The Emperor Anas- tadius..... | 338 |
| 510 Deposition of Macedonius..... | 339 |
| 513 Constantinople in insurrection..... | 340 |
| 514 Revolt of Vitalianus — Humiliation of Anastasius.. | 342 |
| Influence of the Monks..... | 344 |
| 492 Pope Gelasius I..... | 347 |
| 496 Pope Anastasius II..... | 349 |
| 498 Pope Symmachus..... | 350 |

CHAPTER II.

CONVERSION OF THE TEUTONIC RACES.

| | |
|--|------------|
| Conversion of the Teutonic races..... | 353 |
| Conversion of Germans within the Empire..... | 355 |
| Teutonic character..... | 356 |
| Teutonic religion — Woden..... | 357 |
| Human sacrifices — Animal sacrifices — Holy groves | 360 |
| Priesthood..... | 362 |
| Teutons encounter Christianity..... | 364 |
| Christ a God of battle..... | 365 |
| No Teutonic priesthood in their migrations..... | 366 |
| Effect of invasion on Christians..... | 367 |
| Teutons in the Roman empire..... | 370 |
| Successive conversion of the tribes..... | 371 |
| Arianism of first converts..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| Ulphilas..... | 372 |
| History of conversion unknown, except of Burgun- dians..... | 376 |
| Conversion of Franks..... | 378 |
| 496 Clovis the only orthodox sovereign..... | 382 |
| Religious wars..... | 384 |
| Influence of clergy — Clergy Latin..... | 386 |
| Effects of conversion on Teutons..... | 389 |

| A.D. | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Effects of conversion on moral purity — German character in this respect..... | 390 |
| Merovingian kings..... | 395 |
| Christianity barbarizes..... | 397 |
| Increase of sacerdotal power — Bishops a separate order | 399 |

CHAPTER III.

THEODORIC THE OSTROGOTH.

| | |
|---|------------|
| Ostrogothic kingdom in Italy..... | 403 |
| Odoacer | <i>ib.</i> |
| Union of the races imperfect — Division of lands.. | 406 |
| Theodoric — Peace of Italy..... | 408 |
| Theodoric's religious rule..... | 412 |
| 499 Contested election for the popedom..... | 416 |
| Theodoric in Rome — Charges against Symmachus | 418 |
| Tumults in Rome — Synod..... | 419 |
| Decree of the Palmary Synod..... | 421 |
| Affairs of the East..... | 422 |
| 514 Pope Hormisdas..... | 423 |
| The Emperor Anastasius..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| Papal embassy to Constantinople..... | 424 |
| 518 Death of Anastasius the Emperor..... | 429 |
| 518 Accession of Justin..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| Close of the schism..... | 431 |
| Prosperity of Theodoric..... | 432 |
| Rumors of conspiracies..... | 434 |
| State of Theodoric's family..... | 436 |
| Charges against Albinus..... | 438 |
| 525 Correspondence with the East — Mission of Pope John | 439 |
| Boethius — His death..... | 443 |
| Death of Theodoric..... | 447 |
| Ravenna | 448 |

CHAPTER IV.

JUSTINIAN.

| A.D. | | PAGE |
|---------|---|------------|
| 527 | Justinian — Theodora..... | 449 |
| | Persian and African Wars..... | 452 |
| | Suppression of schools at Athens..... | 453 |
| | Conquest of Africa..... | 455 |
| | Ostrogothic kingdom — Death of Athalaric — of Amalasantha..... | 456 |
| | Witiges king..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| 526-535 | Popes Felix IV., Boniface II., John II., Agapetus..... | 457 |
| | Agapetus in Constantinople..... | 459 |
| 536 | Conquest of Italy by Justinian..... | 461 |
| | Rome surrendered to Belisarius..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| | Vigilius..... | 462 |
| 537 | Silverius degraded — Vigilius Pope..... | 463 |
| 544 | The three Chapters..... | 465 |
| | Vigilius summoned to Constantinople..... | 466 |
| 548 | Tergiversation of Vigilius..... | 467 |
| 554 | Banishment — Death..... | 470 |
| 556 | Pope Pelagius I..... | 471 |
| | Totila..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| | The eunuch Narses..... | 473 |
| | Popes John III., Benedict I., Pelagius II..... | 474 |

CHAPTER V.

CHRISTIAN JURISPRUDENCE.

| | | |
|--|---|------------|
| | Christian jurisprudence..... | 479 |
| | effects of Christianity on..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| | I. Jurisprudence of Roman empire..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| | II. Barbaric codes..... | 480 |
| | III. Christian jurisprudence..... | 481 |
| | Supremacy of the Emperor..... | 482 |
| | I. Justinian code..... | 483 |
| | Justinian a Christian emperor..... | 485 |
| | Preamble — Laws for the clergy — Bishops..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| | Roman law purely Roman..... | 489 |

| A. D. | PAGE |
|--|------------|
| A. Law of persons..... | 491 |
| Freemen and slaves..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| Law of slavery..... | 493 |
| Slave-trade..... | 495 |
| Christian family..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| Parental power..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| Marriage..... | 496 |
| Prohibited degrees..... | 497 |
| Spiritual relationship..... | 498 |
| Divorce..... | 500 |
| Concubinage..... | 503 |
| Parental power..... | 504 |
| Infanticide..... | 505 |
| B. Law of Property..... | 507 |
| Church property..... | 508 |
| C. Criminal Law..... | 511 |
| Some crimes more severely punished..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| Crime of heresy..... | 512 |
| II. Barbaric codes..... | 514 |
| Of Theodoric and Athalaric — King supreme..... | 515 |
| Difference of ranks — Clergy co-legislators..... | 517 |
| Lombard laws — Salic law — Gothic law..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| Bishops in popular and judicial assemblies..... | 524 |
| A. Law of persons..... | 527 |
| Freemen and slaves — Emancipation..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| Law of marriage..... | 528 |
| B. Law of property..... | 535 |
| Church property..... | <i>ib.</i> |
| C. Criminal law..... | 537 |
| Asylum — Ordeal..... | 539 |
| III. Church jurisprudence..... | 542 |
| Clergy legislative and executive..... | 543 |
| Rome sole patriarchate of the West..... | 544 |
| Clergy Latin..... | 546 |
| Penitential system..... | 550 |
| Effects on the clergy — on the community | 551 |

HISTORY

OF

LATIN CHRISTIANITY.

INTRODUCTION.

DESIGN AND PLAN OF THE WORK.

THE great event in the history of our religion and of mankind, during many centuries after the extinction of Paganism, is the rise, the development, and the domination of Latin Christianity. Though the religion of Christ had its origin among a Syrian people—though its Divine Author spoke an Aramaic dialect—Christianity was almost from the first a Greek religion. Its primal records were all, or nearly all, written in the Greek language; it was promulgated with the greatest rapidity and success among nations either of Greek descent, or those which had been Grecised by the conquests of Alexander; its most flourishing churches were in Greek cities. Greek was the commercial language in which the Jews, through whom it was at first disseminated, and who were even now settled in almost every province of the Roman world, carried on their intercourse. Primitive Christianity no doubt continued to speak in

Syriac to vast numbers of disciples in the Syrian provinces; it spread eastward to a considerable extent, in Babylonia and beyond the Euphrates, into regions where Greek ceased to be the common tongue. Oriental influences, influences even from the remoter East, worked into its doctrine and into its system; yet even these flowed in chiefly or in great part through Greek channels. The Indian Monasticism¹ had already been domiciliated in Palestine and among the Egyptian Jews. Oriental and Egyptian notions had found their way into the Greek philosophy. Among the earlier Christian converts were some of these partially orientalized Greek philosophers. Many of the first teachers had been trained in their schools. In Antioch, in Alexandria, even in Ephesus there was something of an Asiatic cast in the Greek civilization.

Greek Christianity could not but be affected both in its doctrinal progress and in its polity by its Greek origin. Among the Greeks had been for centuries agitated all those primary questions which lie at the bottom of all religions;—the formation of the worlds—the existence and nature of the Deity—the origin and cause of evil, though this seems to have been studied even with stronger predilection in the trans-Euphratic East. Hence Greek Christianity was insatiably inquisitive, speculative. Confident in the inexhaustible copiousness and fine precision of its

¹ Compare, on Buddhist monasticism, the very curious visitation of the Buddhist monasteries at the close of the fourth century, the continuation of earlier visitations anterior to the Christian era, the *Foe Koneki*, translated by M. A. Rémusat, Paris, 1836; also the recent more popular work by Mr. Hardy, *Eastern Monachism*, London, 1850.

language, it endured no limitation to its curious investigations. As each great question was settled or worn out, it was still ready to propose new ones. It began with the Divinity of Christ (still earlier perhaps with some of the Gnostic Cosmogonical or Theophanic theories), so onward to the Trinity: it expired, or at least drew near its end as the religion of the Roman East, discussing the Divine Light on Mount Tabor.

In their polity the Grecian churches were a federation of republics, as were the settlements of the Jews. But they were founded on a religious, not on a national basis; external to, yet in their boundaries, mostly in their aggregative system, following the old commonwealths, which still continued to subsist under the supremacy of the Roman Prefect or Proconsul, and in later times the distribution of the Imperial dioceses. They were held together by common sympathies, common creeds, common sacred books, certain, as yet simple, but common rites, common usages of life, and a hierarchy everywhere, in theory at least, of the same power and influence. They admitted the Christians of other places by some established sign, or by recommendatory letters. They were often bound together by mutual charitable conventions. Still each was an absolutely independent community. The Roman East, including Greece, had no capital. The old kingdoms might respect the traditionary greatness of some city, which had been the abode of their kings, or which was the seat of a central provincial government: other cities, from their wealth and population, may have assumed a superior rank, Antioch in Syria, Alexan-

dria in Egypt, Ephesus in Asia Minor. But though churches known or reputed to have been founded by Apostles might be looked on with peculiar respect, there was as yet no subordination, no supremacy; their federal union was a voluntary association. Whether the internal constitution had become more or less rapidly or completely monarchical; whether the Bishop had risen to a greater or less height above his co-Presbyters, the whole episcopal order, the representatives of each church, were on the same level. The Metropolitan and afterwards the Patriarchal dignity was of later growth. Jerusalem, which might naturally have aspired to the rank of the Christian capital, at least in the East, had been destroyed, and remained desolate for many years: it assumed only at a later period (at one time it was subject to Cæsarea) even the Patriarchal rank.

But at the extinction of Paganism, Greek, or, as it may now be called in opposition to the West, Eastern Christianity, had almost ceased to be aggressive or creative. Except the contested conversion of the Bulgarians, later of the Russians, and a few wild tribes, it achieved no conquests. The Nestorians alone, driven into exile by cruel persecutions, formed settlements, and propagated their own form of Christianity in Persia, India, perhaps in still more distant lands. The Eastern Church never recovered the ground which it had lost before the revived Magianism of the Sassanian kings of Persia; and it was compelled to retire within still narrowing bounds before triumphant Mohammedanism. The Greek hierarchy had

Not aggressive.

now lost their unity of action. The great Patriarchates, which by this time had been formed on the authority of Councils, were involved in perpetual strife, or were contested by rival bishops, till three of them, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, sank into administrators of a tolerated religion under the Mohammedan dominion. The Bishop of Constantinople was the passive victim, the humble slave, or the factious adversary of the Byzantine Emperor: rarely exercised a lofty moral control upon his despotism. The lower clergy, whatever their more secret beneficent or sanctifying workings on society, had sufficient power, wealth, rank, to tempt ambition, or to degrade to intrigue; not enough to command the public mind for any great salutary purpose; to repress the inveterate immorality of an effete age; to reconcile jarring interests; to mould together hostile races: in general they ruled, where they did rule, by the superstitious fears, rather than by the reverence and attachment of a grateful people. They sank downward into the common ignorance, and yielded to that worst barbarism—a worn out civilization. Monasticism withdrew a great number of those who might have been energetic and useful citizens into barren seclusion and religious indolence; but except where the monks formed themselves, as they frequently did, into fierce political or polemic factions, they had little effect on the condition of society. They stood aloof from the world, the anchorites in their desert wildernesses, the monks, in their jealously-barred convents; and secure, as they supposed, of their own salvation, left the rest of mankind to inevitable perdition.

Greek theology still maintained its speculative tendency; it went on defining with still more exquisite subtlety the Godhead and the nature of Christ. The interminable controversy still lengthened out, and cast forth sect after sect from the enfeebled community. The great Greek writers, Athanasius, Basil, the Gregories, had passed away and left only unworthy successors; the splendid public eloquence had expired on the lips of Chrysostom. There was no writer who laid strong hold on the imagination or reason of men, except the author of that extraordinary book, ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, of which perhaps the remote influence was greater in the West than in the Byzantine empire. John of Damascus, the powerful adversary of Iconoclasm, is a splendid exception, not merely on account of the polemic vigor shown in that controversy, but as a theologian doubtless the ablest of his late age. The Greek language gradually, but slowly, degenerated; at length, but not entirely till after the fall of Constantinople, it broke up into barbarous dialects; but it gave birth by fusion with foreign tongues to no new language productive of noble poetry, of oratory, or philosophy. A rude and premature reformation, that of Iconoclasm, attempted to overthrow the established traditional faith, but offered nothing to supply its place which could either enlighten the mind or enthrall the religious affections: it destroyed the images, but it did not reveal the Original Deity, or the Christ in his pure and essential spirituality. Greek Christianity remained however, and still remains, a separate and peculiar form of faith; it repudiated all the at-

tempts of the feeble sovereigns of the East to barter its independence for succor against the formidable Turks: it is still the religion of revived Greece, and of the vast Russian empire.

Latin Christianity, on the other hand, seemed endowed with an inexhaustible principle of ^{Latin Chris}expanding life. No sooner had the North-^{tianity.}ern tribes entered within its magic circle, than they submitted to its yoke: and, not content with thus conquering its conquerors, it was constantly pushing forward its own frontier, and advancing into the strongholds of Northern Paganism. Gradually it became a monarchy, with all the power of a concentrated dominion. The clergy assumed an absolute despotism over the mind of man: not satisfied with ruling princes and kings, themselves became princes and kings. Their organization was coincident with the bounds of Christendom; they were a second universal magistracy, exercising always equal, asserting, and for a long period possessing, superior power to the civil government. They had their own jurisprudence—the canon law,—coördinate with and of equal authority with the Roman or the various national codes, only with penalties infinitely more terrific, almost arbitrarily administered, and admitting no exception, not even that of the greatest temporal sovereign. Western Monasticism, in its ^{Latin Monas-}general character, was not the barren, idly-^{ticism.}laborious or dreamy quietude of the East. It was industrious and productive: it settled colonies, preserved arts and letters, built splendid edifices, fertilized deserts. If it rent from the world the most powerful minds, having trained them by its stern

discipline, it sent them back to rule the world. It continually, as it were, renewed its youth, and kept up a constant infusion of vigorous life, now quickening into enthusiasm, now darkening into fanaticism; and by its perpetual rivalry, stimulating the zeal, or supplying the deficiencies of the secular clergy. In successive ages it adapted itself to the state of the human mind. At first a missionary to barbarous nations, it built abbeys, hewed down forests, cultivated swamps, enclosed domains, retrieved or won for civilization tracts which had fallen to waste or had never known culture. With St. Dominic it turned its missionary zeal upon Christianity itself, and spread as a preaching order throughout Christendom; with St. Francis it became even more popular, and lowered itself to the very humblest of mankind. In Jesuitism it made a last effort to govern mankind by an incorporated caste. But Jesuitism found it necessary to reject many of the peculiarities of Monasticism: it made itself secular to overcome the world. But the compromise could not endure. Over the Indians of South America alone, but for the force of circumstances, it might have been lasting. In Eastern India it became a kind of Christian Paganism; in Europe a moral and religious Rationalism, fatal both to morals and to religion.

Throughout this period, then, of at least ten centuries, Latin Christianity was the religion of the Western nations of Europe: Latin the religious language; the Latin translation of the Scriptures the religious code of mankind. Latin theology was alone inexhaustibly prolific, and held

Latin Christianity.

wide and unshaken authority. On most speculative tenets this theology had left to Greek controversialists to argue out the endless transcendental questions of religion, and contented herself with resolutely embracing the results, which she fixed in her inflexible theory of doctrine. The only controversy which violently disturbed the Western Church was the practical one, on which the East looked almost with indifference, the origin and motive principle of human action—grace and free will. This, from Augustine to Luther and Jansenius, was the interminable, still reviving problem. Latin Christian literature, like Greek, might have seemed already to have passed its meridian after Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and, high above all, Augustine. The age of true Latin poetry, no doubt, had long been over; the imaginative in Christianity could only find its expression to some extent in the legend and in the ritual; but, except in a very few hymns, it was not till out of the wedlock of Latin with the Northern tongues, not till after new languages had been born in the freshness of youth, that there were great Christian poets: poets not merely writing on religious subjects, but instinct with the religious life of Christianity,—Dante, Ariosto, Tasso, Shakspeare, Milton, Calderon, Schiller. But not merely did Latin theology expand into another vast and teeming period, that of the Schoolmen, culminating in Aquinas; but Latin being the common language, the clergy the only learned body throughout Europe, it was that of law in both its branches; of science, of philosophy, even of history; of letters; in short, of civilization. Latin Christianity, when her time

was come, had her great era of art, not only as the preserver of the traditions of Greek and Roman skill in architecture, and some of the technical operations in sculpture and painting, but original and creative. It was art comprehending architecture, painting, sculpture, and music, Christian in its fullest sense, as devoted entirely to Christian uses, expressive of Christian sentiments, arising out of and kindling in congenial spirits Christian thought and feeling.

The characteristic of Latin Christianity was that *its character*. of the old Latin world—a firm and even obstinate adherence to legal form, whether of traditional usage or written statute; the strong assertion of, and the severe subordination to, authority. Its wildest and most eccentric fanaticism, for the most part, and for many centuries, respected external unity. It was the Roman empire, again extended over Europe by an universal code and a provincial government; by a hierarchy of religious prætors or proconsuls, and a host of inferior officers, each in strict subordination to those immediately above them, and gradually descending to the very lowest ranks of society: the whole with a certain degree of freedom of action, but a restrained and limited freedom, and with an appeal to the spiritual Cæsar in the last resort.

Latin Christianity maintained its unshaken dominion until, what I venture to call, Teutonic Christianity,¹ aided by the invention of paper and of

¹ Throughout the world, wherever the Teutonic is the groundwork of the language, the Reformation either is, or, as in Southern Germany, has been dominant; wherever Latin, Latin Christianity has retained its ascendancy.

printing, asserted its independence, threw off the great mass of traditionary religion, and out of the Bible summoned forth a more simple faith, which seized at once on the reason, on the conscience, and on the passions of men. This faith, with a less perfectly organized outward system, has exercised a more profound moral control, through the sense of strictly personal responsibility. Christianity¹ became a vast influence working irregularly on individual minds, rather than a great social system, coerced by a central supremacy, by an all-embracing spiritual control, and held together by rigid usage, or by outward signs of common citizenship. Its multiplicity and variety, rather than its unity, was the manifestation of its life; or rather its unity lay deeper in its being, and consisted more in intellectual sympathies, in affinities of thought and feeling, of principles and motives, in a more remote or rather untraceable kindred through the common Father and common Saviour. Ceremonial uniformity seemed to retire into subordinate importance and estimation. Books gradually became, as far as the instruction of the human race, a coördi-

¹ It is obvious that I use Christianity, and indeed Teutonic Christianity, in its most comprehensive significance, from national episcopal churches, like that of England, which aspires to maintain the doctrines and organization of the apostolic, or immediately post-apostolic ages, onward to that dubious and undefinable verge where Christianity melts into a high moral theism, a faith which would expand to purer spirituality with less distinct dogmatic system; or that which would hardly call itself more than a Christian philosophy, a religious Rationalism. I presume not, neither is it the office of the historian, to limit the blessings of our religion either in this world or the world to come; "there is One who will know his own." As an historian I can disfranchise none who claim, even on the slightest grounds, the privileges and hopes of Christianity: repudiate none who do not place themselves without the pale of believers and worshippers of Christ, or of God through Christ.

nate priesthood. No longer rare, costly, inaccessible, or unintelligible, they descended to classes which they had never before approached. Eloquence or argument, instead of expiring on the ears of an entranced but limited auditory, addressed mankind at large, flew through kingdoms, crossed seas, perpetuated and promulgated themselves to an incalculable extent. Individual men could not but be working out in their own studies, in their own chambers, in their own minds, the great problems of faith. The primal records of Christianity, in a narrow compass, passed into all the vernacular languages of the world, where they could not be followed by the vast, scattered, and ambiguous volumes of tradition. The clergy became less and less a separate body (the awakened conscience of men refused to be content with vicarious religion through them); they ceased to be the sole arbiters of man's destiny in another life: they sank back into society, to be distinguished only as the models and promoters of moral and religious virtue, and so of order, happiness, peace, and the hope of immortality. They derived their influence less from a traditionary divine commission or vested authority, than from their individual virtue, knowledge, and earnest, if less authoritative, inculcation of divine truth. Monasticism was rejected as alien to the primal religion of the Gospel; the family life, the life of the Christian family, resumed its place as the highest state of Christian grace and perfection.

This progressive development of Christianity seems the inevitable consequence of man's progress in knowledge, and in the more general dissemination of that knowledge. Human

Progressive
development
of Christian-
ity.

thought is almost compelled to assert, and cannot help asserting, its original freedom. And as that progress is manifestly a law of human nature, proceeding from the divine Author of our being, this self-adaptation of the one true religion to that progress must have the divine sanction, and may be supposed, without presumption, to have been contemplated in the counsels of Infinite Wisdom.

The full and more explicit expansion of these views on this Avatar of Teutonic Christianity must await its proper place at the close of our history.

BOOK I.

CHRONOLOGY OF FIRST FOUR CENTURIES.

| A. D. | Bishops of Rome. | Emperors. | Remarkable Events, &c. |
|-------|--|-------------------|--|
| 42 | 1 St. Peter (according to Jerome). | Claudius, year 2. | |
| 43 | 2 | | Claudius in Britain. |
| 44 | 3 | | Death of Herod. |
| 45 | 4 | | Agrippa the Younger in favor with Claudius. |
| 46 | 5 | | St. Paul visits Jerusalem with Barnabas. |
| 47 | 6 | | Tiberius Alexander, Governor in Judea. |
| 48 | 7 | | Agrippa the Younger succeeds his uncle, Herod. |
| 49 | 8 | | Cumanus, Governor of Judea. |
| 50 | 9 | | Council of Jerusalem. 1 Epistle to Thessalonians. |
| 51 | 10 | | |
| 52 | 11 | | The date of the expulsion of the Jews (Suet. Claud.) uncertain, but as Agrippa in Rome was in high favor, and would protect the Jewish interests, it was probably after his departure from Rome. |
| 53 | 12 | | Felix, Governor of Judea. 2 Epistle to Thessalonians. |
| 54 | 13 | Nero, Oct. 13. | |
| 55 | 14 | | |
| 56 | 15 | | Paul at Ephesus. 1 Epistle to Corinthians. |
| 57 | 16 | | At Corinth. Epistle to Galatians. |
| 58 | 17 | | At Corinth. Epistle to Romans. |
| 59 | 18 | | Death of Agrippa. |
| 60 | 19 | | Paul before Felix. Before Festus. In Malta. |
| 61 | 20 | | Paul in Rome, writes to the Ephesians. |
| 62 | 21 | | |
| 63 | 22 | | Paul acquitted. Epistles to Philippians, Colossians, Philemon. |
| 64 | 23 | | Fire of Rome. Persecution of the Christians. Florus, Governor of Judea. |
| 65 | 24 | | |
| 66 | 25 | | Nero goes to Greece. |
| 67 | 1 Linns (according to Jerome, Irenaeus, Eusebius). | | Martyrdom of St. Paul — and of St. Peter (?). |

| A. D. | Bishops of Rome. | Emperors. | Remarkable Events, &c. |
|-------|--|------------------------------------|--|
| 68 | 2 Clement (according to Tertullian and Rufinus). | Galba, Otho, Vitellius, Vespasian. | Death of Nero, in June. |
| 69 | 3 | | |
| 70 | 4 | | Capture and destruction of Jerusalem. |
| 71 | 5 | | |
| 72 | 6 | | |
| 73 | 7 | | |
| 74 | 8 | | |
| 75 | 9 | | |
| 76 | 10 | | |
| 77 | 11 | | |
| 78 | 1 Cletus, or Anacletus (?). | | |
| 79 | 2 | Titus. | |
| 80 | 3 | | |
| 81 | 4 | Domitian. | Death of Titus, Sept. 13 |
| 82 | 5 | | |
| 83 | 6 | | |
| 84 | 7 | | |
| 85 | 8 | | |
| 86 | 9 | | |
| 87 | 10 | | |
| 88 | 11 | | |
| 89 | 12 | | |
| 90 | 13 | | |
| 91 | 1 Clement (?) (according to later writers). | | |
| 92 | 2 | | |
| 93 | 3 | | |
| 94 | 4 | | |
| 95 | 5 | | Death of the Consul Flavius Clemens, on account of Jewish superstition. |
| 96 | 6 | Nerva. | |
| 97 | 7 | | |
| 98 | 8 | Trajan. | |
| 99 | 9 | | Death of St. John (Ireusæus, Eusebius). |
| 100 | 1 Evaristus (?). | | |
| 101 | 2 | | |
| 102 | 3 | | |
| 103 | 4 | | Pliny in Bithynia. |
| 104 | 5 | | Pliny's Letter to Trajan. |
| 105 | 6 | | |
| 106 | 7 | | |
| 107 | 8 | | |
| 108 | 9 | | |
| 109 | 1 Alexander (?). | | |
| 110 | 2 | | |
| 111 | 3 | | |
| 112 | 4 | | |
| 113 | 5 | | |
| 114 | 6 | | Trajan in the East. Sedition of the Jews in Egypt and Cyrene. Martyrdom of Ignatius. |
| 115 | 7 | | |
| 116 | 8 | | |
| 117 | 9 | Hadrian. | |
| 118 | 10 | | |
| 119 | 1 Sixtus (?). | | |
| 120 | 2 | | |
| 121 | 3 | | |
| 122 | 4 | | |

| A.D. | Bishops of Rome. | Emperors. | Remarkable Events, &c. | |
|------|-------------------------|----------------------|---|-------------------|
| 123 | 5 | | Hadrian at Athens. Apologies of Quadratus and Aristides. | |
| 124 | 6 | | | |
| 125 | 7 | | | |
| 126 | 8 | | | |
| 127 | 9 | | | |
| 128 | 10 | | | |
| 129 | 1 Telesphorus. | | | |
| 130 | 2 | | | |
| 131 | 3 | | | Hadrian in Egypt. |
| 132 | 4 | | | Jewish War. |
| 133 | 5 | | | |
| 134 | 6 | | Bar Cochba persecutes the Christians. | |
| 135 | 7 | | End of the Jewish War. | |
| 136 | 8 | | Foundation or reconstruction of Ælia on the ruins of Jerusalem. | |
| 137 | 9 | | | |
| 138 | 10 | Antoninus Pius. | | |
| 139 | 1 Hyginus. | | | |
| 140 | 2 | | | |
| 141 | 3 | | | |
| 142 | 4 | | | |
| 143 | 1 Pius I. | | | |
| 144 | 2 | | | |
| 145 | 3 | | | |
| 146 | 4 | | | |
| 147 | 5 | | | |
| 148 | 6 | | | |
| 149 | 7 | | | |
| 150 | 8 | | Polycarp in Rome. | |
| 151 | 9 | | Marcion in Rome. Justin Martyr, Apology I. | |
| 152 | 10 | | | |
| 153 | 11 | | | |
| 154 | 12 | | | |
| 155 | 13 | | | |
| 156 | 14 | | | |
| 157 | 1 Anicetus. | | | |
| 158 | 2 | | | |
| 159 | 3 | | | |
| 160 | 4 | | | |
| 161 | 5 | M. Aurelius (Verns). | | |
| 162 | 6 | | | |
| 163 | 7 | | | |
| 164 | 8 | | | |
| 165 | 9 | | | |
| 166 | 10 | | Parthian War ended. Marcus Aurelius in the East. Martyrdom of Polycarp (?). | |
| 167 | 11 | | Terror about Marcomannian War. Justin Martyr. | |
| 168 | 1 Soter. | | Apology of Athenagoras. | |
| 169 | 2 | | Death of Verus. | |
| 170 | 3 | | | |
| 171 | 4 | | Letter of Dionysius. | |
| 172 | 5 | | Apology of Melito, B. of Corinth, Euseb. II. E. IV., 23. | |
| 173 | 6 | | | |
| 174 | 7 | | Battle with Quadi — Storm thought miraculous. | |
| 175 | 8 | | | |
| 176 | 9 | | | |
| 177 | 1 Eleutherius (or 178). | | Martyrs of Lyons. | |
| 178 | 2 | | | |

| A.D. | Bishops of Rome. | Emperors. | Remarkable Events, &c. |
|------|--|--|---|
| 179 | 3 | | |
| 180 | 4 | Commodus. | |
| 181 | 5 | | |
| 182 | 6 | | |
| 183 | 7 | | |
| 184 | 8 | | |
| 185 | 9 | | |
| 186 | 10 | | |
| 187 | 11 | | |
| 188 | 12 | | |
| 189 | 13 | | |
| 190 | 1 Victor (?). | Pertinax. | |
| 191 | 2 | Julianus. | |
| 192 | 3 | Niger. | |
| 193 | 4 | Severus. | |
| 194 | 5 | | Montanus, Priscilla and Max. milla. |
| 195 | 6 | | Dispute about Easter. — Euseb. H. E. v. 24. |
| 196 | 7 | | |
| 197 | 8 | | |
| 198 | 9 | | |
| 199 | 10 | | |
| 200 | 11 | | |
| 201 | 12 | | |
| 202 | 1 Zephyrinus (?). | | Persecution of Severus in Egypt |
| 203 | 2 | | Origen teaches in Egypt. |
| 204 | 3 | | |
| 205 | 4 | | |
| 206 | 5 | | |
| 207 | 6 | | Tertullian, Lib. I. Adv. Marcion. He is now a Montanist. |
| 208 | 7 | | |
| 209 | 8 | | |
| 210 | 9 | | |
| 211 | 10 | Caracalla, Geta. | |
| 212 | 11 | | Origen at Rome. Tertullian ad Scapulam (?). |
| 213 | 12 | | |
| 214 | 13 | | |
| 215 | 14 | | |
| 216 | 15 | | |
| 217 | 16 | Macrinus. | |
| 218 | 17 | Elagabalus. | Hippolytus bishop of Porto. |
| 219 | 1 Callistus. | | |
| 220 | 2 | | |
| 221 | 3 | | |
| 222 | 4 | Alexander Seve- rus. | |
| 223 | 1 Urbanus. | | |
| 224 | 2 | | |
| 225 | 3 | | |
| 226 | 4 | | |
| 227 | 5 | | |
| 228 | 6 | | |
| 229 | 7 | | |
| 230 | 1 Pontianus, July 22. | | |
| 231 | 2 | | |
| 232 | 3 | | |
| 233 | 4 | | |
| 234 | 5 | | |
| 235 | 6 Anteros (Pontianus died Sept. 23). Anteros died June 18, 236. | Maximinus, The 2 Gordians, Pupienus Bal- binus. | Pontianus banished to Sardinia. His Martyrdom (?). Martyrdom of Hippolytus (?). |

| A.D. | Bishops of Rome. | Emperors. | Remarkable Events, &c. |
|------|--|-----------------------|--|
| 236 | 1 Fabianus. | | |
| 237 | 2 | | |
| 238 | 3 | | |
| 239 | 4 | Gordianus Junior. | |
| 240 | 5 | | |
| 241 | 6 | | |
| 242 | 7 | | |
| 243 | 8 | | |
| 244 | 9 | Philippus Arabs. | |
| 245 | 10 | | |
| 246 | 11 | | |
| 247 | 12 | | |
| 248 | 13 | | Cyprian, bishop of Carthage. |
| 249 | 14 | Decius. | Martyrdom of Fabianus, Jan. 20 |
| 250 | See vacant. | | |
| 251 | 1 Cornelius, June 4, d. Sept. 14. | Gallus. | St. Cyprian. |
| 252 | 1 Lucius. | | |
| 253 | 1 Stephen. | | Death of Origen. |
| 254 | 2 | Emilianus Valerianus. | Controversy concerning the Lapsi, Novatian Antipope. |
| 255 | 3 | | Controversy about baptism of Heretics. III. Council of Carthage. |
| 256 | 4 | | Exile of Cyprian. |
| 257 | Sixtus II., Martyr, d. Aug. 2, 258. | | |
| 258 | Vacancy. | | Martyrdom of Sixtus. Martyrdom of Cyprian, Sept. 14. |
| 259 | 1 Dionysius, July 22 | | |
| 260 | 2 | Gallienus. | |
| 261 | 3 | | |
| 262 | 4 | | |
| 263 | 5 | | |
| 264 | 6 | | |
| 265 | 7 | | |
| 266 | 8 | | |
| 267 | 9 | | |
| 268 | 10 | Claudius. | |
| 269 | 1 Felix. | | |
| 270 | 2 | Aurelian. | Paul of Samosata deposed. |
| 271 | 3 | | |
| 272 | 4 | | Manes from A.D. 241 to A.D. 272 |
| 273 | 5 | | |
| 274 | 6 | | |
| 275 | 1 Eutychianus. | Tacitus, Probus. | |
| 276 | 2 | Florianus. | |
| 277 | 3 | | |
| 278 | 4 | | |
| 279 | 5 | | |
| 280 | 6 | | |
| 281 | 7 | | |
| 282 | 8 | Carns, Carinus. | |
| 283 | 1 Caius. | Numerianus. | |
| 284 | 2 | Diocletian. | |
| 285 | 3 | | |
| 286 | 4 | Maximian. | |
| 287 | 5 | | |
| 288 | 6 | | |
| 289 | 7 | | |
| 290 | 8 | | Lactantius. |
| 291 | 9 | | |

| A.D. | Bishops of Rome. | Emperors. | Remarkable Events, &c. |
|------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| 292 | 10 | Two Cæsars, | |
| 293 | 11 | Constantius, | |
| 294 | 12 | Galerius. | |
| 295 | 13 | | |
| 296 | 1 Marcellinus, June 30. | | Arnobius. |
| 297 | 2 | | |
| 298 | 3 | | |
| 299 | 4 | | |
| 300 | 5 | | |
| 301 | 6 | | Persecution. |
| 302 | 7 | | |
| 303 | 8 | | |
| 304 | Died Oct. 24. | Constantius, | Abdication of Diocletian and |
| 305 | See vacant. | Galerius. | Maximian. |
| 306 | | Severus Maximin. | |
| 307 | | Constantine, Maxentius, Licinius, Maximian. | |
| 308 | Marcellus, May 19. | Six Emperors. | Death of Severus. |
| 309 | | | |
| 310 | Eusebius, 6 months. | | Death of Maximian. |
| 311 | 1 Vacancy. Melchi- ades, July 2. | | Death of Galerius. |
| 312 | | | Victory of Constantine over Maxentius. |
| 313 | | | Edict of Milan, Oct. 28. |
| 314 | 1 Sylvester, Jan. 31. | | |
| 315 | 2 | | |
| 316 | 3 | | |
| 317 | 4 | | |
| 318 | 5 | | |
| 319 | 6 | | |
| 320 | 7 | | |
| 321 | 8 | | |
| 322 | 9 | | |
| 323 | 10 | | Defeat and death of Licinius. |
| 324 | 11 | | Constantine sole Emperor. |
| 325 | 12 | | Council of Nicea, June 19. |
| 326 | 13 | | |
| 327 | 14 | | |
| 328 | 15 | | |
| 329 | 16 | | |
| 330 | 17 | | |
| 331 | 18 | | |
| 332 | 19 | | |
| 333 | 20 | | |
| 334 | 21 | | |
| 335 | 22 | | |
| 336 | 1 Marcus, Jan. 18. | | Exile of Athanasius. |
| 337 | 1 Julius I., Feb. 6. | Constantine, Constans, Constantius. | Baptism of Constantine. |
| 338 | 2 | | Athanasius returns from exile. |
| 339 | 3 | | |
| 340 | 4 | | Constantine defeated and killed by Constans. Death of Eu- sebius of Cæsarea. |
| 341 | 5 | | Athanasius in Rome. Law against Pagan sacrifices. |
| 342 | 6 | | |

| A.D. | Bishops of Rome. | Emperors. | Remarkable Events, &c. |
|------|----------------------|--|--|
| 343 | 7 | | |
| 344 | 8 | | Athanasius at Milan, in Gaul. |
| 345 | 9 | | |
| 346 | 10 | | |
| 347 | 11 | | Council of Sardica. |
| 348 | 12 | | Council of Philippopolis. |
| 349 | 13 | | Athanasius in Alexandria. |
| 350 | 14 | | Constans killed in Spain by |
| 351 | 15 | Magnentius. | Magnentius. |
| 352 | 1 | Julius died April 5; Liberius, May 22. | |
| 353 | 2 | Constantius alone. | Battle of Mursa. Death of Magnentius. |
| 354 | 3 | | Birth of Augustine. |
| 355 | 4 | | Council of Arles. Council of Milan. Banishment of Liberius. |
| 356 | 5 (Felix, Antipope.) | | Julian's Campaign in Gaul. Athanasius exiled from Alexandria. |
| 357 | 6 | | Constantius at Rome. |
| 358 | 7 | | Recall of Liberius. |
| 359 | 8 | | Council of Rimini. Council of Seleucia. |
| 360 | 9 | | Death of Constantius. |
| 361 | 10 | Julian. | Athanasius returns to Alexandria—again expelled. |
| 362 | 11 | | Attempt to rebuild the Temple. Death of Julian, June 26. |
| 363 | 12 | Jovian. | |
| 364 | 13 | Valentinian, | |
| 365 | 14 | Valens. | |
| 366 | 15 | died Sept. 29. | |
| 367 | 1 | Damasus. | Tumults at Rome on the contested election of Damasus and Ursicinus. |
| 368 | 2 | Gratian. | |
| 369 | 3 | | |
| 370 | 4 | | |
| 371 | 5 | | |
| 372 | 6 | | |
| 373 | 7 | | Death of Athanasius, May 2. |
| 374 | 8 | | |
| 375 | 9 | Valentinian II. | Ambrose, Bishop of Milan. |
| 376 | 10 | | |
| 377 | 11 | | |
| 378 | 12 | | Death of Valens. |
| 379 | 13 | Theodosius, Emp. of the East. | Theodosius expels the Arians. Synod against Priscillian. |
| 380 | 14 | | Council of Constantinople. Address of Symmachus on Statute of Theodosius de Hereticis. |
| 381 | 15 | | |
| 382 | 16 | | |
| 383 | 17 | | |
| 384 | 18 | Damasus died Dec. 11. | Jerome retires to Bethlehem. |
| 385 | 1 | Siricius. | |
| 386 | 2 | | |
| 387 | 3 | | Chrysostom ad Antiochenos. |
| 388 | 4 | | |
| 389 | 5 | | |
| 390 | 6 | | Temple of Serapis destroyed. |
| 391 | 7 | | |
| 392 | 8 | | |

| A.D. | Bishops of Rome. | Emperors. | Remarkable Events, &c. |
|------|------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 393 | 9 | | Jerome retires to Bethlehem. |
| 394 | 10 | | |
| 395 | 11 | Honorius, Arcadius. | |
| 396 | 12 | | |
| 397 | 13 | | Death of Ambrose. |
| 398 | 14 died Nov. 26. | | Chrysostom Bishop of Constantinople. |
| 399 | Anastasius. | | |
| 400 | | | |

BOOK I.

CHAPTER I.

BEGINNING OF ROMAN CHRISTIANITY.

LATIN Christianity, from its commencement, in its character, and in all the circumstances of its development, had an irresistible tendency to monarchy. Its capital had for ages been the capital of the world, and it still remained that of Western Europe. This monarchy reached its height under Hildebrand and Innocent III.; the history of the Roman Pontificate thus becomes the centre of Latin History. The controversies of the East, in which Occidental or Roman Christianity mingled with a lofty dictation, sometimes so unimpassioned, that it might seem as though the establishment of its own supremacy was its ultimate aim — the conversion of the different races of Barbarians, who constituted the world of Latin Christendom — Monasticism, with the forms which it assumed in its successive Orders — the rise and conquests of Mohammedanism, with which Latin religion came at length into direct conflict, at first in Spain and Gaul, in Sicily and Italy; afterwards when the Popes placed themselves at the head of the Crusades, and Islam and Latin Christianity might seem to contest the dominion of the human race — the restoration of the

Western empire beyond the Alps — the feudal system of which the Pope aspired to be as it were the spiritual Suzerain — the long and obstinate conflicts with the temporal power — the origin and tenets of the sects which attempted to withdraw from the unity of the church, and to retire into independent communities — the first struggles of the human mind for freedom within Latin Christendom — the gradual growth of Christian literature, Christian art, and Christian philosophy — all these momentous subjects range themselves as episodes in the chronicle of the Roman bishops. Hence our history obtains that unity which impresses itself upon the attention, and presents the vicissitudes of centuries as a vast, continuous, harmonious whole ; while at the same time it breaks up and separates itself into distinct periods, each with its marked events, peculiar character, and commanding men. And so the plan of our work may, at least, attempt to fulfil the two great functions of history, to arrest the mind and carry it on with unflagging interest, to infix its whole course of events on the imagination and the memory, as well by its broad and definite landmarks, as by the life and reality of its details in each separate period. The writer is unfeignedly conscious how far his own powers fall below the dignity of his subject, below the accomplishment of his own conceptions.

I. — The first of these periods in the history of Latin A. D. 366-401. Christianity closes with Pope Damasus and his two successors.¹ Its age of total obscurity is passed, its indistinct twilight is brightening into open day. The

¹There is another advantage in this division ; the first authentic decretal is that of Pope Siricius, the successor of Damasus.

Christian bishop is become so important a personage in Rome, as to be the subject of profane history. His election is a cause of civil strife. Christianity more than equally divides the Patriciate, still more the people; it has already ascended the Imperial throne. Noble matrons and virgins are becoming the vestals of Christian Monasticism. The bitterness of the Heathen party betrays a galling sense of inferiority. Paganism is writhing, struggling, languishing in its death pangs, Christianity growing haughty and wanton in its triumph.

II. — The second ends with Pope Leo the Great. Paganism has made its last vain effort, not A. D. 461. now for equality, for toleration. It has been buried under the ruins of the conquered capital. Alaric tramples out its last embers. Rome emerges from its destruction by the Goths a Christian city. The East has wrought out, after the strife of two centuries, the dogmatic system of the church, which Rome receives with haughty condescension, as if she had imposed it on the world. The great Western controversy, Pelagianism, has been agitated and has passed away. Pre-tensions to the successorship of St. Peter are A. D. 402-417. already heard from Innocent I. Claims are made at least to the authority of a Western Patriarch. In Leo the Great, half a century later, the pope is A. D. 440-461. not merely the greatest personage in Rome, but even in Italy; he takes the lead as a pacific protector against the Barbarians. Leo the Great is likewise the first distinguished writer among the popes.

III. — To the death of Gregory I. (the Great).

A. D. 604. Christianity is not only the religion of the Roman or Italian, but in part of the barbarian world. Now takes place the league of Christianity with Barbarism. The old Roman letters and arts die away into almost total extinction. So fallen is Roman literature, that Boethius is a great philosopher, Cassiodorus a great historian, Prudentius, Fortunatus, Juvencus great poets. The East has made its last effort to unite the Christian world under one dominion. Justinian has aspired to legislate for Christendom. Monastic Christianity, having received a strong impulse from St. Benedict, is in the ascendant. Gregory I. as a Pope, and as a writer, offers himself as a model of its excellencies and defects.

IV.—To the coronation of Charlemagne as Emperor of the West. A. D. 800. Mohammed and Mohammedanism arise. The East and Egypt are severed from Greek, Africa and Spain from Latin Christianity. Anglo-Saxon Britain, Western and Southern Germany are Christian. Iconoclasm in the East finally separates Greek and Latin Christianity. The Pope has become the great power in Italy. The Gothic kingdom, the Greek dominion of Justinian have passed away. The Pope seeks an alliance against the Lombards with the Transalpine kings. Charlemagne is Patrician of Rome and Emperor of the West.

V.—The Empire of Charlemagne. The mingled Temporal and Ecclesiastical supremacy of Charlemagne breaks up at his death. Under his successors the spiritual supremacy, in part the temporal, falls to the clergy. Growth of the Transalpine hierarchy.

Pope Nicholas the First accepts the false decretals. Invasion of the Northmen. The dark ages A. D. 996. of the Papacy lower and terminate in the degradation of the Popes into slaves of the lawless Barons of the Romagna.

VI.—The line of German Pontiffs. The Transalpine powers interpose, rescue the Papacy A. D. 996-1061. from its threatened dissolution, from the hatred and contempt of mankind. For great part of a century foreign ecclesiastics are seated on the Papal throne.

VII.—The restoration of the Italian Papacy under Gregory VII. (Hildebrand). The Pontif- A. D. 1061- cates of his immediate predecessors and suc- 1073. cessors. Now commences the complete organization of the sacerdotal caste as independent of, and claiming superiority to, all temporal powers. The strife of centuries ends in the enforced celibacy of the clergy. Berengar disputes Transubstantiation. Urban II. places himself at the head of Christendom on the A. D. 1095. occasion of the first Crusade.

VIII.—Continuation of contest about Investitures. Intellectual movement. Erigena. Gotschalk. Anselm. Abelard. Arnold of Brescia. Strong revival of Monasticism. Stephen Harding. St. Ber- The 12th cen- nard. Strife in England for immunities of tury. the clergy. Thomas à Becket. Rise of the Emperors of the line of Hohenstaufen. Frederick Barbarossa.

IX.—Meridian of the Papal power under Innocent III. Innocent aspires to rule all the king- From 1198.

doms of the West. Latin conquest of Constantinople. Wars of the Albigenses. St. Dominic. St. Francis.

X. — The successors of Innocent III. wage an internecine conflict with the Emperors. Fruitless and premature attempt at emancipation under Frederick II.

Gregory IX.
1228-1233. The Decretals, the Palladium of the Papal power, are collected, completed, promulgated as the law of Christendom by Gregory IX. Continued conflict of the Papal and Sacerdotal against the Imperial and Secular power. Innocent IV.
dies 1254. Innocent IV. Fall of the House of Hohenstaufen.

XI. — The Empire is crushed, and withdraws into its Teutonic sphere. The French descend into Italy. In the King of France arises a new adversary to the Pope. Philip the Fair and Boniface VIII. Boniface dies
1303. close the open strife of the temporal and spiritual power.

XII. — The Popes are become the slaves of France at Avignon. What is called the Babylonian captivity of seventy years. A. D. 1305 to
1370. Clement V. abolishes the Templars. The Empire resumes its claims on Italy. Henry of Luxemburg. Louis of Bavaria. John XXII. and the Fraticelli. Rienzi.

XIII. — Restoration to Rome. The great Schism. Councils of Pisa, of Constance, of Basil, of Florence, — the Councils advance a claim to supremacy over the Popes. Last attempt to reconcile Greek and Latin Christianity. Popes begin to be patrons of Letters and Arts.

XIV. — Retrospect of Mediæval Letters and Arts. Revival of Greek Letters.

CONCLUSION. — Advance of the Reformation. Teu-
tonic Christianity aspires and begins to divide the
world with Latin Christianity.

Like almost all the great works of nature and of
human power in the material world and in the world
of man, the Papacy grew up in silence and obscurity.
The names of the earlier Bishops of Rome are known
only by barren lists,¹ by spurious decrees and epistles
inscribed, centuries later, with their names; by their
collision with the teachers of heretical opinions, almost
all of whom found their way to Rome; by martyrdoms
ascribed with the same lavish reverence to those who
lived under the mildest of the Roman emperors, as
well as those under the most merciless persecutors.²
Yet the mythic or imaginative spirit of early Chris-
tianity has either respected, or was not tempted to

¹ The catalogue published by Bucherius, called also Liberianus, is generally the most accredited. M. Bunsen promises a revision of the whole question. (Hippolytus, i. 279.) Historically the chronological discrepancies in these lists are of no great importance. But it is remarkable that almost all the earlier names are Greek; Clemens, Pius, Victor, Caius, are among the very few genuine Roman.

² In a list of Popes, published by Fabricius (*Bibliotheca Græca*, xi. p. 794), from St. Peter to Sylvester, two unhappy pontiffs alone (who are acknowledged to be Greeks) are excluded from the honors of martyrdom, Dionysius and Eusebius. It might seem that this list was composed after Greek and Latin Christianity had become hostile. As an illustration of the worthlessness of these traditions, Telesphorus is reckoned as a martyr on the authority of Irenæus (l. ii. c. 3; compare note of Feuardentius). But Telesphorus was bishop of Rome during the reign of Hadrian; his martyrdom is ascribed to the first year of Antoninus Pius. Their character, as well as the general voice of Christian history (see *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 151, 156), absolves these emperors from the charge of persecution.

indulge its creative fertility by the primitive annals of Rome. After the embellishment, if not the invention, of St. Peter's Pontificate, his conflict with Simon Magus in the presence of the Emperor, and the circumstance of his martyrdom, it was content with raising the successive bishops to the rank of martyrs without any peculiar richness or fulness of legend.¹

It would be singularly curious and instructive to trace, if it were possible, the rise and growth of any single Christian community, more especially that of Rome, at once in the whole church, and in the lives of the bishops; the first initiatory movements in the conquest of the world, and of the mistress of the world, by the religion of Christ. How did the Church enlarge her sphere in Rome? how, out of the population (from a million to a million and a half),² slowly gather in her tens, her hundreds, her thousands of converts? By what processes, by what influences,

¹ Two remarkable passages greatly weaken, or rather utterly destroy the authority of all the older Roman martyrologies. In the book, *De libris recipiendis*, ascribed to the pontificate of Damasus, of Hornisdas, more probably to that of Gelasius, the caution of the Roman Church, in not publicly reading the martyrologies is highly praised, their writers being unknown and without authority. *Singulari cautela a S. Rom. Ecclesiâ non leguntur, quia et eorum qui conscripserint nomina penitus ignorantur, et ab infidelibus vel idiotis superflua aut minus apta quam rei ordo fuerit esse putantur* The authors "*Deo magis quam hominibus noti sunt.*" *Apud Mansi, sub Pont. Gelasii, A.D. 492, 496.* Gregory I. makes even a more ingenuous confession, that excepting one small volume (a calendar, it should seem, of the names and days on which they were honored) there were no Acts of Martyrs in the archives of the Roman See or in the libraries of Rome. *Præter illa, quæ in ejusdem Eusebii libris (doubtless the de Martyr. Palæst. of the historian), de gestis sanctorum martyrum continentur, nulla in archivis hujus nostræ Ecclesiæ vel in Romanæ urbis bibliothecis esse cognovi, nisi pauca quædam in unius codicis volumine collecta, et seqq. Greg. M. Epist. viii. 29.*

² Notwithstanding the arguments of M. Dureau de la Malle, Mr. Merivale, and other learned writers who have also investigated this subject, I still think the estimate of Gibbon the most probable.

by what degrees did the Christians creep onward towards dangerous, towards equal, towards superior numbers? How did they find access to the public ear, the public mind, the public heart? How were they looked upon by the government (after the Neronian persecution), with what gradations, or alternations of contempt, of indifference, of suspicion, of animosity? When were they entirely separated and distinguished in general opinion from the Jewish communities? When did they altogether cease to Judaize? From what order, from what class, from what race did they chiefly make their proselytes? Where and by what channels did they wage their strife with the religion, where with the philosophy of the times? To what extent were they permitted or disposed to hold public discussion? or did the work of conversion spread in secret from man to man? When did their worship emerge from the obscurity of a private dwelling; or have its edifices, like the Jewish synagogues, recognized as sacred fanes? Were they, to what extent, and how long, a people dwelling apart within their own usages, and retiring from social communion with their kindred, and with the rest of mankind?

Rome must be imagined in the vastness and multi-formity of its social condition, the mingling and confusion of races, languages, conditions, in order to conceive the slow, imperceptible, yet continuous aggression of Christianity. Amid the affairs of the universal empire, the perpetual revolutions, which were constantly calling up new dynasties or new masters over the world, the pomp and state of the Imperial palace, the commerce, the business flowing in from all

Obscurity of the first progress of Christianity.

parts of the world, the bustle of the Basilicas or courts of law, the ordinary religious ceremonies, or the more splendid rites on signal-occasions, which still went on, if with diminishing concourse of worshippers, with their old sumptuousness, magnificence, and frequency, the public games, the theatres, the gladiatorial shows, the Lucullan or Apician banquets, — Christianity was gradually withdrawing from the heterogeneous mass some of all orders, even slaves, out of the vices, the ignorance, the misery of that corrupted social system. It was ever instilling feelings of humanity yet unknown or coldly commended by an impotent philosophy, among men and women, whose infant ears had been habituated to the shrieks of dying gladiators; it was giving dignity to minds prostrated by years, almost centuries, of degrading despotism; it was nurturing purity and modesty of manners in an unspeakable state of depravation; it was enshrining the marriage bed in a sanctity long almost entirely lost, and rekindling to a steady warmth the domestic affections; it was substituting a simple, calm, and rational faith and worship for the worn-out superstitions of heathenism; gently establishing in the soul of man the sense of immortality, till it became a natural and inextinguishable part of his moral being.

The dimness and obscurity which veiled the growing church, no doubt threw its modest concealment over the person of the Bishop. He was but one man, with no recognized function, in the vast and tumultuous population. He had his unmarked dwelling, perhaps in the distant Transteverine region, or in the then lowly and unfrequented Vatican. By the vulgar, he was beheld as a Jew, or as belonging

Obscurity of
the Bishop of
Rome.

to one of those countless Eastern religions, which, from the commencement of the Empire, had been flowing, each with its strange rites and mysteries, into Rome. The Emperor, the Imperial family, the court favorites, the military commanders, the Consulars, the Senators, the Patricians by birth, wealth, or favor, the Pontiffs, the great lawyers, even those who ministered to the public pleasures, the distinguished mimes or gladiators, when they appeared in the streets, commanded more public attention than the Christian Bishop; except when sought out for persecution by some politic or fanatic Emperor. Slowly, and at long intervals, did the Bishop of Rome emerge to dangerous eminence. Yet, was there not more real greatness, a more solemn testimony to his faith in Christ, in this calm and steadfast patience which awaited the tardy accomplishment of the divine promises, than if, as he is sometimes described by the fond reverence of later Roman writers, he had already laid claim to supreme power over expanding Christianity, or had been held of sufficient importance to be constantly exposed to death? The Bishop of Rome could not but be conscious that he was chief minister in the capital of the world of a religion which was confronting Paganism in all its power and majesty. His faith was constantly looking forward to the time, when (if not anticipated by the more appalling triumph at the coming of Christ in His glory) that vast fabric of idolatry, in its strength and wealth, hallowed by the veneration of ages, with all its temples, pomps, theatres, priesthood, its crimes and its superstitions, and besides this, all the wisdom of the philosophic aristocracy, would crumble away; and the successor of the Galilean fisherman or the persecuted

Jew be recognized as the religious sovereign of the Christianized city. The peaceful head of a small community (small comparatively with the believers in the old religions or the believers in none,) even though, like the Apostle, he may have had some converts in high places, "in Cæsar's household," yet who had no doubt in the future universality of Christianity, and who was content to pursue his noiseless course of beneficence and conversion, is a nobler example of true Christianity, than he who, in the excitement of opposition to power, and in the absorbing but brief agony of martyrdom, laid down his life for the Cross.

Christianity, indeed, might seem, even from the first, to have disdained obscurity — to have sprung up or to have been forced into terrible notoriety in the Neronian persecution and the subsequent martyrdom of one at least, according to the vulgar tradition, of its two great Apostles. What caprice of cruelty directed the attention of Nero to the Christians, and made him suppose them victims important enough to glut the popular indignation at the burning of Rome, it is impossible to determine: (the author has ventured on a bold conjecture, and adheres to his own paradox).¹ The cause and extent of the Domitian persecution is equally obscure. The son of Vespasian was not likely to be merciful to any connected with the fanatic Jews. Its known victims were of the imperial family, against whom some crime was necessary, and an accusation of Christianity served the end.²

At the commencement of the second century, under

¹ Hist. of Christianity, ii. p. 36.

² Ibid., ii. p. 59.

Trajan, persecution against the Christians is ^{Roman} raging in the East. That, however (I feel ^{Church under} ^{Trajan.} increased confidence in the opinion), was a local, or rather Asiatic persecution, arising out of the vigilant and not groundless apprehension of the sullen and brooding preparation for insurrection among the whole Jewish race (with whom Roman terror and hatred still confounded the Christians), which broke out in the bloody massacres of Cyrene and Cyprus, and in the final rebellion, during the reign of Hadrian, under Barchochebas. But while Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, is carried to Rome to suffer martyrdom, the Roman community is in peace, and not without influence. Ignatius entreats his Roman brethren not to interfere with injurious kindness between himself and his glorious death.¹

The wealth of the Roman community, and their lavish Christian use of their wealth, by contributing to the wants of foreign churches, at all periods, especially in times of danger and disaster, (an ancient usage which lasted till the time of Eusebius,) testifies at once to their flourishing condition, to their constant communication with more distant parts of the empire,² and thus in-

¹ Φοβοῦμαι γὰρ τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην, μὴ αὐτὴ με ἀδικήσῃ, ὑμῖν γὰρ εὐχερές ἐστιν ὃ θέλετε ποιῆσαι. — p. 41. Ἐγὼ γράφω πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις καὶ ἐντέλλομαι πᾶσιν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐκὼν ὑπὲρ Θεοῦ ἀποθνήσκω, ἕάνπερ ὑμεῖς μὴ κωλύσητέ (με). Παρακαλῶ ὑμεῖς μὴ (ἐν) εἰννοία ἁκαίρῳ γένησθέ μοι ... — Corpus Ignatianum a Cureton, p. 45. I quote Mr. Cureton's Syriac Ignatius, not feeling that the larger copies have equal historical authority.

² The first notice of this is in the latter half of the second century, during the bishopric of Soter, either 173-177, or 168-176, as appears from the letter of Dionysius of Corinth, ἐξ ἀρχῆς γὰρ ὑμῖν ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῦτο. He calls it also πατριπαράδοτον ἔθος. — Euseb. H. E. iv. 23. It continued during the Decian persecution; Syria and Arabia are described as rejoicing in the bounty of Rome. H. E. vii. 5. Eusebius himself speaks of it as lasting to his time. τὸ μεχρὶ τοῦ 1218' ἡμᾶς διωγμοῦ φυλαχθὲν Ῥωμαίων ἔθος.

cidental, perhaps, to the class, the middle or mercantile class, which formed the greater part of the believers.

But the history of Latin Christianity has not begun. For some considerable (it cannot but be an undefinable) part of the first three centuries, the Church of Rome, and most, if not all the churches of the West, were, if we may so speak, Greek religious colonies. Their language was Greek, their organization Greek, their writers Greek, their Scriptures Greek; and many vestiges and traditions show that their ritual, their Liturgy was Greek. Through Greek the communication of the churches of Rome and of the West was constantly kept up with the East; and through Greek every heresiarch, or his disciples, having found his way to Rome, propagated, with more or less success, his peculiar doctrines. Greek was the commercial language throughout the empire; by which the Jews, before the destruction of their city, already so widely disseminated through the world, and altogether engaged in commerce, carried on their affairs.¹

¹ At the commencement of the second century, from the time of the great peace, which followed the victories of Trajan, and which, with some exceptions, occupied the whole reigns of Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, Marcus Aurelius, till the Marcomannic war; when the Cæsars had become cosmopolitan sovereigns of the Roman Empire, rather than emperors of Rome; Greek, in letters, appears to have assumed a complete ascendancy. Greek literature has the names of Plutarch, Appian, Arrian, Herodian (the historian), Lucian, Pausanias, Dion Cassius, Galen, Sextus Empiricus, Epictetus, Ptolemy. The Emperor Marcus Aurelius wrote his philosophy in Greek. The poets, such as they were, chiefly of the didactic class, Oppian, Nicander, are Greeks. (See, in Fynes Clinton's Appendix to *Fasti Romani*, the catalogue of Greek authors.) Latin literature might seem to have been in a state of suspended animation after Quintilian, the Plinys, and Tacitus. Not merely are there no writers of name who have survived, but there hardly seem to have been any. From Juvenal to Claudian there is scarcely a poet. The fragments of Fronto, lately discovered, do not make us wish for more of a writer who had greater fame than most of his day. Apuleius was an African.

Jurisprudence alone maintained the dignity and dominion of Latin. The

The Greek Old Testament was read in the synagogues of the foreign Jews. The churches, formed sometimes on the foundation, to a certain extent on the model, of the synagogues, would adhere for some time, no doubt, to their language. The Gospels and the Apostolic writings, so soon as they became part of the public worship, would be read, as the Septuagint was, in their original tongue. All the Christian extant writings which appeared in Rome and in the West are Greek, or were originally Greek,¹ the Epistles of Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Clementine Recognitions and Homilies; the works of Justin Martyr, down to Caius and Hippolytus the author of the Refutation of All Heresies. The Octavius of Minucius Felix,² and the Treatise of Novatian on the Trinity, are the earliest known works of Latin Christian literature which came from Rome. So was it too in Gaul: there the first Christians were settled chiefly in the Greek cities, which owned Marseilles as their parent, and which retained the use of Greek as their vernacular tongue. Irenæus wrote in Greek; the account of the Martyrs of Lyons and Vienne is in Greek. Vestiges of the old Greek ritual long survived not only in Rome, but also in some of the Gallic churches. The Kyrie eleison still lingers in the Latin service.³ The singular fact,

great lawyers, Ulpian, Paulus, and their colleagues, are the only famous writers. Latin law alone, of Latin letters, was studied in the schools of the East. The Greek writers of the day were many of them ignorant of Latin.

¹ *Ubrigens war die Griechische Sprache noch fast die einzige Kirchengesprache.* Gieseler, i. p. 203. (Compare the passage.)

² Some place the Octavius in the reign of Marcus Aurelius, others between Tertullian and Cyprian. Gieseler, note, p. 207.

³ Martene, *de Antiquis Ecclesiæ ritibus*, i. p. 102: he quotes the anonymous Turonius. *Nos canimus illud Græcè juxta morem antiquum Roma*

related by the historian Sozomen, that, for the first centuries, there was no public preaching in Rome, here finds its explanation. Greek was the ordinary language of the community, but among the believers and worshippers may have been Latins, who understood not, or understood imperfectly, the Greek. The Gospels or sacred writings were explained according to the capacities of the persons present. Hippolytus indeed composed, probably delivered, homilies in Greek, in imitation of Origen, who, when at Rome, may have preached in Greek; and this is spoken of as something new. Pope Leo I. was the first celebrated Latin preacher, and his brief and emphatic sermons read like the first essays of a rude and untried eloquence, rather than the finished compositions which would imply a long study and cultivation of pulpit oratory. Compare them with Chrysostom.¹

Africa,² not Rome, gave birth to Latin Christianity.

næ ecclesiæ, cui tam Græci quam Latini solebant antiquitus deservire, et a Græcis habitabatur maxima pars Italiæ, et seqq. This is evidence for the Church of Tours. It is by no means clear when the Latin service began, even in Rome. There is much further illustration of the coexistence of the Latin and Greek service in the West, to a late period. Compare Martene, iii. 35. The Epistle and Gospel were read in both languages to a late period. Mabillon, *Iter Italicum*, ii. pp. 168 and 453. In Southern Gaul Latin had not entirely dispossessed Greek in the fifth century: Greek was still spoken by part of the population of Arles. (See Fauriel, *Gaule Méridionale*, i. p. 432.) A Saint Martial de Limoges on chantait en Grec dans le x. siècle à la Messe du jour de la Pentecôte le Gloria, le Sanctus, l'Agnus, &c. Ce fait est établi par un MS. de la Bibliothèque Royale, 4° 4458. Jourdain, *Traductions d'Aristote*, p. 44.

¹ In Rome neither the Bishop nor any one else publicly preached to the people, *οὔτε δὲ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος οὔτε ἄλλός τις ἐνθάδε ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας διδάσκει*. H. E. vii. 19. In Alexandria the bishop alone preached. Compare Bunsen's Hippolytus, vol. i. p. 318.

² Of Africa Greek was the general language no further East than the Cyrenaica; westward the old Punic language prevailed, even where the Roman conquerors had superinduced Latin. Even Tertullian wrote also

Tertullian was the first Latin writer, at least the first who commanded the public ear; and there is strong ground for supposing that, since Africa parent of Latin Christianity. Tertullian quotes the sacred writings perpetually and copiously, the earliest of those many Latin versions, noticed by Augustine, and on which Jerome grounded his Vulgate, were African.¹ Cyprian kept up the tradition of ecclesiastical Latin. Arnobius, too, was an African.²

Thus the Roman church was but one of the confederation of Greek religious republics, founded by Christianity. As of Apostolic origin, still Church of Rome centre of Christendom. more as the church of the capital of the world, it was, of course, of paramount dignity and importance. It is difficult to exaggerate the height at which Rome, before the foundation of Constantinople,

in Greek. Latinè *quoque* ostendam virgines nostras velari oportere. (De Virgin. veland.) Sed et huic materiæ propter suaviludios nostros Græco quoque stylo satisfacimus. De Coron. Mil. vi.

¹ Vetus hæc interpretatio vix dubitari potest quin inter eam gentem quæ Græcæ linguæ minimè perita esset, nata fuerit, hoc est in Africâ. Lachman, Pref. in Nov. Test. Lachman quotes a learned Dissertation of Cardinal Wiseman as conclusive on this point. In this Dissertation (reprinted in his Essays, London, 1854) the author ventures on the forlorn hope of the vindication of the disputed text in St. John's Epistle. I can only express my surprise that so acute a writer should see any force in such arguments. But the Dissertation on African Latinity appears to me valuable, scholar-like, and sound. The dubious passage of St. Augustine, on which alone rests the tradition of the *Versio Itala*, I would read, after Bentley, as Bishop Marsh and most of the later biblical scholars, *Ilia*. — Marsh's Introduction, note, vol. ii. p. 623.

I would suggest, as a curious investigation, if it has not yet been executed by any competent scholar (which I presume not to assert), a critical comparison of the Latinity of the old version, as published by Sabatier, and even of the Vulgate, with the Latin of Tertullian, Cyprian, Apuleius of Madaura, and other African writers.

² Minucius Felix, Arnobius, Lactantius are to the Greek divines what Cicero was to the Greek philosophers — writers of popular abstracts in that which in his hands was, in theirs aspired to be, elegant Latin.

stood above the other cities of the earth; the centre of commerce, the centre of affairs, the centre of empire. The Christians, like the rest of mankind, were constantly ebbing and flowing out of Rome and into Rome. The church of the capital could not but assume something of the dignity of the capital; it was constantly receiving, as it were, the homage of all the foreign Christians, who, from interest, business, ambition, curiosity, either visited or took up their residence in the Eternal City.

The Roman Church, if it had become prematurely Latin, would have been isolated and set apart from the rest of Christendom; remaining Greek, it became also the natural and inevitable centre of Christianity. The public documents of the Christian world spoke throughout the same language; no interpretation was necessary between the East and the West.¹ To the unity of the Church this was of infinite importance. The Roman Christians and their Bishop were the constituted guardians and protectors of what may be called the public interests of Christianity. In Rome they beheld, or had the earliest intelligence of, every revolution in the empire; they had the first cognizance of all the Imperial edicts which might affect the brethren. On them, even if they had no access to the counsels or to the palace of the Emperor, on their influence, on their conduct, might in some degree depend the fate of Christendom. They were in the van, the first to foresee the threatened persecution, the first to suffer. The Bishop of Rome, as long as the Emperor ruled in

¹ As late as the middle of the third century, after the Novatian schism, Pope Cornelius writes in Greek to Fabius of Antioch. Eusebius records as something new and extraordinary that letters from Cyprian to the Asiatic bishops are in Latin. H. E. vi. 43.

Rome, was at once in the post of the greatest distinction, and in that of the greatest difficulty and danger. The Christian world would look with trembling interest on his conduct, as his example might either glorify or disgrace the Church ; on his prudence or his temerity, on his resolution or on his weakness, might depend the orders despatched to every prefect or proconsul in the Empire. Local oppressions or local persecutions would be confined to a city or a province ; in Rome might be the signal for general proscription. The eyes of all Christendom must thus have constantly been fixed on Rome and on the Roman Bishop.

But if Rome, or the Church of Rome, was thus the centre of the more peaceful influences of Centre of
Christian
controversies. Christianity, and of the hopes and fears of the Christian world, it was no less inevitably the chosen battle field of her civil wars ; and Christianity has ever more faithfully recorded her dissensions than her conquests. In Rome every feud which distracted the infant community reached its height ; nowhere do the Judaizing tenets seem to have been more obstinate, or to have held so long and stubborn a conflict with more full and genuine Christianity. In Rome every heresy, almost every heresiarch, found welcome reception. All new opinions, all attempts to harmonize Christianity with the tenets of the Greek philosophers, with the Oriental religions, the Cosmogonies, the Theophanies, and Mysteries of the East, were boldly agitated, either by the authors of the Gnostic About
A. D. 140. systems or by their disciples. Valentinus the Alexandrian was himself in Rome, so also was Marcion of Sinope. The Phrygian Montanus, with his prophetesses, Priscilla and Maximilla, if not present,

had their sect, a powerful sect, in Rome and in Africa. In Rome their convert, for a time at least, was the Pope; in Africa, Tertullian. Somewhat later, the precursors of the great Trinitarian controversy came from all quarters. Praxeas, an Asiatic; Theodotus, a Byzantine; Artemon, an Asiatic; Noetus, a Smyrniote, at least his disciples, the Deacon Epigenes and Cleomenes, taught at Rome. Sabellius, from Ptolemais in Cyrene, appeared in person; his opinions took their full development in Rome. Not only do all these controversies betray the inexhaustible fertility of the Greek or Eastern imagination, not only were they all drawn from Greek or Oriental doctrines, but they must have been still agitated, discussed, ramified into their parts and divisions, through the versatile and subtile Greek. They were all strangers and foreigners; not one of all these systems originated in Rome, in Italy, or in Africa.¹ On all these opinions the Bishop of Rome was almost compelled to sit in judgment; he must receive or reject, authorize or condemn; he was a proselyte, whom it would be the ambition of all to gain. No one unfamiliar with Greek, no one not to a great extent Greek by birth, by education, or by habit, could in any degree comprehend the conflicting theories.

The Judaizing opinions, combated by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, maintained their ground among some of the Roman Chris-

Judaizing
Christianity.

¹ A passage of Aulus Gellius illustrates the conscious inadequacy of the Latin to express, notwithstanding the innovations of Cicero, the finer distinctions of the Greek philosophy: *Hæc Favorinum dicentem audivi Græcâ oratione, cujus sententias, quantum meminisse potui, retuli. Amœnitates vero et copias ubertatesque verborum, Latina omnis facundia vix quidem indipisci potuerit. Noct. Att. xii.* Favorinus, of the time of Hadrian, was a native of Arles in Gaul.

tians for above a century or more after that Apostle's death. A remarkable monument attests their power and vitality. There can be slight doubt that the author of that singular work, commonly called the Clementina, was a Roman, or rather a Greek domiciled in Rome.¹ Its Roman origin is almost proved by the choice of the hero in this earliest of religious romances. Clement, who sets forth as a heathen philosopher in search of truth, becomes the companion of St. Peter in the East, the witness of his long and stubborn strife with his great adversary, Simon the Magician; and if the letter prefixed to the work be a genuine part of it,² becomes the successor of St. Peter in the see of Rome. It bears in its front, and throughout, the character of a romance; it can hardly be considered even as mythic history. Its groundwork is that so common in the latest Greek and in the Latin comedy, and in the Greek novels; adventures of persons cast away at sea, and sold into slavery; lost children by strange accidents restored to their parents, husbands to their wives; amusing scenes in what we may call the middle or mercantile life of the times. It might seem borrowed, in its incidents, from a play of Plautus or Terence, or from their originals; a kind of type of the *Æthiopics* of Bishop Heliodorus, or the *Chærea* and *Callirhoe*. The religious interest is still more remarkable, and no doubt faith-

¹ This is the unanimous opinion of those who, in later days, have critically investigated the Clementina—Schlieman, Neander, Baur, Gieseler. *ἑγὼ Κλήμης Ῥωμαίος ὢν*, in init. This does not prove much.

² I entertain some doubt on this point. A good critical edition of this work, in its various forms, is much to be desired.*

* There are now two good editions of the Clementina—1. by Schwegler, Stuttgart, 1847; 2. The last and best, by Dressel, Gottingen, 1853; besides, 3. The Latin translation of Rufinus, by Gersdorf, Leipsic, 1838.

fully represents the views and tenets of a certain sect or class of Christians. It is the work of a Judaizing Christian, according to a very peculiar form of Ebionitism.¹ The scene is chiefly laid in Palestine and its neighborhood, its original language is Greek. The views of the author as to the rank, influence, and relative position of the Apostles, is among its most singular characteristics. So far from ascribing any primacy to St. Peter, though St. Peter is throughout the leading personage, James, Bishop of Jerusalem, is the acknowledged head of Christendom, the arbiter of Christian doctrine, the Bishop of Bishops, to whom Peter himself bows with submissive reverence. Of any earlier visits of Peter to Rome the author is ignorant. Clement encounters the Apostle in Palestine; in Palestine or in the East is carried on the whole strife with Simon Magus. Yet Peter is the Apostle of the Gentiles, to Peter the heathens owe their Christianity. More than this, there is a bitter hatred to St. Paul, which betrays itself in brief, covert, sarcastic allusion, not to be mistaken in its object or aim.² The whole purpose of the work is to assert a Petrine, a Judaizing, an anti-Pauline Christianity. The Gospel is but a republication of the Law, that is, the pure, genuine, original Law, which emanated from God. God is light, his Wisdom or his Spirit (these are identified and are both the Son of God) has dwelt in different men, from Adam to

¹ This is abundantly proved by Schlieman and by Neander.

² In the letter of St. Peter, *τινὲς γὰρ τῶν ἀπὸ ἐθνῶν, τὸ δὲ ἐμοῦ νόμιμον ἀπεδοκίμασαν κήρυγμα, τοῦ ἐχθροῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀνομόν τινα καὶ φλυαρώδη προσηκόμενοι διδασκαλίαν.* If we could doubt that here St. Paul, not Simon Magus is meant, the allusions xi. 35, xvii. 19, and elsewhere, to the very acts and words of St. Paul are conclusive. Compare Schlieman, *Die Clementine*, 74, 96, 534, &c.

JESUS. The whole world is one vast system of Dualisms, or Antagonisms. The antagonism of Simon Magus to St. Peter is chiefly urged in the Clementine homilies; but there are manifest hints, more perhaps than hints, of a second antagonism between Peter and Paul, the teacher of Christianity with the Law, and the teacher of Christianity without the Law. Here then is the representative of what can scarcely be supposed an insignificant party in Rome (the various forms, reconstructions, and versions in which the Clementina appear, whole, or in fragments, attest their wide-spread popularity) who does not scruple to couple fiction with the most sacred names. Of the whole party it must have been the obvious interest to exalt St. Peter, to assert him as the founder, the Bishop of the true Church in Rome; and it is certainly singular that in all the early traditions, which are more than allusions to St. Peter at Rome, Simon Magus appears as his shadow. Has, then, the myth grown out of the pure fiction, or is the fiction but an expansion of the myth? ¹

At all events these works are witnesses to the perpetuity and strength, to a late period, of these Judaizing opinions in Rome.² Their fictitious form in no way invalidates their authority as expressing living opinions, tenets, and sentiments. If not Roman (I have slight doubt on this head), there is an attestation to the wide-spread oppugnancy of a Petrine and a Pauline party;

¹ Strictly speaking the authority for Simon Magus being at Rome is earlier than that for St. Peter. The famous passage of Justin Martyr on the inscription *Semoni Sanco*, is about twenty years older than the Epistle of Dionysius of Corinth (A. D. 171),—the first *distinct* assertion of St. Peter in Rome. Euseb. H. E. ii. 13, 14.

² Schlieman assigns the Recognitions to some time between 212 and 230—the Clementina, no doubt, are of an *earlier* date. p. 327, *et seqq.*

to strong divergence of opinion as to the relative rank and dignity of the Apostles.

Out of the antagonism between Judaic and anti-
Controversy about Easter. Judaic Christianity arose the first conflict, in which the Bishop of Rome, as the leader of a great part of the Christian confederation, assumed unwonted authority. Difference of opinion did not necessarily lead to open strife — from difference of observance it was unavoidable. The controversy about A. D. 109. the time of keeping Easter, or rather the Paschal Feast, had slept from the days of Polycarp and Anicetus of Rome. Towards the close of the second century it broke out again. Rome, it is remarkable, now held the anti-Judaic usage of the variable feast, and in this concurred with the churches of Palestine, of Cæsarea, and Jerusalem. These were chiefly of Gentile descent, and probably from near neighborhood to the Jews were most averse to the usages of that hostile and odious race. The Asiatic churches had adhered to the ancient Jewish custom, the observance of the 14th day of the month (Nisan). The controversy seems to have been awakened in Rome by one Blastus,¹ denounced as endeavoring secretly to enslave the Church to Judaism. The Bishop Victor deposed the obstinate schismatic from A. D. 196. the Roman Presbytery. But the strife was not confined to Rome. The Asiatic Christians, under Polycrates of Ephesus, maintained their own, the Judaic usage, sanctioned, as was asserted, by the martyr

¹ Est præterea his omnibus Blastus accedens, qui latenter Judaismum vult introducere. Pascha enim dicit non aliter custodiendum esse nisi secundum legem Moysi xiiii mensis. — Præscript. Hæret. This is from an addition, probably an ancient one, to the Treatise of Tertullian.

Polycarp, by Philip the Deacon, and even by St. John. Victor, supported by the Bishops, Theophilus of the Palestinian Cæsarea, by Narcissus of Jerusalem, by some in Pontus, in Osroene, in Gaul, and by Bacchylides of Corinth, peremptorily demanded a Council to judge the Asiatic Bishops; threatened or actually pronounced a disruption of all communion with those who presumed to maintain their stubborn difference from himself and the rest of the Christian world.¹ The strife was appeased by the interposition of Irenæus, justly, according to the Ecclesiastical historian, called a Man of Peace. Irenæus was Bishop of Vienne in Gaul; and so completely is Christianity now one world, that a Bishop of Gaul allays a feud in which the Bishop of Rome is in alliance with the Bishops of Syria and of the remoter East, against those of Asia Minor. Africa does not look with indifference on the controversy. Irenæus had already written an epistle to Blastus in Rome, reproving him as author of the schism: he now wrote to the Bishop Victor, asserting the right of the Churches to maintain their own usages on such points, and recommending a milder tone on these ceremonial questions.²

It was not till the Council of Nicea that Christendom acquiesced in the same Paschal Cycle.

The reign of Commodus, commencing with the last twenty years of the second century, is an epoch in the history of Western Christendom. Reign of Commodus 180-193.
The feud between the Judaizing and anti-Judaizing

¹ Euseb. H. E. v. 15.

² The Latin book ascribed to Novatian, against the Jewish distinction of meats, shows Judaism still struggling within the church on its most vital peculiarities. The author of this tract wrote also against circumcision and the Jewish Sabbath.

parties in Rome seemed to expire with the controversy about Easter. The older Gnostic systems of Valentinus and Marcion had had their day. Montanism was expelled from Rome to find refuge in Africa. In Africa Latin Christianity began to take its proper form in the writings of Tertullian. Rome was absorbed in the inevitable disputes concerning the Divinity of the Saviour, the prelude to the great Trinitarian controversy. The Bishops of Rome, Eleutherius, still more Victor, and at the commencement of the third century Zephyrinus and Callistus, before dimly known by scattered allusions in Tertullian and Eusebius, and still later writers, have suddenly emerged into light in the contemporary work, justly, to all appearance, attributed to Hippolytus Bishop of Portus.¹

¹The Chevalier Bunsen's very learned work has proved the authorship of Hippolytus to my full satisfaction — so likewise Dr. Wordsworth — Hippolytus. I have also read the 'Hippolytus und Kallistus' (just published), by J. Döllinger, the church historian; I must say with no conviction but of the author's learning and ingenuity. It appears to me that M. Döllinger's arguments against M. Bunsen (*e. g.* from the ignorance of St. Jerome) are quite as fatal to his own theory. I still think it most probable that Hippolytus was Bishop of Portus, and that these suburbicarian bishops formed or were part of a kind of presbytery or college with the bishops of Rome. I hardly understand how those (seven) bishops (the cardinal-bishops) can have gained their peculiar relation to Rome, in later times, without any earlier tradition in their favor. The loose language of later Greek writers might easily make of a bishop, a member of such a presbytery, a bishop in Rome, or even of Rome. More than one, at least, of these writers calls Hippolytus Bishop of Portus: and hence, too, he may have been sometimes described as Presbyter.

Portus, there can be no doubt, was a very considerable town; but a new and flourishing haven cannot have grown up at the mouth of the Tiber, after half, at least, of the commerce and concourse of strangers had deserted Rome, after the foundation of Constantinople, and during the Barbarian invasions. Birkenhead would not have risen to rival Liverpool excepting in a most prosperous state of English trade.

I cannot but regret that M. Döllinger's book, so able, and in some respects so instructive, should be written with such a resolute (no doubt conscientious) determination to make out a case. It might well be entitled

The Christians from the death of M. Aurelius, throughout the reign of Commodus, enjoyed undisturbed peace with the civil government.¹ But many of the victims of the persecution under Aurelius were pining in the unwholesome mines of Sardinia. Marcia, the favorite concubine of the Emperor Commodus, whom he treated as his wife, and who held the state of an Empress, was favorable to the Christians: how far she herself had embraced the doctrines, how, if herself disposed to Christianity, she reconciled it with her life, does not appear.² The Bishop Victor did not scruple (such scruples had been too fastidiously rigorous) to employ her influence for the release of his

Apologia pro Callisto; and I must presume to say, in my judgment, a most unfortunate case for his own cause. Were I polemically disposed as to the succession to the Papacy, the authority and supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, or even the unity of the Church, I could hardly hope for so liberal a concession as that twice within thirty years, during the early part of the third century, rival bishops, one a most distinguished theologian, should set themselves up in Rome itself against the acknowledged Pope, and declare their own communities to be the true Church. Döllinger indeed could not but see, that, whoever the author, he writes, from station, from character, or from influence, as quite on a level with the Pope; he seems altogether unconscious of awe, and even of the respect for that office, which is of a later period. The Abbé Cruice, in his *Histoire de l'Eglise de Rome sous les Pontificats de St. Victor, St. Zephyrin, et de St. Calliste* (Paris, 1856), is bolder and more dutiful. With him the Popes are already invested in all their power (of excommunication), in their ex officio wisdom and holiness. They are all, by the magical prefix S, Saints; Victor and Callistus, on the authority of legend, martyrs. This unhistoric history (not unamusing), this theology without precision, seems to pass in France for profound learning.

¹ Asterius Urbanus apud Eusebium, H. E. v. 16. Compare Moyle's works, ii. p. 265. — The peace lasted for thirteen years after the death of Maximilla the Montanist, just the period of the reign of Commodus.

² οὐδὲν δὲ ὑπέιχε γαμετῆς γυναικός, ἀλλὰ πάντα ὑπέηρχεν ὅσα Σεβάστη πλὴν τοῦ πυρός. Herodian, i. 50. Her complicity in the murder of Commodus was but to avert her own. Commodus must have been insane; Marcia strove, even with tears, to dissuade him from the disgrace of appearing in public as a gladiator; his two ministers joined their strong remonstrances. Commodus, in revenge, marked down her name, and those

exiled brethren : they all returned to Rome.¹ This state of peace seemed to quicken into more active life the brooding elements of discord, and to invite the founders of new systems, or their busy proselytes, to Rome. Already had spread to Europe, to Africa, to Rome itself, from the depths of Phrygia, the disciples of Montanus. It is probable that these Montanist or kindred prophecies of coming wars, and the approaching Dissolution of the World (a vaticination which involved or rather signified to the jealous Roman ear only the ruin of the Empire), may have aided in exciting the religious terror and indignation of the philosophic Emperor and of the Roman world against the Christians, and so have been one cause of the persecutions under Marcus Aurelius.² Montanus himself, and Maximilla, his chief prophetess, seem not to have travelled beyond the confines of Phrygia.³ But their followers swarmed over Christendom. They dispersed or revealed to the initiated in countless books, the visions of Montanus, and his no less inspired female followers, Priscilla and Maximilla.⁴ Montanism, strictly speaking, was no heresy ; in their notions of God and of Christ, these sectaries departed not from the received doctrine. But beyond,

of Lætus and Eclectus, his faithful counsellors, for death. The fatal tablet fell into the hands of Marcia. They anticipated their own doom by that of Commodus. Herodian, *ibid.* Marcia afterwards married Eclectus. — Dion Cassius, or Xiphylin, *lvii.* 4.

¹ *Refutatio Hæresium*, p. 287.

² This further confirms the author's view of the cause of the persecutions under M. Aurelius. *Hist. of Christianity*, Book ii. c. 7.

³ Their fate was so obscure, that rumors spread abroad among their enemies that they had died like Judas, had hanged themselves. See the uncertain author quoted by Eusebius. *H. E.* v. 16.

⁴ This we learn from the *Refutatio Hæresium*. *ὡν βιβλους ἀπείρους ἔχοντες πλανῶνται*, p. 275.

and as the consummation and completion of the Christian Revelation, the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, dwelt in Montanus and the Prophetesses. At intervals, throughout the annals of Christianity, the Holy Ghost has been summoned by the hopes, felt as present by the kindled imaginations, been proclaimed by the passionate enthusiasm of a few, as accomplishing in them the imperfect revelation ; as the third revelation — which is to supersede and to fulfil the Law and the Gospel. This notion will appear again in the middle ages as the doctrine of the Abbot Joachim, of John Peter de Oliva and the Fraticelli ; in a milder form it is that of George Fox and Barclay. The land of heathen orgies was the natural birthplace of that wild Christian mysticism ; it was the Phrygian fanaticism speaking a new language ; and as the ancient Phrygian rites of Cybele found welcome reception in heathen Rome, so also that, which was appropriately called Cataphrygianism, in the Christian Church.¹ A stern intolerant asceticism, which had already begun to harden around the Christian heart, a rigor, a perfection of manners as of creed (so they deemed it) beyond the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel, distinguished the Montanists, who, by their own asserted superiority, condemned the rest of the Christian world.² They had fasts far more long and severe, their own festivals, their own food, chiefly roots ;³ they held the austere views on the connection of the sexes ; if they did not absolutely condemn, hardly permitted marriage ; a second marriage was an

¹ Compare the *Super alta vectus Atys* with the extravagancies of Montanism.

² πλείον δὲ αὐτῶν φάσκοντες ὡς μεμαθηκέναι, ἢ ἐκ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν καὶ τῶν Εὐαγγελίων. Euseb. H. E., p. 275.

³ The author of the *Refutatio* speaks of their *ξηροφάγια*.

inexpiable sin. Their visions enwrap the imagination, their rigor enthralled minds of congenial temperament. They seized on the African passions, they fell in with the austerity, they satisfied the holy ambition of Tertullian, who would not rest below what seemed the most lofty, self-sacrificing Christianity. In Rome itself (so Tertullian writes, with mingled indignation and contempt) the Bishop had been seized with admiration, had acknowledged the inspiration of the Prophets; he had issued letters of peace in their favor, which had tended to quiet the agitated churches of Asia and of Phrygia. But at the instigation of Praxeas the Heresiarch, if not the author, among the first teachers of that doctrine, afterwards denounced as Patripassianism, he had revoked his letters, denied their spiritual gifts, and driven out the Prophets in disgrace.¹

The indignation of Tertullian at the rejection of his Montanist opinions urges him to arraign the Pope, with what justice, to what extent we know not, as having embraced the Patripassian opinions of Praxeas. This Monarchianism, or, as it was branded by the more odious name, Patripassianism, was the controversy which raged during the episcopate of Victor, Zephyrinus, and Callistus.² It called forth the

¹ Ita duo negotia Diaboli Praxeas Romæ procuravit, prophetiam expulit et hæresim intulit. Paracletum fugavit, et Patrem crucifixit. Adversus Praxeam, c. i. Who was this bishop of Rome? It has been usually supposed Victor. Neander (*Anti-Gnosticus*, p. 486) argues strongly, I think not conclusively, that it was his predecessor Eleutherius. The spurious passage, at the close of the *De Præscrip. Hæret.*, which, though not Tertullian's, seems ancient, has these words:—"Praxeas quidem hæresim introduxit, quam Victorinus (the Bishop Victor?) corroborare curavit."

² The oppugnancy of the Latin and Greek mind is well illustrated by the contrast of Tertullian with the early Greek writers, *e. g.* Justin Martyr. In Tertullian there is no courteous respect for the Greek philosophy: he is dead to the beauty of the dying hours of Socrates; his Dæmon is a devil.

‘Refutation of Heresies.’ That paramount doctrine of Christianity, the nature of Christ, his relation to the primal and paternal Godhead, which had been contested in a vaguer and more imaginative form under the Gnostic systems, must be brought to a direct issue. Rome, though the war was waged by Greek combatants in the Greek language, must be the chosen battlefield of the conflict. There was division in the Church. Pope Victor, a stern and haughty Prelate, who had demanded implicit submission to his opinions on the question of Easter, now seemed stunned and bewildered by the polemic din and tumult.¹ The feeblener Zephyrinus, through his long pontificate, vacillated and wavered to and fro. Callistus, if we are to believe his implacable and uncompromising adversary, not only departed from the true faith, but left a sect, bearing his name, to perpetuate his reprehensible opinions. From Theodotus, a follower of Valentinus, to Noetus and his disciple Epigonus, there was ^{About} _{A.D. 150.}

“No man comes to God but by Christ; of these things the heathen knew nothing.” T. de Anim. i. 39. Compare Ritter, *Gesch. Christ. Philosophie*, p. 335. Tertullian cannot conceive immaterial being. *Nihil incorporale quod non est.* De Carn. Christ. Neander, iii. p. 965.

¹ Victor condemned indeed and excommunicated Theodotus, who reduced the Saviour to his naked manhood; he was but an image of Melchisedek. This was asserted fifty years later, when the doctrine of the naked manhood of Christ was taught in its most obnoxious form by Artemas, and afterwards by Paul of Samosata. These teachers appealed to the unbroken tradition of the church, from the Apostles to their own days, in favor of their own tenet. It was answered that Victor had condemned Theodotus, the author of this God-denying apostacy; *ὅτι Βίκτωρ τὸν σκυτέα Θεοδότου, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν ταύτης τῆς ἀρησιθεύου ἀποστασίας, ἀπεκήρυξε τῆς κοινωρίας, πρῶτον εἰποντα ψιλὸν ἀνθρώπον τὸν Χριστόν.* Euseb. H. E. v. 15 Epiphani. 54, 55. Compare Pseudo-Tertullian de Præscrip. Hæret. On the Theodoti, compare Bunsen, Hippolytus, p. 92. Yet Victor, it should seem, was deceived by Praxeas (see note above). Florinus, condemned with Blastus the Quartodeciman, was a Monarchian; but there were manifestly many shades of Monarchianism.

a constant succession of strangers, each with his own system. The shades of distinction were infinite, from that older Ebionitish or Judaic doctrine, which kept down the Saviour to mere naked manhood, hardly superior to the prophets; and that which approximated to, if it did not express in absolute terms, the full Godhead of the Nicene Creed. The broad divisions, up to a certain period, had been threefold: 1. Those who altogether denied the Godhead—the extreme Ebionites. 2. Those who denied the Manhood—all the Gnostic sects. In their diverging forms of Docetism, these held the unreal, or but seeming human nature of the Redeemer; whether, as Valentinus said, the Æon Christ had descended on the man Jesus, the psychic or animal man; or as Marcion, maintained the manhood to be a mere phantasm. 3. All the rest (even the Roman Ebionites, represented by the Clementine Homilies) acknowledged some Deity, some efflux, irradiation, emanation of the primal Godhead. The Logos, the Wisdom, the Spirit of God (the distinction was not always maintained, nor as yet accurately defined) indwelt in various manners and degrees within the Christ. The difficulty was to claim the plenary Godhead for the Son, the Redeemer, without infringing on the sole, original Principality of the Father; to admit subordination without inferiority. So grew up a new division between the Monarchians, the assertors of one immutable primary Principle, who yet acknowledged the divinity of the Redeemer; and those who, while they mostly acknowledged in terms, were impatient of any real or definite subordination. Each drew an awful conclusion from the tenets of his adversary; each used an opprobrious term which ap-

About A.D.
200-220.

pealed to the resentful passions. The Monarchians were charged with the appalling doctrine, that the Father, the one primary Principle, must have suffered on the cross; they were called Patripassians. They retorted on those who were unable, or who refused to define the subordination of the Son, as worshippers of two Gods, Ditheists. Sabellius, who at first repressed, or brought forward his views with reserve and caution, attempted to mediate, and was disdainfully cast aside by both parties. The notion of the same God under three manifestations, forms, or names, seemed to annul the separate personality of each.¹

Pope Victor saw but the beginning of this strife. With Pope Zephyrinus, whose Episcopate of A.D. 201-219. nineteen years commences with the third century, appears his antagonist, the antagonist of his successor Callistus, the author of the Refutation of all Heresies. According to his own distinct statement, this writer was not a casual and transient visitor in Rome, but domiciled in the city or in its neighborhood, invested in some high public function,² and holding acknowledged influence and authority. He describes himself as the head of what may be called the orthodox party, resisting and condemning the wavering policy of one Pope, actually excommunicating another, and landing him down to posterity as an heresiarch of a sect called after his name. Who then was this antagonist? What rank and position did he hold? Fifty years A.D. 201.-250.

¹ Sabellius, according to the Refutation of Heresies, might have been kept within the bounds of orthodoxy, had he not been driven into extremes by the injudicious violence of the Pope.

² Origen visited Rome about the year 211, but his visit was not long; and, with all his fame and learning, to the height of which he had not attained, he was a stranger, without rank or authority. He was not even in orders.

later¹ the Roman church comprehended, besides its Bishop, forty-six Presbyters, and seven Deacons,² with their subordinate officers. Each Presbyter doubtless presided over a separate community, each with its basilica, scattered over the wide circuit of the city: they were the primary Parish Priests of Rome. But besides these, were Suburbicarian Bishops of the adjacent towns, Ostia, Tibur, Portus, and others (six or seven), who did not maintain their absolute independence on the metropolis, each in the seclusion of his own community; they held their synods in Rome, but as yet with Greek equality rather than Roman subordination; they were the initiatory College of Cardinals (who still take some of their titles from these sees), but with the Pope as one of this coequal college, rather than the dominant, certainly not the despotic, head.

Of all these suburban districts at this time Portus was the most considerable, and most likely to be occupied by a distinguished prelate. Portus, from the reign of Trajan, had superseded Ostia as the haven of Rome. It was a commercial town of growing extent and opulence, at which most of the strangers from the East who came by sea landed or set sail. Through Portus, no doubt, most of the foreign Christians found their way to Rome.³ Of this city at the present time, it can hardly be doubted, Hippolytus was the bishop, Hippolytus who afterwards rose to the dignity of saint and martyr, and whose

¹ Calculating from the accession of Zephyrinus to the Decian persecution. Letter of Pope Cornelius in Euseb. H. E. vi. 42.

² Each deacon appears to have comprehended under his charitable superintendence two out of the fourteen regions of the city.

³ In the letters of Æneas Sylvius there is a curious account of a visit which he made to the site of this ancient bishopric, then held by one of his friends. Dr. Wordsworth has some interesting details concerning Portus.

statue, discovered in the Laurentian cemetery, now stands in the Vatican. Conclusive internal evidence indicates Hippolytus as the author of the Refutation of all Heresies. If any one might dare to confront the Bishop of Rome, it was the Bishop of Portus.

Zephyrinus, according to his unsparing adversary, was an unlearned man; ignorant of the lan-^{Pope Zephy-}guage and definitions of the Church; avari-^{rinus. 202-}icious, venal, of unsettled principles; not holding the balance between conflicting opinions, but embracing adverse tenets with all the zeal, of which a mind so irresolute was capable. He was now a disciple of Cleomenes, the successor of Noetus, and teacher of Noetianism in Rome (Noetus held the extreme Monarchian doctrine, so as to be obnoxious to the charge of Patripassianism), now of Sabellius, who, become more bold, had matured his scheme, which was odious alike to the other two contending parties. Zephyrinus was entirely governed by the crafty Callistus; and thus constantly driven back, by his fears or confusion of mind, to opposite tenets, and involved in the most glaring contradictions. At one time he publicly used the startling language: "I acknowledge one God, Jesus Christ, and none beside him, that was born and suffered;" at another, he refuted himself, "It was not the Father that died, but the Son." So through the long episcopate of Zephyrinus there was endless conflict and confusion. The author of the Refutation steadily, perseveringly, resisted the vacillating Pontiff; he himself was branded with the opprobrious appellation of Ditheist.

Callistus, who had ruled the feeble mind
of Zephyrinus, aspired to be his successor; <sup>Callistus
Pope. 219-
223.</sup>

as head, it should seem, of one of the contending parties, he attained the object of his ambition. The memory of theologic adversaries is tenacious. His enemies were not likely to forget the early life of Callistus, which must have been public and notorious, at least among the Christians. He had been a slave in the family of Carpophorus, a wealthy Christian, in the Emperor's household. He was set up by his master in a bank in the quarter called the *Piscina Publica*. The Christian brethren and widows, on the credit of the name of Carpophorus, deposited their savings in this bank of Callistus. He made away with the funds, was called to account, fled, embarked on board a ship, was pursued, threw himself into the sea — was rescued — brought back to Rome, and ignominiously consigned to hard labor in the public workhouse. The merciful Carpophorus cared not for his own losses, but for those of the poor widows; he released the prisoner on the pretext of collecting moneys, which he pretended to be due to him. Callistus raised a riot in a Jewish synagogue, was carried before the Prefect Fuscianus, scourged and transported to the mines in Sardinia. On the release of the exiles through the intercession of Marcia, Callistus, though not on the list furnished by the Bishop Victor, persuaded Hyacinthus, the Eunuch appointed to bear the order for the release of the captives to the governor, to become responsible for his liberation also.¹ He returned to Rome; the Pope Victor, though distressed by the affair, was too

¹ This singular picture of Roman and Christian middle life has an air of minute truthfulness, though possibly somewhat darkened by polemic hostility. Some have supposed that they detect a difference in the style from the rest of the treatise. I perceive none but that which is natural in a transition from polemic or argumentative writing to simple narrative

merciful to expose the fraud; Callistus was sent to Antium with a monthly allowance for his maintenance. At Antium (for this release of the Sardinian prisoners must have been at the commencement of Victor's episcopate)¹ he remained nine or ten years. Zephyrinus recalled him from his obscure retreat; and placed him over the cemetery.² By degrees the Pope entirely surrendered himself to the guidance of Callistus.

The first act of Callistus on his advancement to the bishopric was the excommunication of Sabellius, an act cordially approved by Hippolytus, and ascribed to the fear of himself. Callistus formed a new scheme, by which he hoped to elude the charge on one side of Patripassianism, on the other of Ditheism. Hippolytus denounces his heresy without scruple or reserve.³

The suggestion that it is a Novatian interpolation is desperate and preposterous. Novatian was not heard of till thirty years after, his followers, of course, later. What possible motive could they have for blackening the memory of Zephyrinus and Callistus? Novatian was no enemy of the Bishop of Rome; had no design to invalidate his powers. He was the enemy of Cornelius, his successful rival for the see; he aspired himself to be bishop — was, in fact, anti-Pope. The great point on which Novatian made his stand had, indeed, been mooted, but did not become a cause of fatal division till after the persecution of Decius, the treatment of the Lapsi — those who in the persecution had denied the faith.

Hippolytus, it is true, in the poetic legend of Prudentius (who borrows the circumstances of his martyrdom from the destiny of his namesake in the tragedy of Euripides), is charged with holding the tenets of Novatus, which he recanted, and in his death-agony became a good Catholic. But the author of the Refutation of all Heresies can hardly have been involved in the schism of Novatian, who did not appear till so many years after the death of Callistus. Novatian, with such a partisan, would not have sought out three obscure bishops for his ordination. I cannot but think the Spanish legendary poet of the fourth century utterly without historical authority, — possibly he confounded different Hippolyti.

¹ The release of the prisoners took place probably in the tenth year of Commodus, the year of Victor's accession, A.D. 190.

² We are naturally reminded of the cemetery called of Callistus. Aringhi supposes this cemetery older than the time of Callistus.

³ Callistianism differed but slightly from Noetism. God and his divine

Christian doctrine, the profound mystery of the Saviour's Godhead, was not the only subject of collision between the adverse parties in the Church of Rome. The difficult reconciliation of Christian tenderness and Christian holiness could hardly fail to produce a milder and more austere party throughout Christendom. The first young influences of Monachism, the perfection claimed by celibacy over the less ostentatious virtue of domestic purity, the notion of the heroism of self-mortification, led to inevitable differences. Montanism, with its fanatic rigor, had wrought up this strife to a great height. The more severe, who did not embrace the Montanist tenets, would not be surpassed by heretics in self-abnegation. The lenity to be shown to penitents, the condescension to the weaknesses of flesh and blood, raised perpetual disputes. Callistus throughout, unlike those whose early lives demand indulgence, who are usually the most severe, was himself indulgent to others; and this was the dominant tone at the time in the Roman Church. The author of the Refutation, though uninfected by Montanist tenets, inveighs against the leniency of Callistus, as asserting that even a bishop, guilty of a deadly sin, was not to be deposed. The nature of this, according to Hippolytus, deadly sin, which Callistus treated with such offensive tenderness, appears from the next sentence:¹ it related

Word were one; together they were the Spirit, the one Spiritual Being. This Spirit took flesh of the Virgin; so the Father was in the Son, but he suffered not as the Son, but with the Son.

¹ Οὗτος ἐδογματίσεν ὅπως εἰ ἐπίσκοπος ἁμάρτοι τι εἰ καὶ πρὸς θάνατον, ἢ δεῖν κατατίθεσθαι. Ἐπὶ τούτου ἤρξαντο ἐπίσκοποι καὶ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι δέγαμοι καὶ τρίγαμοι καθίστασθαι εἰς κλήρους. Εἰ δὲ καὶ τις ἐν κλήρῳ ὦν γαμοίη, μένειν τον τοιοῦτον ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ ὡς μὴ ἡμαρτήκοτα. ix. 12. p. 290.

to that grave question which had begun to absorb the Christian mind—the marriage of the clergy. That usage, which has always prevailed, and still prevails, in the Greek Church, as yet seems to have satisfied the more rigorous at Rome. Those who were already married when ordained, retained their wives. But a second marriage, or marriage after ordination, was revolting to the incipient monkery of the Church. But Callistus, according to his implacable adversary, went further, he admitted men who had been twice, even thrice married, to holy orders; he allowed those already in orders to marry. His more indulgent party appealed to the evangelical argument,¹ “Who art thou that judgest another man’s servant?” They alleged the parables of the tares and wheat, the clean and unclean beasts in the ark. This the more austere denounced as criminal flattery of the passions of the multitude; as the sanction of voluptuousness proscribed by Christ, with the base design of courting popularity, and swelling the ranks of their faction. There is a heavier charge behind. The widows, if they could not contain, were not only allowed to marry, but to take a slave or freedman, below their own rank, who could not be their legal husband.² Hence abortions, and child murders, to conceal these disgraceful connections. Callistus, therefore, is sanctioning adultery and murder. But even this is not the height of his offence, he had dared to administer a second baptism. So already had ecclesiastical offences become worse in the estimation of vehement religious

¹ R. H. p. 290.

² The widows, who had taken on themselves the office of deaconesses, and who, though not bound by vow, were under a kind of virtual engagement against second marriage.

partisans than moral enormities. Here, at least, it is fair to mistrust the angry adversary. But this conflict between a more indulgent and a more austere party in Rome, and some declaration of the Pope Zephyrinus, probably, rather than Callistus, — but Zephyrinus acting under the influence of Callistus — on the connection between the sexes, had already excited the indignation of Tertullian in Africa, now still more hardened by his Montanist tenets. “The Bishop of Bishops had promulgated an edict, that he would remit to penitents even the sins of adultery and fornication. This license to lust is issued in the stronghold of all wicked and shameless lusts.”¹

Persecution restored that peace to the Roman Church, which had been so much disturbed throughout her uninvaded prosperity, during the tolerant rule of Alexander Severus. In the sudden outburst of hostility, during the short reign of the brutal Thracian Maximin, Pontianus, who had followed Urban I., the
A. D. 235. successor of Callistus, and with him a presbyter, Hippolytus, suffered sentence of deportation to the usual place of exile — Sardinia. There Pontianus is said (nor is there much reason to doubt the tradition) to have endured martyrdom. Hippolytus,² according to the poetic legend in Prudentius of two centuries later, suffered in the suburbs of Rome.³

¹ De Pudicitia. — Did the title *Episcopus Episcoporum*, which I think cannot but mean Rome, arise from his superiority to the suburbicarian bishops? See, however, on this title the note of Baluzius on the vii. Concil. Carthag. — or in Routh, ii. 153.

² Compare Bunsen. The title of Presbyter assigned to Hippolytus, if, as is most probable, the same with the author of the Refutation and other works, even if he were Bishop of Portus, raises no difficulty. These bishops were members of the Roman Presbytery.

³ At this time, more likely than fifteen years afterwards, in the Decian persecution. Legend respects not dates.

The Decian persecution, about thirty years after the death of Callistus, was the birth epoch of Latin Christianity; Cyprian its true parent.

Rome, the recognized metropolis of the West, Carthage, the metropolis of the African churches, are in constant and regular intercourse.¹ There is first a Punic league, afterwards at least a threatened Punic war. In the persecution the churches are brought into close alliance by common sympathies, common perils, common sufferings, singularly enough by common schisms; slowly, but no doubt at length, by their common language. The same Imperial edict endangers the life of the Roman and of the Carthaginian Bishop; malcontents from Rome find their way to Carthage, from Carthage to Rome. The same man, Novatus, stirs up rebellion against episcopal authority in Rome and in Carthage; the letters of the churches to each other are promulgated in Latin, though at a period somewhat later those from the African churches sent into the East are distinguished from those which came from Rome, as written in the Roman tongue.² So too in Rome and in Carthage (in Carthage in the most mature and perfect form, from the master mind of Cyprian) appear the Roman strength and the Roman respect for law, the imperious assertion of hierarchical despotism. In the community there is trembling deference for hierarchical authority, though at first with a bold but short resistance. There is an anti-Bishop in Rome and in Carthage. But

¹ The intercourse between Carthage and Rome, on account of the corn trade alone, was probably more regular and rapid than in any other part of the empire—*mutatis mutandis*—like that between Marseilles and Algeria.

² Euseb. H. E. See above, p. 58, note.

in both Churches discipline becomes of equal importance with doctrine; the unity of the Church is made to depend on obedience to its outward polity; rebellion to episcopal authority becomes as great a crime as erroneous opinion; schism as hateful as heresy.

Fabianus, under Decius, is the first martyr Bishop of Rome, whose death rests on certain testimony.¹ The papal chair remained vacant for a short time; either the Christians dared not choose, or no one dared to assume the perilous rank. Cyprian of Carthage, on the same occasion, not from timidity, but from prudent and parental regard for his flock, retired into a safe retreat. There were already divisions in the Church of Carthage. Novatus, a turbulent presbyter, with five others,² had been jealous of the elevation of Cyprian. Novatus, whose character is darkly drawn by Cyprian, had presumed to interfere with the bishop's prerogative (a crime hardly less heinous than speculation and licentiousness) and himself ordained a deacon, Felicissimus. This hostile party would no doubt heap contempt on the base flight of Cyprian; while they, less in danger, seemed to have remained to brave the persecutor. The party took upon themselves the episcopal functions.³ On their own authority, too, the faction of Novatus determined, in the more lenient way, the great question, the reception of the fallen, those who

¹ Perhaps that of Pontianus may be above suspicion. (See above.)

² It is doubtful whether Novatus was one of these five.

³ Cyprian, from his retreat, sent two bishops to collect and administer the alms, probably of great amount, in Carthage. Walch conjectures, with much probability, that Felicissimus may have resented this intrusion on his province as Deacon.

had denied the faith and offered sacrifice, and those who, with more pardonable weakness, had bought certificates of submission from the venal officers.¹ Cyprian in vain remonstrated from his retreat: he too had somewhat departed from his old sternness, when he had shut the doors of the Church against the renegades. He was not now for inflexible and peremptory rejection of those weak brethren, for whom he may have learned some sympathy; he insisted only on their less hasty, more formal reception, after penance, confession, imposition of hands by the bishop. Each case was to be separately considered before an assembly of the bishops, presbyters, deacons, the faithful who had stood,² and the laity; so popular still was Cyprian's view of episcopal authority. Cornelius, in Rome, ^{Cornelius} had been elected bishop on the return of ^{Bishop of} Rome. peace. The same question distracted his Church, but with more disastrous results. The same Novatus was now in Rome: true only to his own restlessness, he here embraced the severer party, at the head of which stood a leader, by some strange coincidence, almost of the same name with his own, Novatian.³ This Novatian man had been a Stoic philosopher. His hard nature, in the agony of wrestling after truth, before he had found peace in Christianity, broke down both body and mind. His enemies afterwards declared that he had

¹ They were called Libellatici. Compare Mosheim de Reb. Christian. ante Constant. M., pp. 482, 489.

² Throughout this is his language—Viderint laici, hoc quomodo eurent. Ep. liii., also xi. xxix. xxxi. Compare Concil. Carthag. iii., where it is among the objections that a fallen had been received sine petitu et conscientia plebis. Mansi sub ann. 252, or Routh, vol. ii. p. 74.

³ The Greek writers all called Novatian, Novatus. We are on historical ground, or what a myth might be made out of these two *Innovators!*—Novatus and Novatian.

been possessed ; the demon was not completely exorcised. He had only received what was called Clinic baptism (an imperfect rite) on what was supposed his death-bed. The Stoic remained within the Christian ; he became a rigid ascetic. Novatian sternly declared that no mercy but that of God (from that he did not exclude the fallen) could absolve from the inexpiable sin of apostacy : the Church, which received such unabsolvable sinners into its bosom, was unclean, and ceased to be the Church. Novatian might have contented himself, like the Thrases of old, with protesting against the abuse of episcopal despotism, no less abuse because it erred on the side of leniency. When charged with ambitious designs on the Bishopric of Rome, of having been the rival, and therefore having become the enemy, of Cornelius, he solemnly declared that he preferred the solitary virtue and dignity of the ascetic ; it was only by compulsion that he took upon himself the function of an Antipope. Cyprian attributes the schism to the malignant influence of Novatus : — “ In proportion as Rome is greater than Carthage, so was the sin of Novatus in Rome more heinous than that in Carthage. In Carthage he had ordained a deacon, in Rome he had made a bishop.”¹ Novatian was publicly but hastily and irregularly consecrated, as Bishop of Rome, by three bishops, it is said, of obscure towns in Italy. Novatian was in doctrine rigidly orthodox ; but in Cyprian’s view (who makes common cause with the Bishop of Rome against the common enemy) what avails orthodoxy of doctrine in one out

¹ Planè quoniam pro magnitudine sua debeat Carthaginem Roma præcedere, illic majora et graviora commisit. Qui istic adversus ecclesiam diaconum fecerat illic episcopum fecit. Epist. xlix. The præminence of the Bishop of Rome arises out of the præminent greatness of Rome.

of the Church?¹ He is self-excluded from the pale of salvation. Cyprian had grounds, if not for his abhorrence, for his fears of Novatianism. It aspired itself to be the Church, to set up rival bishops throughout Christendom; the test of that Church was this uncompromising, inflexible severity. Even in Carthage arose another bishop, Fortunatus, who asserted himself to have been consecrated by twenty-three Numidian bishops. Cyprian, not without bitterness, while he admits that Cornelius had rejected his rebellious Deacon Felicissimus from communion, complains that he had been weakly shaken, and induced to waver, by the false representations of the partisans of Fortunatus.² This transient difference was soon lost in Cyprian's generous admiration for the intrepidity of Cornelius, in whose glorious Confession the whole Church of Rome, even the fallen, who had been admitted as penitents, now nobly joined. Cornelius was banished, it is said, by the Emperor Gallus, to Cività Vecchia; he was followed by vast numbers of believers, who shared his exile, and his danger. The Church returned from banishment, but under a new bishop, Lucius; Cornelius had died, the words of Cyprian hardly assert by a violent death.³ The Novatians alone, during this

¹ Quod vero ad Novatiani personam pertinet, pater carissime, desiderasti tibi scribi quam hæresin introduxisset, scias nos primo in loco non curiosos esse debere quid ille doceat, cum foris doceat. Quisquis ille est, et qualiscunque est, Christianus non est, qui in Christi ecclesiâ non est. Ad Anton. Epist. lii.

² Read the whole remarkable letter, lv. ad Cornelium — the strongest revelation of the views, reasonings, passions, fears, hatreds of Cyprian. I cannot consent, with a late writer, to the abandonment of all these documents as spurious. Forgery would not have left the argument so doubtful, or rather so decisive against the object imputed to the forgers.

³ Epist. ad Lucium P. R. reversum ab exilio — lviii. See, however, Epist. lxxviii. — He is described as martyrio quoque dignatione Domini honoratus. Compare Routh's note, ii. 132.

new trial of the faith, stood aloof in sullen hostility. A. D. 253. They were too obscure, Cyprian suggests, to provoke the jealousy of the rulers. But Cyprian miscalculated that strength and vitality of Novatianism. It spread throughout Christendom: even in the East, Fabius, Bishop of Antioch, was hardly restrained from joining the party. Dionysius of Alexandria treated their advances with greater wisdom; he earnestly urged Novatian, now that Cornelius was dead and the question laid almost at rest by the cessation of persecution, to return into the bosom of the Church. On Novatian's stubborn refusal, he condemned in strong terms his harsh Christianity, as depriving the Saviour of his sacred attribute of mercy. But Novatianism endured for above two centuries; it had its bishops in Constantinople, Nicea, Nicomedia, Citiæus in Phrygia, in Cyzicum and Bithynia; even in Alexandria, in Italy, in Gaul, in Spain. It had its saints, its hermits, its monks. St. Ambrose in Italy, Pacianus, Bishop of Barcelona, and towards the end of the fourth century Leo the Great, thought it necessary to condemn or to refute the doctrines of Novatian. The two Byzantine ecclesiastical historians, Socrates and his follower Sozomen, have been accused of leaning to Novatianism.¹

Novatianism, like all unsuccessful opposition, added Cyprian's unity of the Church. strength to its triumphant adversary. It was not so much by its rigor, as by its collision with the Hierarchical system, that it lost its hold on the Christian mind. It declared that there were sins be-

¹ Compare Walch *Ketzer-Geschichte*. Walch has collected every passage relating to Novatianism with his usual industry, accuracy and fairness, ii. pp. 185, 288.

yond the absolving power of the clergy. By setting up rival bishops in Rome, Carthage, and other cities, it only evoked more commandingly the growing theory of Christian unity, and caused it to be asserted in a still more rigid and exclusive form. Within the pale of the Church, under the lawful Bishop, were Christ and salvation; without it, the realm of the Devil, the world of perdition. The faith of the heretic and schismatic was no faith, his holiness no holiness, his martyrdom no martyrdom.¹ Latin Christianity, in the mind of Cyprian, if not its founder, its chief hierophant, had soared to the ideal height of this unity. This Utopia of Cyprian placed St. Peter at the head of the College of coequal Apostles, from whom the Bishops inherited coequal dignity. The succession of the Bishop of Rome from St. Peter was now, near 200 years after his death, an accredited tradition. Nor, so long as Carthage and Rome were in amity and alliance, did Cyprian scruple to admit (as Carthage could not but own her inferiority to Imperial Rome) a kind of primacy, of dignity at least, in the Metropolitan Bishop.²

¹ The second Council of Carthage touches on this absolving power of the priesthood — "Quando permiserit ipse, qui legem dedit ut ligati in terris etiam in cœlis ligati essent, solvi autem possent illa quæ hic prius in ecclesiâ solverentur." The decree of this Council anticipates another instant persecution, and urges, with great force and beauty, the necessity of strengthening all disciples against the coming trial — quos excitamus et hortamur ad prælium non inermes et nudos relinquamus, sed protectione corporis et sanguinis Christi muniamus. Mansi, sub ann. 252, or Routh, Rel. Sacræ, v. iii. p. 70.

² Hoc erant utique et cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis: sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, et primatus Petro datur, ut una Christi ecclesia et cathedra una monstretur. De unit. Eccles. There is little doubt that this famous passage is an interpolation; it is not found in the best manuscripts. The whole passage without these words seems to me to bear out the guarded assertion of the text.

The Punic league suddenly gives place to a Punic war. A new controversy has sprung up in the interval between the Decian and Valerian persecutions, on the rebaptism of heretics. Africa, the East, Alexandria with less decision, declared the baptism by heretics an idle ceremony, and even an impious mimicry of that holy rite, which could only be valid from the consecrated hands of the lawful clergy. Lucius of Rome had ruled but a few months: he was succeeded by Stephen. This pope adopted a milder rule. Every baptism in the name of Christ admitted to Christian privileges. He enforced this rule, according to his adversaries (his own letters are lost), with imperious dictation. At length he broke off communion with all the churches of the East and of Africa, which adhered to the more rigorous practice.¹ But the Eastern hatred of heresy conspired with the hierarchical spirit of Africa, which could endure no intrusion on the prerogatives of the clergy. Cyprian confronts Stephen not only as an equal, but, strong in the concurrence of the East and of Alexandria, as his superior. The primacy of Peter has lost its authority. He condemns the perverseness, obstinacy, contumacy of Stephen. He promulgates, in Latin, a letter of Firmilian, Bishop of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, still more unmeasured in its censures. Firmilian denounces the audacity, the insolence of Stephen; scoffs at his boasted descent from St. Peter; declares that, by his sin, he has excommunicated himself: he is the schismatic, the apostate from the unity

¹ He denounced Cyprian, according to Firmilian, as a false Christ, a false apostle, a deceitful workman. Firm. Epist. apud Cyprian. Opera.

of the Church.¹ A solemn Council of eighty-seven bishops, assembled at Carthage under Cyprian, asserted the independent judgment of the African Churches, repudiated the assumption of the title, Bishop of Bishops, or the arbitrary dictation of one bishop to Christendom.

Yet even during this internal feud, Latin Christendom was gathering into a separate unity. The Churches of Gaul and Spain appeal at once to Rome and to Carthage; Arles, indeed, in southern Gaul, may still have been Greek. But the high character of Cyprian, and the flourishing state of the African Churches, combined with their Latinity to endow them with this concurrent primacy in the West. Martianus, Bishop of Arles, had embraced Novatianism in all its rigor. The oppressed anti-Novatian party sent to Carthage as well as to Rome, to entreat their aid. Cyprian appears to acknowledge the superior right in the Bishop of Rome to appoint a substitute for the rebellious Novatianist. He urges Pope Stephen, by the memory of his martyred predecessors Cornelius and Lucius, not to shrink from this act of necessary rigor.² This, however, was but a letter from one bishop to another, from Cyprian of Carthage to Stephen of Rome.³ The answer to the Bishops of Spain is the formal act of a synod of African Bishops, assembled

¹ *Excidisti enim temet ipsum; noli te fallere. Siquidem ille est verè schismaticus, qui se a communione Ecclesiasticæ unitatis apostatam fecerit. Firm. ad Cyprian.* I see no ground to question, with *some* Roman Catholic writers, the authenticity of this letter. No doubt it is a translation from the Greek; if by Cyprian himself, it accounts for the sameness of style. A Donatist forgery would have been in a different tone, and directed against different persons. Compare Walch *Ketzer-Geschichte*, ii. 323, *et seqq.* Routh, note ii. p. 151.

² A. D. 256. Apud Mansi, sub ann. or Routh, *Rel. Sac.* iii. p. 91.

³ Cypriani *Epist.* lxxvii.

under the presidency of the Bishop of Carthage. It is a Latin religious state paper, addressed by one part of Latin Christendom to the rest.¹ The Spanish Bishops, Basilides and Martialis, of Leon and Astorga, had, during the Decian persecution, denied the faith, offered sacrifice, according to the language of the day, returned to wallow in the mire of paganism. Yet they had dared to resume, not merely their privileges as Christians, but the holy office of bishops. Whatever leniency might be shown to humbler penitents, that the immaculate priesthood should not be irrevocably forfeited by such defilement, revolted not only the more severe, but the general sentiment. Two other bishops, Felix and Sabinus, were consecrated in their place. Basilides found his way to Rome, and imposed by his arts on the unsuspecting Stephen, who commanded his reinstatement in his high office. Appeal was made to Carthage against Rome. Cyprian would strengthen his own authority by that of a synod. At the head of his thirty-five bishops, Cyprian approves the acts of the Presbyters and people of Leon and Astorga in rejecting such unworthy bishops; treats with a kind of respectful compassion the weakness of Stephen of Rome, who had been so easily abused; and exhorts the Spaniards to adhere to their rightful prelates, Felix and Sabinus.²

The persecution of Valerian joined the Bishops of Rome and of Carthage, Sixtus, the successor of Stephen, and the famous Cyprian, in the same glorious martyrdom.³

¹ The Decrees of the Council of Carthage are the earliest Latin *public* documents.

² Cyprian. Epist. lxxvii.

³ On the martyrdom of Cyprian, Hist. of Christ. ii. 251.

Dionysius, a Calabrian, is again a Greek Bishop of Rome, mingling with something of congenial A.D. 259. zeal, and in the Greek language, in the controversies of Greek Alexandria, and condemning the errors of the Bishop of the same name, who had the evil report of having been the predecessor of Arius in doctrine. Dionysius, of Alexandria, however, a prelate of great virtue, it should seem, was but incautiously betrayed into these doubtful expressions ; at all events, he repudiated the conclusions drawn from his words. With all the more candid and charitable, he soon resumed his fame for orthodoxy. When the Emperor Aurelian¹ transferred the ecclesiastical judgment over A.D. 270.

Paul of Samosata, a rebel against the Empire as against the Church, from the Bishops of Syria to those of Rome and Italy, a subtle Greek heresy, maintained by Syrian Greeks, could not have been adjudicated but by Greeks or by Latins perfect masters of Greek. Dionysius, as Bishop of Rome, passed sentence in this important controversy.

Towards the close of this third century, throughout the persecution of Diocletian, darkness settles again over the Bishops of Rome. The apostacy of Marcellinus, A.D. 296. Marcellinus is but a late and discarded fable, adopted as favoring the Papal supremacy. Legend assembles three hundred Bishops at Sinuessa, three hundred Bishops peaceably debating at such times in a small Neapolitan town. This synod refused to take cognizance of the crime of St. Peter's successor. Marcellinus was forced to degrade himself.

The legend, that his successor, Marcellus, was re-

¹ Compare, on the act of Aurelianus, *Hist. of Christ.* ii. p. 257.

duced to the servile office of a groom, rests on ^{Marcellus,} no better authority. Had it any claim to ^{A.D. 304.} truth, the successors of Marcellus had full and ample revenge, when kings and emperors submitted to the same menial service, and held the stirrup for the Popes to mount their horses.

CHAPTER II.

ROME AFTER THE CONVERSION OF CONSTANTINE.

THUS, down to the conversion of Constantine, the biography of the Roman Bishops, and the ^{Conversion} history of the Roman Episcopate, are one; ^{of Constantine.} the acts and peculiar character of the Pontiffs, the influence and fortunes of the See, excepting in the doubtful and occasional gleams of light which have brought out Victor, Zephyrinus, Callistus, Cornelius, Stephen, into more distinct personality, are involved in a dim and vague twilight. On the establishment of Christianity, as the religion if not of the Empire, of the Emperor, the Bishop of Rome rises at once to the rank of a great accredited functionary; the Bishops gradually, though still slowly, assume the life of individual character. The Bishop is the first Christian in the first city of the world, and that city is legally Christian. The Supreme Pontificate of heathenism might still linger from ancient usage among the numerous titles of the Emperor; but so long as Constantine was in Rome, the Bishop of Rome, the head of the Emperor's religion, became in public estimation the equal, in authority and influence immeasurably the superior, to all of sacerdotal rank. The schisms and factions of Christianity now become affairs of state. As long as Rome is the imperial residence, an appeal to the Emperor is an appeal to the Bishop of Rome. The

Bishop of Rome sits, by the imperial authority, at the head of a synod of Italian prelates, to judge the disputes with the African Donatists.

Melchiades held the See of Rome at the time of Constantine's conversion, but soon made room for Silvester, whose name is more inseparably connected with that great event. Silvester has become a kind of hero of religious fable. But it was not so much the genuine mythical spirit which unconsciously transmutes history into legend; it was rather deliberate invention, with a specific aim and design, which, in direct defiance of history, accelerated the baptism of Constantine, and sanctified a porphyry vessel as appropriated to, or connected with, that holy use: and at a later period produced the monstrous fable of the Donation.¹

¹ This document — the Imperial Edict of Donation — a forgery as clumsy as audacious, ought to be inspected by those who would judge of the ignorance which could impose, or the credulity which would receive it, as the title-deed to enormous rights and possessions. (Muratori ascribes the forgery of the act to the period between 755 and 766.) — *Palatium nostrum . . . et urbem Romam, et totius Italiae, et occidentalium regionum provincias, loca, civitates . . . prædicto beatissimo patri nostro Silvestro Catholico Papæ tradentes et cedentes hujus et successoribus, ejus Pontificatus potestate . . . divino nostro hoc pragmaticeo decreto administrari diffinimus, juri sanctæ Romanorum ecclesiæ subjicienda et in eo permansura exhibemus.* The Donation may be found, prefixed to Laurentius Valla's famous refutation. Read, too, the more guarded and reluctant surrender of Nicholas of Cusa, the feeble murmur of defence from Antoninus, archbishop of Florence, — apud Brown, *Fasciculus*, pp. 124, 161. Before the Reformation, the Donation had fallen the first victim of awakening religious inquiry. Dante, while he denounces, does not venture to question the truth of Constantine's gift. By the time of Ariosto it had become the object of unrebuked satire, even in Italy. Astolpho finds it among the chimeras of earth in the moon,

“ or puzza forte.

Questo era il don (se però dir lice)

Che Constantino al buon Silvestro fece.”

Orl. Fur. xxxiv. 80.

But that with which Constantine actually did invest the Church, the right of holding landed property, and receiving it by bequest, was ^{Grant of Constantine.} far more valuable to the Christian Hierarchy, and not least to the Bishop of Rome, than a premature and prodigal endowment, which would at once have plunged them in civil affairs; and, before they had attained their strength, made them objects of jealousy or of rapacity to the temporal Sovereign. Had it been possible, a precipitate seizure, or a hasty acceptance of large territorial possessions would have been fatal to the dominion of the Church. It was the slow and imperceptible accumulation of wealth, the unmarked ascent to power and sovereignty, which enabled the Papacy to endure for centuries.

The obscurity of the Bishops of Rome was not in this alone their strength. The earlier Pontiffs (Clement is hardly an exception) were men, who of themselves commanded no great authority, and awoke no jealousy. Rome had no Origen, no Athanasius, no Ambrose, no Augustine, no Jerome. ^{Roman Bishops obscure.}

The power of the Hierarchy was established by other master-minds: by the Carthaginian Cyprian, by the Italian Ambrose, the Prelate of political weight as well as of austere piety, by the eloquent Chrysostom.¹ The names of none of the Popes, down to Leo and Gregory the Great, appear among the distinguished writers of Christendom.² This more cautious and retired dignity was no less favorable to their earlier

¹ Chrysostom's book on the Priesthood throughout.

² Early Christianity, it may be observed, cannot be justly estimated from its writers. The Greeks were mostly trained in the schools of philosophy — the Latin in the schools of rhetoric; and polemic treatises could not but form a great part of the earliest Christian literature.

power, than to their later claim of infallibility. If more stirring and ambitious men, they might have betrayed to the civil power the secret of their aspiring hopes; if they had been voluminous writers, in the more speculative times, before the Christian creed had assumed its definite and coherent form, it might have been more difficult to assert their unimpeachable orthodoxy.

The removal of the seat of empire to Constantinople consummated the separation of Greek and Latin Christianity; one took the dominion of the East, the other of the West. Greek Christianity has now another centre in the new capital; and the new capital has entered into those close relations with the great cities of the East, which had before belonged exclusively to Rome. Alexandria has become the granary of Constantinople; her Christianity and her commerce, instead of floating along the Mediterranean to Italy, pours up the Ægean to the city on the Bosphorus. The Syrian capitals, Antioch, Jerusalem, the cities of Asia Minor and Bithynia, Ephesus, Nicea, Nicomedia, own another mistress. The tide of Greek trade has ebbed away from the West, and found a nearer mart; political and religious ambition and adventure crowd to the new Eastern Court. That Court becomes the chosen scene of Christian controversy; the Emperor is the proselyte to gain whom contending parties employ argument, influence, intrigue.

That which was begun by the foundation of Constantinople, was completed by the partition of the empire between the sons of Constantine. There are now two Roman worlds, a Greek,

Foundation
of Constantinople.

Division of
the empire.

and a Latin. In one respect, Rome lost in dignity, she was no longer the sole Metropolis of the empire; the East no longer treated her with the deference of a subject. On the other hand, she was the uncontested, unrivalled head of her own hemisphere; she had no rival in those provinces, which yet held her allegiance, either as to civil or religious supremacy. The separation of the empire was not more complete between the sons of Constantine or Theodosius, than between Greek and Latin Christianity.

In Rome itself Latin Christianity had long been in the ascendant. Greek had slowly and imperceptibly withdrawn from her services, her ^{Latin Christianity that} ^{of Rome.} Scriptures, her controversial writings, the spirit of her Christianity. It is now in the person of Athanasius, a stranger hospitably welcomed, not a member at once received into her community. Great part of the three years, during which Athanasius resided in Rome, must be devoted to learning Latin, before he can obtain his full mastery over the mind of the Roman Pontiff, perhaps before he can fully initiate the Romans in the subtle distinctions of that great controversy.¹

The whole West, Africa, Gaul, in which so soon as the religion spread beyond the Greek settle- ^{of the West.} ments, it found Latin, if not the vernacular, the dominant language (the native Celtic had been driven back into obscurity), Spain, what remained of Britain, formed a religious as well as a civil realm. In her Apostolical antiquity, in the dignity therefore of her Church, Rome stood as much alone and unapproachable among the young and undistinguished cities of the West, as in her civil majesty. After Cyprian,

¹ Gibbon, c. xxi. p. 360.

Carthage, until the days of Augustine, had sunk back into her secondary rank: Africa had been long rent to pieces by the Donatist schisms. Rome, therefore, might gather up her strength in quiet, before she committed herself in strife with any of her more formidable adversaries; and those adversaries were still weakening each other in the turmoils of unending controversy; so as to leave the almost undivided Unity of the West an object of admiration and envy to the rest of Christendom.

For throughout the religious and civil wars, which almost simultaneously with the conversion of Trinitarian controversy. Constantine distracted the Christian world, the Bishops of Rome and the West stood aloof in unimpassioned equanimity; they were drawn into the Trinitarian controversy, rather than embarked in it by their own ardent zeal. So long as Greek Christianity predominated in Rome, so long had the Church been divided by Greek doctrinal controversy. There the earliest disputes about the divinity of the Saviour had found ready audience. But Latin Christianity, as it grew to predominance in Rome, seemed to shrink from these foreign questions, or rather to abandon them for others more congenial. The Quarto Deciman controversy related to the establishment of a common law of Christendom, as to the time of keeping her great Festival. So in Novatianism, the readmission of apostates into the outward privileges of the Church, the kindred dispute concerning the rebaptism of heretics, were constitutional points, which related to the ecclesiastical polity. Donatism turned on the legitimate succession of the African Bishops.

The Trinitarian controversy was an Eastern ques-

tion. It began in Alexandria, invaded the Syrian cities, was ready, from its foundation, to disturb the churches, and people the streets of Constantinople with contending factions. Until taken up by the fierce and busy heterodoxy of Constantius when sole Emperor, it chiefly agitated the East. The Asiatic Nicea was the seat of the Council; all but a very few of the three hundred and twenty Bishops, who formed the Council, were from Asiatic or Egyptian sees. There were two Presbyters only to represent the Bishop of Rome;¹ the Bishop by his absence happily escaped the dangerous precedent, which might have been raised by his appearance in any rank inferior to the Presidency. Besides these Presbyters, there were not above seven or eight Western Prelates. Hosius of Cordova, if, as some accounts state, he presided, did so as the favorite of the Emperor; if it may be so expressed, as the Court divine.²

During the second period of the Trinitarian controversy, when the Arian Emperor of the East, ^{2nd period.} Constantius, had made it a question which involved the whole world in strife; and, though it was not the cause of the fratricidal war between the sons of Constantine, yet no doubt it aggravated the hostility; Rome alone, except for a short time of compulsory

¹ Τῆς δὲ γε Βασιλευούσης πόλεως ὁ μὲν προέστωρ διὰ γῆρας ὑστέροι προεσβύτεροι δὲ αὐτοῦ ἄροντες τὴν αὐτοῦ τάξιν ἐπλήρωσαν. The expression "the royal city" is significant. Socrat. H. E., i. 8. The presbyters' names are reported, Vitus and Vincentius.

² Hosius is named by writers of the fifth century as the first among the bishops at Nicea to sign the decrees. (Gelas. Cyzicen. Act. Concil. sub ann. 325.) Theodoret assigns a kind of presidency to Eustathius of Antioch. In all the earlier accounts it is impossible to discern any president, certainly none when the emperor is present. Hosius, in later times, was taken up as the representative of the Bishop of Rome. Compare Shroock. C. K. v. p. 335.

submission, remained faithful to the cause of Athanasius. The great Athanasius himself, a second time an exile from the East,¹ the object of the Eastern Emperor's inveterate animosity, had found a hospitable reception at Rome. There, having acquired the knowledge of Latin, he laid the spells of his master-mind on the Pope Julius, and received the deferential homage of Latin Christianity, which accepted the creed, which its narrow and barren vocabulary could hardly express in adequate terms. Yet throughout, the adhesion of Rome and of the West was a passive acquiescence in the dogmatic system, which had been wrought out by the profounder theology of the Eastern divines, rather than a vigorous and original examination on her part of those mysteries. The Latin Church was the scholar, as well as the loyal partisan of Athanasius. New and unexpected power grew out of this firmness in the head of Latin Christianity, when so large a part of Eastern Christendom had fallen away into what was deemed apostasy. The orthodoxy of the West stood out in bold relief at the Council of Sardica.²

¹ On his first exile he had been received by the Emperor Constans at Treves.

² Even those Latin writers (for Latin Christianity could not altogether be silent on the controversy) who treated on the Trinity, rather set forth or explained to their flocks the orthodox doctrines determined in the East, than refuted native heresies, or proposed their own irrefragable judgment. Nor were the more important treatises written in the capital, or in the less barbarized Latin of Rome, but by Hilary, the Gallic bishop of Poitiers, in the rude and harsh Roman dialect of that province; and Hilary had been banished to the East, where he had become impregnated with the spirit, to his praise be it said, by no means with the acrimony of the strife. At the close of the controversy a Latin creed embodied the doctrines of Athanasius and of the anti-Nestorian writers; but even this was not so much a work of controversy, as a final summary of Latin Christianity, as to the ultimate result of the whole. It is the creed commonly called that of St. Athanasius.

At this Council, held under the protection, and within the realm of the orthodox Constans, the occupation of all the greater sees in the East by Arian or semi-Arian prelates, the secession of the Eastern minority from the Council, left Latin Christianity, as it were, the representative of Christendom. It assumed to itself the dignity and authority of a General A. D. 347. Council, and it might seem that the suffrage of that Council awed the reluctant Constantius, and enforced the restoration of Athanasius to his see. By some happy fortune, by some policy prescient of future advantage, it might be unwillingness to risk his dignity at so great a distance from his own city, the trouble or expense of long journeys, or more important avocations at home, or the uncertainty that he would be allowed the place of honor, the Bishop of Rome (Julius I.) was absent from Sardica as from Nicea. Council of Sardica. Hosius of Cordova again presided in that assembly. Three Italian bishops appended their signatures after that of Hosius, as representing the Roman Pontiff. Unconsciously the representatives of these times prepared the way for the Legates of future ages. Western Christendom might seem disposed to show its gratitude to Rome for its pure and consistent orthodoxy, by acknowledging at Sardica a certain right of appeal to the Bishop of Rome from Illyricum and Macedonia. These provinces were still part of the empire of the West, and the decree might seem as if the Primacy of Rome was to be coextensive with the Western Empire. The metropolitan power of Latin Christianity thus gathered two large provinces, mostly Greek in race and in language, under its jurisdiction. The bishops of

Illyricum and Macedonia, in seeking a temporary protector (no doubt their immediate object) from the lawless tyranny of their Eastern and heterodox superiors, foresaw not that they were imposing on themselves a master who would never relax his claim to their implicit obedience.

Liberius, the successor of Julius I., had to endure the fiercer period of conflict with the Arian Emperor. Constantius was now sole master of the Roman world. From the councils of Arles and of Milan had been extorted by bribes, by threats, and by force, the condemnation of Athanasius. Liberius had commenced his pontificate with an act of declared hostility to Athanasius. He had summoned the Prelate of Alexandria to Rome: he had declared him cut off from the communion of the West.¹ But if, from fear of Constantius, he had rejected Athanasius, he soon threw off his timidity: he as suddenly changed his policy as his opinions. He disclaimed his feeble Legate, the Bishop of Capua, who in his name had subscribed at Arles the sentence against the great Trinitarian. Himself, at length, after suffering menace, persecution, exile, was reduced so far to compromise his principles as to assent to that condemnation. Yet nothing could show more strongly the different place now occupied by the Bishop of Rome, in the estimation of Rome and of the world. Liberius is no martyr, calmly laying down his life for Christianity, inflexibly refusing to sacrifice on an heathen altar. He is a prelate, rejecting the summary commands of an heretical sovereign, treating

Pope Liberius. A.D. 352, May 22.

Council of Arles, A.D. 355.

Council of Milan, A.D. 355.

¹ Liberii Epistol. apud Hilar. Fragm. v.

his messages, his blandishments, his presents, with lofty disdain. The Arian Emperor of the world discerns the importance of attaching the Bishop of Rome to his party, in his mortal strife with Athanasius. His chief minister, the Eunuch Eusebius, appears in Rome to negotiate the alliance, bears with him rich presents, and a letter from the Emperor.¹ Liberius coldly answers that the Church of Rome A.D. 356. having solemnly declared Athanasius guiltless, he could not condemn him. Nothing less than a Council of the Church, from which the Emperor, his officers, and all the Arian prelates shall be excluded, can reverse the decree. Eusebius threatens, but in vain; he lays down the Emperor's gifts in the Church of St. Peter. Liberius orders the infected offerings to be cast out of the sanctuary. He proceeds to utter a solemn anathema against all Arian heretics. Thus Roman liberty has found a new champion. The Bishop stands on what he holds to be the law of the Church; he is faithful to the Prelate, whose creed has been recognized as exclusive Christian truth by the Senate of Christendom. He disfranchises all, even the Emperor himself, from the privileges of the Christian polity. Constantius, in his wrath, orders the seizure of his rebellious subject; but the Bishop of Rome is no longer at the head of a feeble community; he is respected, beloved by the whole city. All Rome is in commotion in defence of the Christian prelate. The city must be surrounded, and even then it is thought more prudent to apprehend Liberius by night, and to convey him secretly out of the city. He is sent

¹ Athanas. Hist. Arian. ad Monach. p. 764, *et seqq.* Theodoret, H. E. ii. c. 15, 16. Sozomen, iv. c. 11. Ammian. Marcell. xv. c. 7.

Liberius at
Milan.

to the Emperor at Milan. He appears before Constantius, with the aged Hosius of Cordova, and all the more distinguished orthodox prelates of the west, Eusebius of Vercelli, Lucifer of Cagliari, Hilary of Poitiers. He maintains the same lofty tone. Constantius declares that Athanasius has been condemned by a Council of the Church; he insists on the treason of Athanasius in corresponding with the enemies of the Emperor. Liberius is unshaken: "If he were the only friend of Athanasius, he would adhere to the righteous cause." The Bishop of Rome is banished to cold and inhospitable Thrace. He scornfully rejects offers of money, made by the Emperor for his expenses on the way. "Let him keep it to pay his soldiers." To the eunuch who made the like offer, he spoke with more bitter sarcasm. "Do you, who have wasted all the churches of the world, presume to offer me alms as a criminal? Away, first become a Christian!"¹

Two years of exile in that barbarous region, the dread of worse than exile, perhaps disastrous news from Rome, at length broke the spirit of Liberius; he consented to sign the semi-Arian creed of Sirmium, and to renounce the communion of Athanasius.²

For the Emperor had attempted to strike a still heavier blow against the rebellious exile. A rival bishop, as though the See were vacant, had usurped the throne. Felix was elected, it was

Felix
Antipope.

¹ Athanas. Apolog. Contra Arian. p. 205. Ad Monach. p. 368. Theodoret, ii. c. 16, 17.

² The jealousy of Felix, according to Baronius (sub ann. 357), was the Dalila which robbed the Episcopal Samson (Liberius) of his strength and fortitude.

said, by three eunuchs, who presumed to represent the people of Rome, and consecrated by three courtly prelates, two of them from the East. But the clergy of Rome, and the people with still more determinate resolution, kept aloof from the empty churches, where Bishop Felix, if not himself an Arian, did not scruple to communicate with Arians.¹ The estrangement continued through the two years of the exile of Liberius; the Pastor was without a flock. At the close of this period, the Emperor Constantius A.D. 357. visited Rome; the females, those especially of the upper rank, (history now speaks as if the whole higher orders were Christians,) had most strenuously maintained the right of Liberius, and refused all allegiance to the intrusive Felix. They endeavored to persuade the Senators, Consulars, and Patricians, to make a representation to the Emperor; the timid nobles devolved the dangerous office on their wives. The female deputation, in their richest attire, as befitting their rank, marched along the admiring streets, and stood before the Imperial presence; by their fear-

¹ Theodoret (H. E. ii. 16) and Sozomen (H. E. iv. 15) plainly assert that Felix adhered to the creed of Nicea. Socrates (H. E. ii. 37) conderans him as infected by the Arian heresy. By Athanasius (ad Monach., p. 861) he is called a monster, raised by the malice of Antichrist, worthy of, and fit to execute, the worst design of his wicked partisans. This prelate of questionable faith, this usurper of the Roman See, has stolen, it is difficult to conjecture how, into the Roman Martyrology. It seems clear that he retired from Rome, and died a few years after in peace. Gregory the Thirteenth, when searching investigations into ecclesiastical history became necessary, startled by the perplexing difficulty perhaps of a canonized Arian, certainly of an antipope, with the honors of a martyr, ordered a regular inquiry into the claims of Felix. (Baron. Ann. sub ann. 357.) The case looked desperate for the memory of Felix: he was in danger of degradation, when, by a seasonable miracle, his body was discovered with an ancient inscription, "Pope and Martyr." Baronius wrote a book about it, which was never published.

less pertinacity they obtained a promise for the release of Liberius. Even then Constantius was but imperfectly informed concerning the strength of the factions which himself having exasperated to the utmost, he now vainly attempted to reconcile. His Edict declared that the two Bishops should rule with conjoint authority, each over his respective community. Such an edict of toleration was premature by nearly fourteen centuries or more. In that place, the uncongenial atmosphere of which we should hardly have expected Christian passions to have penetrated, the Circus of Rome, the Edict was publicly read. "What!" exclaimed the scoffing spectators, "because we have two factions here, distinguished by their colors, are we to have two factions in the Church?" The whole audience broke forth in an overwhelming shout, "One God! one Christ! one Bishop!"

Liberius returned, in the course of the next year, to Rome. His entrance was an ovation; the people thronged forth, as of old to meet some triumphant Consul or Cicero on his return from exile. The rival bishop, Felix, fled before his face;¹ but Felix and his party would not altogether abandon the coequal dignity assigned him by the decree of Constantius, and confirmed by the Council of Sirmium. He returned; and, at the head of a body of faithful ecclesiastics, celebrated divine worship in the basilica of Julius, beyond the Tiber. He was expelled, patricians and populace uniting against this, one of the earliest Antipopes who resisted armed force.²

Liberius in
Rome.
A.D. 353,
Aug. 1.

¹ Hieron. Chron. Marc. et Faust. p. 4.

² This curious passage in the Pontifical Annals (apud Muratori iii. sub an.) is evidently from the party of Felix; — it asserts his Catholicity.

A tradition has survived in the Pontifical Annals, of a proscription, a massacre.¹ The streets, the baths, the churches ran with blood, — the streets, where the partisans of rival bishops encountered in arms; the baths, where Arian and Catholic could not wash together without mutual contamination; the churches, where they could not join in common worship to the same Redeemer. Felix himself escaped, and lived some years in peace, on an estate near the road to Portus.² Liberius, Rome itself, sinks back into obscurity; the Pope mingled not, as far as is known, in the fray, which had now involved the West as well as the East, Latin as well as Greek Christianity; he was absent from the fatal Council of Rimini,³ which de- A. D. 359. luded the world into unsuspected Arianism.⁴

The Emperor Julian, during his short and eventful reign, might seem to have forgotten that there A. D. 361-363. was such a city as Rome. Paris, Athens, Constantinople, Antioch, Jerusalem, perhaps Alexandria, might seem to be the only Imperial cities worthy of his regard. It was a Greek religion which Julian Emperor. he aspired to restore; his philosophy was Greek; his writings Greek; he taught, ruled, worshipped, perished in the East.⁵ Under his successors (after Jovian), Valentinian, and Valens, while Valens af- Valentinian. Sept. 23 or 24, 366. flicted the East by his feeble and frantic zeal

¹ Gibbon (who for once does not quote his special authority, nevertheless accepts it), c. xxi. v. iii. p. 385. It is rejected by Bower (v. i. p. 141) and by Walch, "Lives of Popes," *in loc.*

² He died the year before Liberius, 365.

³ Hist. of Christ. iii. p. 46.

⁴ Liberius had already subscribed, during his banishment, the creed of Sirmium. Constantius and his semi-Arian or Arian counsellors may have been content with that act of submission, which had not been formally re-voled.

⁵ On Julian, Hist. of Christ. vol. iii. c. vi.

for Arianism, Valentinian maintained the repose of the West by his rigid and impartial toleration.¹

On the death of Liberius, the factions, which had smouldered in secret, broke out again with fatal fury. The Pontificate of Damasus displays Christianity now Strife on the death of Liberius. not merely the dominant, it might almost seem the sole religion of Rome; and the Roman character is working as visibly into Christianity. The election to the Christian bishopric arrays the people in adverse factions; the government is appalled; churches become citadels, are obstinately defended, furiously stormed; they are defiled with blood. Men fall in murderous warfare before the altar of the Prince of Peace. In one sense it might seem the reanimation of Rome to new life; ancient Rome is resuming her wonted but long-lost liberties. The iron hand of despotism, from the time of the last Triumvirate, or rather from the accession of Augustus to the Empire, had compressed the unruly populace, which only occasionally dared to break out, on a change in the Imperial dynasty, to oppose, or be the victims of, the Prætorian soldiery. Now, however, the Roman populace appears quickened by a new principle of freedom; of freedom, if with some of its bold independence, with all its blind partisanship, its headstrong and stubborn ferocity. The great offices, which still perpetuated in name the ancient Republic, the Senatorship, Quæstorship, Consul-ate, are quietly transmitted according to the Imperial mandates, excite no popular commotion, nor even interest; for they are honorary titles, which confer neither influence, nor authority, nor wealth. Even the Prefecture of the city is accepted at the will of the

¹ Compare Hist. of Christ. iii. p. 111.

Emperor, who rarely condescends to visit Rome. But the election to the bishopric is now not merely an affair of importance — *the* affair of paramount importance it might seem — in Rome ; it is an event in the annals of the world. The heathen historian,¹ on whose notice had already been forced the Athanasian controversy, Athanasius himself, and the acts and the exile of Liberius, assigns the same place to the contested promotion of Damasus which Livy might to that of one of the great consuls, tribunes, or dictators. He interprets, as well as relates, the event :² — “ No wonder that for so magnificent a prize as the Bishopric of Rome, men should contest with the utmost eagerness and obstinacy. To be enriched by the lavish donations of the principal females of the city ; to ride, splendidly attired, in a stately chariot ; to sit at a profuse, luxuriant, more than imperial, table — these are the rewards of successful ambition.”³ The honest historian contrasts this pomp and luxury with the abstemiousness, the humility, the exemplary gentleness of the provincial prelates. Ammianus, ignorant or regardless as to the legitimacy of either election, arraigns both Damasus and his rival Ursicinus⁴ as equally guilty authors of the tumult.

¹ I assume, without hesitation, the heathenism of Ammianus, though, with regard to him, as to other writers of the time, there is as much truth as sagacity in the observation of Heyne — *Est obvia res in lectione scriptorum istius temporis, prudentiorum plerosque nec patrias religiones abjecisse, nec novas damnasse, sed in his quoque pro suorum ingeniorum facultate probanda probasse.* Heynii Prolus. in Wagner's edit. p. cxxxv.

² Ammianus Marcellinus, xxvii. 3, sub ann. 367.

³ Compare — it is amusing and instructive — the Cardinal Baronius writing in the splendid Papal court, and the severe Jansenist Tillemont, on this passage.

⁴ On the side of Ursicinus (Ursinus) is the remarkable document published by Sirmond (*Opera*, i. p. 127), the petition of Marcellinus and Faustinus to the Emperor Theodosius, who, in his answer, though they were

Of the Christian writers (and there are, singularly enough, contemporary witnesses, probably eye-witnesses, on each side), the one asserts the priority and legality of election in favor of Damasus, the other of Ursicinus; the one aggravates, the other extenuates the violence and slaughter. But that scenes occurred of frightful atrocity is beyond all doubt. So long and obstinate was the conflict, that Juventius, the Præfect of the city, finding his authority contemned, his forces

afterwards Luciferians (an unpopular sect), testifies to their character by his gracious promises of protection. According to the Preface (is it quite certain that the Preface is of the same date?) to this *Libellus Precum*, Damasus was supported by the party of Felix; he was the successor of Felix, the reputed Arian, Ursicinus of Liberius.* The Presbyters, Deacons, and faithful people, who had adhered to Liberius in his exile, met in the Julian Basilica, and duly elected Ursicinus; who was consecrated by Paul, bishop of Tibur. Damasus was proclaimed by the followers of Felix, in S. M. Lucina. Damasus collected a mob of charioteers and a wild rabble, broke into the Julian Basilica, and committed great slaughter. Seven days after, having bribed a great body of ecclesiastics and the populace, and seized the Lateran Church, he was elected and consecrated bishop. Ursicinus was expelled from Rome. Damasus, however, continued his acts of violence. Seven Presbyters of the other party were hurried prisoners to the Lateran: their faction rose, rescued them, and carried them to the Basilica of Liberius (S. Maria Maggiore). Damasus, at the head of a gang of gladiators, charioteers, and laborers, with axes, swords, and clubs, stormed the church: a hundred and sixty of both sexes were barbarously killed; not one on the side of Damasus. The party of Ursicinus were obliged to withdraw, vainly petitioning for a synod of bishops to examine into the validity of the two elections. Ursicinus returned from exile more than once, but Damasus had the ladies of Rome in his favor; and the council of Valentinian was not inaccessible to bribes. New scenes of blood took place. Ursicinus was compelled at length to give up the contest.

On the other hand Damasus had on his side the great vindicator—success. Rufinus, and Jerome (then at Rome, afterwards the secretary of Damasus) assert, with the same minuteness and particularity, the priority and the lawfulness of his election: they treat Ursicinus as a schismatic: but they cannot deny, however they may mitigate, the acts of violence and bloodshed.

* Damasus, from other authority, is said to have sworn as Presbyter to own no bishop but Liberius, to have accompanied him in exile, but speedily deserted him, returned to Rome, and at last submitted to Felix.

unequal to keep the peace, retired into the neighborhood of Rome. Churches were garrisoned, churches besieged, churches stormed and deluged with blood. In one day, relates Ammianus, above one hundred and thirty dead bodies were counted in the basilica of Sisinnius. The triumph of Damasus cannot relieve his memory from the sanction, the excitement of, hardly from active participation in, these deeds of blood.¹ Nor did the contention cease with the first discomfiture and banishment of Ursicinus: he was more than once recalled, exiled, again set up as rival bishop, and re-exiled. Another frightful massacre took place in the church of St. Agnes. The Emperor was forced to have recourse to the character and firmness of the famous heathen Prætextatus, as successor to Juventius in the government of Rome, in order to put down with impartial severity these disastrous tumults. Some years elapsed before Damasus was in undisputed possession of his see.

The strife between Damasus and Ursicinus was a prolongation or rival of that between Liberius ^{Damasus} and Felix, and so may have remotely grown ^{Pope} out of the doctrinal conflict of Arianism and Trinitarianism.² No doubt too it was a conflict of personal ambition, for the high prize of the Roman Episcopate. But there was another powerful element of discord among the Christians of Rome. The heathen historian

¹ Baronius ingeniously discovered a certain Maximus, a man of notorious cruelty, who afterwards held a high office, and might, perhaps, have been accessory to the late scenes of tumult; and so quietly exculpates Damasus, by laying all the carnage upon Maximus, who was not in authority, possibly not in Rome at the commencement of the strife.

² Jerome, Epist. xv. t. i. p. 39, asserts the orthodoxy of Damasus, the Arianism of Ursicinus: but Jerome is hardly conclusive authority against the enemy of Damasus.

saw and described the outward aspect of things, the tumults which disturbed the peace of the city, the conflagrations, the massacres, the assaulted and defended churches, the two masses of believers striving in arms for the mastery. So too he saw the more notorious habits, the public demeanor of the bishops and of the clergy, their pomp, wealth, ceremony. The letters of Jerome, while they confirm the statements of Ammianus, reveal the internal state, the more secret workings, in this new condition of society. Athanasius had not merely brought with him into the West the more speculative controversies which distracted Greek Christianity, he had also introduced the principles and spirit of Eastern Monasticism: and this too had been embraced with all the strength and intensity of the Roman character. That which during the whole of the Roman history had given a majesty, a commanding grandeur to the virtues and to the vices of the Romans, to their patrician pride and plebeian liberty, to their frugality and rapacity, to their courage, discipline, and respect for order; to their prodigality, luxury, sensuality; to their despotism and their servility; now seemed to survive in the force and devotion with which they threw themselves into Christianity, and into Christianity in its most extreme, if it may be so said, excessive form. On the one hand the Bishop and the clergy are already aspiring to a sacerdotal power and preëminence hardly attained, hardly aimed at, in any other part of Christendom; the Pontiff cannot rest below a magnificence which would contrast as strongly with the life of the primitive Bishop, as that of Lucullus with that of Fabricius. The prodigality of the offerings to the Church and to

Monasticism
in Rome.

the clergy, those more especially by bequest, is so immoderate, that a law¹ is necessary to restrain the profuseness on one hand, the avidity on the other, a law which the statesman Ambrose² and the Monk Jerome approve, as demanded by the abuses of the times. "Priests of idols, mimes, charioteers, harlots may receive bequests; it is interdicted, and wisely interdicted, only to ecclesiastics and monks." The Church may already seem to have taken the place of the emperor as universal legatee. As men before bought by this posthumous adulation the favor of Cæsar, so would they now that of God. Heredipety, or legacy hunting, is inveighed against, in the clergy especially, as by the older Satirists. Jerome in his epistles is the Juvenal of his times, without his grossness indeed, for Christianity no doubt had greatly raised the standard of morals. The heathen, as represented by such men as Prætextatus (they now seem to have retired into a separate community, and stood in relation to the general society, as the Christians had stood to the heathen under Vespasian or the Antonines), had partaken in the moral advancement. But with this great exception, this repulsive license, Jerome, both in the vehemence of his denunciations, and in his description of the vices, manners, habits of Rome, might seem to be writing of pre-Christian times.³

¹ The law of Valentinian (A.D. 370), addressed to Damasus, bishop of Rome, and ordered to be read in all the churches of the city. Cod. Theodos. xiv. 2, 20.

² Ambros. Epist. xxii. l. 5, p. 200. Hieronym. Epist. ii. p. 13. Solis clericis et monachis hæc lege prohibetur, et prohibetur non a persecutoribus, sed a principibus Christianis. Nec de lege conqueror, sed doleo cur meruerimus hanc legem. Hieronym. ad Nepotian.

³ Prudentius, with poetic anachronism, throws back the jealousy of the heathens of the enormous wealth offered on the altars of the Christians, and

But the Roman character did not interwork into the general Christianity alone, it embraced monastic Christianity, in all its extremest rigor, its sternest asceticism, with the same ardor and energy. Christian Stoicism could not but find its Catos; but it was principally among the females that the recoil seemed to take place from the utter shamelessness, the unspeakable profligacy of the Imperial times, to a severity of chastity, to a fanatic appreciation of virginity as an angelic state, as a kind of religious aristocratical distinction, far above the regular virtues of the wife or the matron. Pope Damasus, though by no means indifferent to the splendor of his office, was the patron, as his secretary Jerome was the preacher, of this powerful party; and between this party and the priesthood of Rome there was already that hostility which has so constantly prevailed between the Regulars, the observants of monastic rule, and what were called in later times the secular clergy. The Monastics inveighed against the worldly riches, pomp, and luxury of the clergy; the clergy looked with undisguised jealousy on the growing, irresistible influence of the monks, especially over the high-born females.¹ Jerome hated, and was hated

the alienation of estates from their right heirs, into the third century. The Prefect of Rome reproaches the Deacon Laurentius, before his martyrdom (about 258), with the silver cups and golden candlesticks of the service:—

“Tum summa cura est fratribus — Ut sermo testatur loquax,
 Offerre, fundis venditis — Sestertiorum millia.
 Addicta avorum prædia — Foedis sub auctionibus,
 Successor exhæres gemit — Sanctis egens parentibus.
 Hæc oculuntur abditis — Ecclesiarum in angulis,
 Et summa pietas creditur — Nudare dulces liberos.”

Peristeph. Hymn 11.

Compare Paolo Sarpi delle Materie Beneficarie, c. vi. v. iv. p. 74.

¹ Jerome spared neither the clergy nor the monks. On the clergy, see the passage (ad Eustochium): Sunt alii, de hominibus loquor, mei ordinis,

with the most cordial reciprocity. The austere Jerome was accused, unjustly no doubt, of more than spiritual intimacy with his distinguished converts; his enemies brought a charge of adultery against Pope Damasus himself.¹

Nor was this a question merely between the superior clergy and a man in the high and invidious position of Jerome, renowned for his boundless learning, and holding the eminent office of secretary under Pope Damasus. It was a dispute which agitated the people of Rome. Among the female proselytes who crowded to the teaching of Jerome, and became his most fervent votaries, were some of the most illustrious matrons, widows, and virgins. Marcella had already, when Athanasius was at Rome, become enamoured of the hard and recluse life of the female Egyptian anchorites. But she was for some time alone. The satiric Romans laughed to scorn this new and superstitious Christianity. A layman, Helvidius, wrote a book against it, a book of some popularity, which Jerome answered with his usual controversial fury and con-

qui ideo presbyteratum et diaconatum ambiunt ut mulieres licentius videantur. Then follows the description of a clerical coxcomb. His whole care is in his dress, that it be well perfumed; that his feet may not slip about in a loose sandal; his hair is crisped with a curling-pin; his fingers glitter with rings; he walks on tiptoe lest he should splash himself with the wet soil; when you see him, you would think him a bridegroom rather than an ecclesiastic. Jerome ends the passage. *Et isti sunt sacerdotes Baal.* Then on the monks (*ad Nepot.*): *Nonnulli sunt ditiores monachi, quam fuerant sæculares et clerici, qui possident opes sub Christo paupere, quas sub locuplete et fallaci Diabolo non habuerant, et seqq.* Compare, throughout, the account of Jerome, in the *Hist. of Christianity*, vol. iii. p. 323, *et seqq.*

¹ *Quem in tantum matronæ diligebant, ut matronarum auriscalpius diceretur.* So says the preface to the hostile petition, the *Libellus Precum.* *Apud Sirmond. i. p. 136.* The charge of adultery is in *Anastasius Vit. Damasi.*

temptuousness. Marcella was a widow of one of the oldest patrician houses, connected with all the consular families and with the prefect of the city. She was extremely rich. She became the most ardent of Jerome's hearers; her example spread with irresistible contagion. The sister of Marcella, Paula, with her two daughters, Blesilla and Eustochium,¹ threw themselves passionately into the same devotion. Paula, like her sister, was very wealthy; she possessed great part of Nicopolis, the city founded by Augustus to commemorate the battle of Actium. Blesilla, her younger daughter, was a widow at the age of twenty. She rejected the importunate persuasions of her friends to contaminate herself with a second marriage. She abandoned herself entirely to the spiritual direction of Jerome; her tender frame sank under the cruel penances and macerations which he enjoined. The death of the young and beautiful widow was attributed to these austerities. All Rome took an indignant interest in her fate; her mother, for her unnatural weakness, became an object of general reprobation, and the public voice loudly denounced Jerome as guilty of her death. A tumult broke out at the funeral; there was a loud cry,—“Why do we tolerate these accursed monks? Away with them, stone them, cast them into the Tiber!”

The pontificate of Damasus, with those of his two immediate successors, Siricius and Anastasius, is an epoch in the history of Latin Christianity, distinguished

¹ Among the other names of Jerome's female admirers, one sounds Hebrew, —Lea; some Greek, —Eustochium, Melanium; besides these are Principia, Felicitas, Feliciana, Marcellina, Asella. On Asella and the whole subject, see *Hist. of Christianity*, iii. p. 328, *et seqq.* Compare also a later work Gfrörer, *Kirchen-Geschichte*, ii. p. 631, *et seqq.*

by the commencement of three great changes:—I. The progress towards sovereignty, at least over the Western Church: the steps thus made in advance will find their place in the general view of the Papal power on the accession of Innocent I. II. The rapidly increasing power of monasticism. III. The promulgation of a Latin version of the Scriptures, which became the religious code of the West, was received as of equal authority with the original Greek or Hebrew, and thus made the Western independent of the Eastern churches, superseded the original Scriptures for centuries in the greatest part of Christendom, operated powerfully on the growth of Latin Christian literature, contributed to establish Latin as the language of the Church, and still tends to maintain the unity with Rome of all nations whose languages have been chiefly formed from the Latin.

Of both these events, the extension of monasticism, and the promulgation of the Vulgate Bible, Jerome was the author; of the former principally, of the latter exclusively. This was his great and indefeasible title to the appellation of a Father of the Latin Church. Whatever it may owe to the older and fragmentary versions of the sacred writings, Jerome's Bible is a wonderful work, still more as achieved by one man, and that a Western Christian, even with all the advantage of study and of residence in the East. It almost created a new language. The inflexible Latin became pliant and expansive, naturalizing foreign Eastern imagery, Eastern modes of expression and of thought, and Eastern religious notions, most uncongenial to its own genius and character; and yet retaining much of its own peculiar strength, solidity, and majesty. If the

Northern, the Teutonic languages, coalesce with greater facility with the Orientalism of the Scriptures, it is the triumph of Jerome to have brought the more dissonant Latin into harmony with the Eastern tongues. The Vulgate was even more, perhaps, than the Papal power the foundation of Latin Christianity.

Jerome cherished the secret hope, if it was not the avowed object of his ambition, to succeed Damasus as the Bishop of Rome. He was designated, he says, almost by unanimous consent for that dignity.¹ Is the rejection of an aspirant so singularly unfit for the station, from his violent passions, his insolent treatment of his adversaries, his utter want of self-command, his almost unrivalled faculty of awakening hatred, to be attributed to the sagacious and intuitive wisdom of Rome? Or, as is far more probable, did the vanity of Jerome mistake outward respect for general attachment, awe of his abilities and learning for admiration, and so blind him to the ill-dissembled, if dissembled, hostility which he had provoked in so many quarters? It is difficult to refrain from speculating on his elevation. How signally dangerous would it have been to have loaded the rising Papacy with the responsibility of all, or even a large part of the voluminous works of Jerome! The station of a Father of the Church, one of the four great Latin Fathers, committed Christendom to a less close adhesion to all his opinions, while at the same time it placed him above jealous and hostile scrutiny. It was not till two centuries later, when speculative subjects had ceased to agitate the Christian mind, and the creed and the discipline had settled down

¹ *Omnium pæne judicio, dignus summo sacerdotio decernebatur. Epist. xlv. ad Asellam, 3.*

to a mature and established form, that a Father of the Church, a voluminous writer, could safely appear on the episcopal throne of Rome. Gregory the Great was at once the representative and the voice of the Christianity of his age. Nor could the great work of Jerome have been achieved at Rome, assuredly not by a Pope. It was in his cell at Bethlehem, meditating and completing the Vulgate, that Jerome fixed for centuries the dominion of Latin Christianity over the mind of man. Siricius was the successor of Damasus.¹ Jerome left ungrateful Rome, Pope Siricius. A.D. 384-398. against whose sins the recluse of Palestine becomes even more impassioned, whose clergy and people become blacker and more inexcusable in his harsher and more unsparing denunciations.

The pontificate of Siricius is memorable for the first authentic Decretal, the first letter of the Bishop of Rome, which became a law to the Western Church, and the foundation of the vast system of ecclesiastical jurisprudence. It betrays the Roman tendency to harden into inflexible statute that which was left before to usage, opinion, or feeling. The East enacted creeds, the West discipline.

The Decree of Siricius was addressed to Himerius, Bishop of Tarragona.² Himerius had writ- The Decretal. A.D. 385. ten before the death of Damasus to consult the Bishop of Rome on certain doubtful points of usage, the validity of heretical baptism, the treatment of apostates, of religious persons guilty of incontinence, the steps which the clergy were to pass through to the higher ranks, and the great question of all, the celi-

¹ Damasus died Dec. 11.

² Apud Mansi, sub ann. 385, or Constant. Epist. Pontificum.

bacy of the clergy. The answer of Siricius is in the tone of one who supposes that the usages of the Church of Rome were to be received as those of Christendom. It was to be communicated beyond the province of Tarragona, throughout Spain, in Carthage, Bætica, Lusitania, Galicia: it appears, by an allusion in a writing of Pope Innocent I., even in Southern Gaul. The all-important article was on the marriage of the clergy; this was peremptorily interdicted, as by an immutable ordinance, to all priests and deacons. This law, while it implied the ascendancy of monastic opinions, showed likewise that there was a large part of the clergy who could only be controlled into celibacy by law. Even now the law was forced to make some temporary concessions. Those who confessed that it was a fault, and could plead ignorance that celibacy was an established usage of the Church, were exempted from penalties, but could not hope for promotion to a higher rank.

This unrepealed law was one of the characteristics of Latin Christianity. Her first voice of authority might seem to utter the stern prohibition. Celibacy of the Clergy. This, more than any other measure, separated the sacerdotal order from the rest of society, from the common human sympathies, interests, affections. It justified them to themselves in assuming a dignity superior to the rest of mankind, and seemed their title to enforce acknowledgment and reverence for that superior dignity. The monastic principle admitting, virtually at least, almost to its full extent, the Manichean tenet of the innate sinfulness of all sexual intercourse as partaking of the inextinguishable impurity of Matter, was gradually wrought into the general

feeling. Whether marriage was treated as in itself an evil, perhaps to be tolerated, but still degrading to human nature, as by Jerome.¹ and the more ascetic teachers; or honored, as by Augustine, with a specious adulation, only to exalt virginity to a still loftier height above it;² the clergy were taught to assert it at once as a privilege, as a distinction, as the consummation and the testimony to the sacredness of their order. As there was this perpetual appeal to their pride (they were thus visibly set apart from the vulgar, the rest of mankind),³ so they were compelled to its observance at once by the law of the Church, and by the fear of falling below their perpetual rivals, the monks, in the general estimation. The argument of their greater usefulness to Christian society, of their more entire devotion to the duties of their holy function by being released from the cares and duties of domestic life: the noble Apostolic motive, that they ought to be bound to the world by few, and those the most fragilities, in order more fearlessly to incur danger, or to sacrifice even life more readily in the cause of the Cross; such low incentives were disdained as beneath consideration. Some hardy opponents, Helvidius, Jovinian, Vigilantius, and others of more obscure name, endeavored to stem the mingling tide of authority and popular sentiment; they were swept away by its resistless

¹ On Jerome's views see quotations Hist. of Christianity, iii. 320, *et seqq.*

² *Gaudium virginum Christi* — de Christo, in Christo, cum Christo, post Christum, per Christum, propter Christum. Sequantur itaque agnum qui virginitatem corporis amiserunt, non quocunque ille ierit, sed quousque ipsi potuerint. De Sanct. Virgin. cap. 27. — The virgin and her mother may both be in heaven, but one a bright, the other a dim star. Serm. 354, ad Continent.

³ *Quid interesset inter populum et sacerdotem, si iisdem ad stringerentur legibus.* Ambros. Epist. lxxiii. ad Eccl. Vercell.

force.¹ They boldly called in question the first principles of the new Christian theory, and in the name of reason, nature, and the New Testament, denied this inherent perfection of virginity, as compared with lawful marriage. Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, lifted up at once their voices against these unexpected and mistimed adversaries. Jerome went so far in his disparagement of marriage, as to be disclaimed by his own ardent admirers: but still his adversaries have been handed down to posterity under the ill-omened name of heretics, solely, or almost solely on this account. They live, in his vituperative pages, objects of scorn more than of hatred. So unpopular was their resistance to the spirit of the age. The general feeling shuddered at their refusal to admit that which had now become one of the leading articles of Latin Christian faith. Yet, notwithstanding this, the law of the Celibacy of the Clergy, even though imposed with such overweening authority, was not received without some open and more tacit resistance. There were few, perhaps, courageous or far-sighted enough to oppose the principle itself, though even among bishops Jovinian was not without followers. Others, incautiously admitting the principle, struggled to escape from its consequences. In some regions the married clergy formed the majority, and, always supporting married bishops by their suffrages and influence, kept up a formidable succession. Still Christendom was against them; and in most cases, those who were conscientiously opposed to these austere restrictions, had recourse to evasions or secret violations

¹ I have entered somewhat more at length into this controversy in the *Hist. of Christianity*.

of the law, infinitely more dangerous to public morals. Throughout the whole period, from Pope Siricius to the Reformation, as must appear in the course of our history, the law was defied, infringed, eluded. It never obtained anything approaching to general observance, though its violation was at times more open, at times more clandestine.

The Pontificates of Damasus and Siricius beheld almost the last open struggles of expiring Roman paganism, the dispute concerning the Statue of Victory in the Senate, the secession of a large ^{Extinction of Paganism.} number of the more distinguished senators, the pleadings of the eloquent Symmachus for the toleration of the religion of ancient Rome. To such humiliation were reduced the deities of the Capitol, the gods, who, as was supposed, had achieved the conquest of the world, and laid it at the feet of Rome. But in this great contest the Bishop of Rome filled only an inferior part; it was Ambrose, the Bishop of Milan, who enforced the final sentence of condemnation against paganism, asserted the sin, in a Christian Emperor, of assuming any Imperial title connected with pagan worship, and of permitting any portion of the public revenue to be expended on the rites of idolatry. It was Ambrose who forbade the last marks of respect to the tutelar divinities of Rome in the public ceremonies.

Latin Christianity, in truth, in all but its monarchical strength, in its unity under one Head, and under one code of ecclesiastical law, enacted and executed in its last resort by that Head, was established in its dominion over the human mind without the walls of Rome. It was Jerome who sent forth the Vulgate from his retreat in Palestine; it was Ambrose of Milan who raised the sacerdotal power to more than independence, limited

the universal homage paid to the Imperial authority, protected youthful and feeble Emperors, and in the name of justice and of humanity rebuked the greatest sovereign of the age. It was Augustine, Bishop of the African Hippo, who organized Latin theology; wrought Christianity into the minds and hearts of men by his impassioned autobiography; and finally, under the name of the "City of God," established that new and undefined kingdom, at the head of which the Bishop of Rome was hereafter to place himself as Sovereign; that vast polity, which was to rise out of the ruins of ancient and pagan Rome; if not to succeed at once to the temporal supremacy, to superinduce a higher government, that of God himself. This divine government was sure eventually to fall to those who were already aspiring to be the earthly representatives of God. The Theocracy of Augustine, comprehending both worlds, Heaven as well as earth, was far more sublime, as more indefinite, than the spiritual monarchy of the later Popes. It established, it contemplated no such external or visible autocracy, but it prepared the way for it in the minds of men; the spiritual City of God became a secular monarchy ruling by spiritual means.

It may be well here to close the fourth century of Christianity, which ended in the uneventful pontificate *Anastasius I.* of Anastasius I. Four hundred years had now elapsed since the birth of the Redeemer. The gospel was the established religion of both parts of the Roman Empire; Greek and Latin Christianity divided the Roman world. Most of the barbarians, who had settled within the frontiers of the Empire, had submitted to her religion. With Christianity the hierarchical system had embraced the world.

BOOK II. — CONTEMPORARY CHRONOLOGY.

| POPES. | BISHOPS OF CONSTANTINOPLE. | PATRIARCHS OF ALEXANDRIA. | PATRIARCHS OF ANTIOCH. | BISHOPS OF JERUSALEM. | EMPERORS OF THE WEST. | EMPERORS OF THE EAST. |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--|---|
| A.D. 402. Innocent I. 417. | A.D. 397. Chrysostom 404. 404. Arsacius. 405. | A.D. 396. Theophilus. 412. | A.D. 381. Flavianus. 404. 404. Porphyryrus. 414. | A.D. 386. John. 416. | A.D. 395. Honorius. 423. | A.D. 385. Arcadius. 408. 408. Theodosius 450. II. |
| 417. Zosimus. 418. 418. Bonifacius. 422. 418. (Eulalius, 419. Antipope). 422. Cœlestinus 432. I. | 406. Atticus. 425. 426. Sisinnius. 427. 428. Nestorius, 431. (deposed.) 431. Maximianus. 434. 434. Proclus. 447. | A.D. 412. Cyril. 444. | 414. Alexander. 421. | 416. Praxylus. 428. | 424. Valentinian 455. III. | |
| 432. Sixtus III. 440. | 447. Flavianus, 449. (murdered.) | 444. Dioscorus, 451. (deposed.) | 442. Dominus II. 449. (deposed.) | 428. Juvenalis. 458. | 424. Valentinian 455. III. | |
| 440. Leo I. 461. | 449. Anatolius. 458. 458. Gennadius. 471. | 451. Proterius, 460. Timotheus Zelirus, ri- val bishops. 460. Salofacolus. 477. T. Zelirus. | 449. Maximus. 455. 456. Basilus. 458. 458. Acacius. 459. | 458. Anastasius. 478. | 455. Maximus. Avitus. Majorian. 461. 461. Severus. 464. | 450. Marcian. 457. 457. Leo I. 474. |

BOOK II.



CHAPTER I.

INNOCENT I.

THE fifth century of Christianity has begun, and now arises a line of Roman prelates, some of them from their personal character, as well as from the circumstances of the time, admirably qualified to advance the supremacy of the See of Rome, at least over Western Christendom.

Christianity, in its Latin form, which for centuries was to be its most powerful, enduring, prolific development, wanted, for her stability and unity of influence, a capital and a centre; and Rome might seem deserted by her emperors for the express purpose of allowing the spiritual monarchy to grow up without any dangerous collision against the civil government. The emperors had long withdrawn from Rome as the royal residence. Of those who bore the title, one ruled in Constantinople, and, more and more absorbed in the cares and calamities of the Eastern sovereignty, became gradually estranged from the affairs of the West. Nor was it till the time of Justinian that any attempt was made to revive his imperial pretensions to Rome. The Western Emperor lingered for a time in inglorious obscurity among the marshes of Ravenna,

Rome centre
of the West.

till at length the faint shadow of monarchy melted away, and a barbarian assumed the power and the appellation of Sovereign of Italy. Still, of the barbarian kings, not one ventured to fix himself in the ancient capital, or to inhabit the mouldering palaces of the older Cæsars. Nor could Ravenna, Milan, or Pavia, though the seats of monarchs, obscure the greatness of Rome in general reverence: they were still provincial cities; nor could they divert the tide of commerce, of concourse, of legal, if not of administrative business, which, however more irregular and intermitting, still flowed towards Rome. The internal government of the city retained something of the old republican form which had been permitted to subsist under the despotism of the emperors. Above the consuls or Senate, the shadows of former magistracies, the supreme authority was vested in a delegate, or representative of the Emperor, the prefect, or governor; but, with the empire, that authority became more and more powerless. The aristocracy, as we shall ere long see, were scattered abroad after the capture of the city by Alaric, and were never after reorganized into a powerful party. Some centuries elapsed before that feudal oligarchy grew up, which, at a later period, were such dangerous enemies to the Papacy, degrading it to the compulsory appointment of turbulent or immoral prelates, or by the personal insult, and even the murder, of popes. During the following period, therefore, the Bishop of Rome, respected by the barbarians, even by the fiercest pagans, none of whom were quite without awe of the high priesthood of the Roman religion, and, by that respect, commended still more strongly to the reverence of all Latin Christians; alone hallowed,

as it were, and permitted to maintain his serene dignity amid scenes of violence, confusion, and bloodshed; grew rapidly up to be the most important person in the city; if not in form the supreme magistrate, yet dominant in influence and admitted authority, the all-venerated Head of the Church; and where the civil power thus lay prostrate, assuming, without awakening jealousy and for the public advantage, many of its functions, and maintaining some show of order and of rule.

It was not solely as a Christian bishop, and bishop of that city, which was still, according to the prevailing feeling, the capital of the world, but as the successor of St. Peter, of him who was now acknowledged to be the head of the apostolic body, that the Roman pontiff commanded the veneration of Rome and of Christendom. The primacy of St. Peter, and the primacy of Rome, had been long reacting upon each other in the minds of men, and took root in the general sentiment. The Church of Rome would own no founder less than the chief Apostle; and the distance between St. Peter and the rest of the Apostles, even St. Paul himself, was increased by his being acknowledged as the spiritual ancestor of the Bishop of Rome. At the commencement of the fifth century, the lineal descent of the Pope from St. Peter was an accredited tenet of Christianity. As yet his pretensions to supremacy were vague and unformed; but when authority is in the ascendant, it is the stronger for being indefinite. It is almost a certain sign that it is becoming precarious, or has been called in question, when it condescends to appeal to precedent, written statute, or regular jurisdiction.

Everything tended to confirm, nothing to impede or weaken the gradual condensation of the supreme ecclesiastical power in the Supreme Bishop. The majesty of the notion of one all-powerful ruler, to which the world had been so long familiarized in the emperors; the discord and emulation among the other prelates, both of the East and West, and the manifest advantage of a supreme arbiter; the Unity of the visible Church, which was becoming, — or had, indeed, become — the dominant ^{Unity of the Church.} idea of Christendom; all seemed to demand, or at least, had a strong tendency to promote and to maintain the necessity of one Supreme Head. As the unity in Christ was too sublimely spiritual, so the supremacy of the collective episcopate, which endowed each bishop with an equal portion of apostolic dignity and of power, was a notion too speculative and metaphysical for the common mind. Councils were only occasional diets, or general conventions, not a standing representative Senate of Christendom. There was a simplicity and distinctness in the conception of one visible Head to one visible body, such as forcibly arrests and fully satisfies the less inquiring mind, which still seeks something firm and stable whereon to repose its faith. Cyprian, in whom the unity of the Church had taken its severest form, though practically he refused to submit the independence of the African churches to the dictation of Rome, did far more to advance her power by the primacy which he assigned to St. Peter, than he impaired it by his steady and disdainful repudiation of her authority, whenever it was brought to the test of submission.¹

¹ Qui cathedram Petri, super quem fundata est Ecclesia, deserit, in ec-

In the West, throughout Latin Christendom, the Roman See, in antiquity, in dignity, in the more regular succession of its prelates, stood alone and unapproachable. In the great Eastern bishoprics the holy lineage had been already broken and confused by the claims of rival prelates, by the usurpation of bishops, accounted heretical, at the present period Arians or Macedonians or Apollinarians, later Nestorians or Monophysites. Jerusalem had never advanced that claim to which it might seem entitled by its higher antiquity. Jerusalem was not universally acknowledged as an Apostolic See; at all events it was the capital of Judaism rather than of Christianity; and the succession, at the time of the Jewish war, and during the period of desolation to the time of Hadrian, had been interrupted at least in its local descent. At one period Jerusalem was subordinate to the Palestinian Cæsarea. Antioch had been perpetually contested; its episcopal line had been vitiated, its throne contaminated by the actual succession of several Arian prelates.¹ In Alexandria the Arian prelates had been considered lawless usurpers: the orthodox Church had never voluntarily submitted to their jurisdiction; and Alexandria had been hallowed as the episcopal seat of the great Athanasius. But Athanasius himself, when driven from his see, had

clesiâ se esse confidit? This was a plain and intelligible doctrine. *Episcopatus unus est, cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur*—was a conception far more vague and abstract, and therefore far less popular. *De Unit. Eccl.* See for the dispute with Stephen, Bishop of Rome, ch. i.

¹ The obvious difficulty of the Primacy of Antioch as the first See of St. Peter, which, it might seem, had been, if not objected, at least suggested, was thus met by Innocent I. *Quæ urbis Romæ sedi non cederet, nisi quod ipsa in transitu meruit, ista susceptum apud se, consummatumque gaudet.*—Innocent. Epis. xix. ad Alexand.

found a hospitable reception at Rome, and constant support from the Roman Bishops. His presence had reflected a glory upon that see, which, but for one brief period of compulsory apostacy, had remained rigidly attached to the orthodox Trinitarian opinions. Constantinople was but a new city, and had no pretensions to venerable or apostolic origin. It had attained, indeed, to the dignity of a patriarchate, but only by the decree of a recent council; in other respects it owed all its eminence to being the prelate of new Rome, of the seat of empire. The feuds and contests between the rival patriarchates of the East were constantly promoting the steady progress of Rome towards supremacy. Throughout the fierce rivalry between Alexandria and Constantinople, the hostilities which had even now begun between Theophilus and Chrysostom, and which were continued with implacable violence between Cyril and Nestorius, Flavianus and Dioscorus, the alliance of the Bishop of Rome was too important not to be purchased at any sacrifice; and if the independence of the Eastern churches was compromised, if not by an appeal to Rome, at least by the ready admission of her interference, the leaders of the opposing parties were too much occupied by their immediate objects, and blinded by factious passions, to discern or to regard the consequences of these silent aggressions. From the personal or political objects of these feuds the Bishop of Rome might stand aloof; in the religious questions he might mingle in undisturbed dignity, or might offer himself as mediator, just as he might choose the occasion, and almost on his own terms. At the same time, not merely on the great subject

of the Trinity, had Rome repudiated the more obnoxious heresy, even on less vital questions, the Latin capital happy in the exemption from controversial bishops had rarely swerved from the canon of severe orthodoxy; and if any one of her bishops had been forced or perplexed into a rash or erroneous decision, as Liberius, during his short concession to semi-Arianism; or, as we shall see before long, Zosimus to Pelagianism; and a still later pope, who was bewildered into Monophytism; their errors were effaced by a speedy, full, and glorious recantation.

Thus the East, agitated by furious conflicts concerning the highest doctrines of Christianity, concerning the preëminence of the rival sees for dominant influence with the Emperor, was still throwing itself, as each faction was oppressed by its rival, at the feet of remote and more impartial Rome. In the West, at the same time, the disputes which were constantly arising about points of discipline, the succession of bishops, the boundaries of conflicting jurisdictions, still demanded and were glad to have recourse to a foreign arbitrator; and who so fitting an arbiter as the Bishop of that city, which, in theory at least, was still the centre of civil government, the seat of Cæsar's tribunal, to whom the Roman world had acquired a settled and inveterate habit of appeal? Rome the mother of civil, might likewise give birth to canonical jurisprudence.¹

For the great talisman of the Papal influence was

¹ Until the Roman Curia became inordinate in its exactions, and so utterly venal as it is universally represented in later centuries, this arbitration, when so much was yet unsettled, while the new society was yet in the process of formation, must have tended to peace and so to the strength of Christianity.

the yet majestic name of Rome. The bishops gave laws to the city, which had so long given, and still to so great an extent, gave laws to the world. In the sentiment of mankind, at least in the West, Rome had never been dethroned from her supremacy. There were still Roman armies, Roman laws, Roman municipalities, Roman literature, in name at least a Roman Empire.¹ Constantinople boasted rather than disdained the appellation of New Rome. But while the Bishops of Rome retained much of the awe and reverence which adhered to the name, they stood aloof from all which desecrated and degraded it. It was the idolatrous and pagan Rome which fell before the barbarians, or rather was visited for its vices and crimes, its persecutions, and its still obstinate infidelity, by those terrible instruments of the divine vengeance. As our history will show, the discomfiture of the heathen Rhadagaisus, and the tutelary, though partial, protection which Christianity spread over the city during the capture by Alaric (to which Augustine triumphantly appealed), were not obliterated by the unawed and remorseless devastation of Genseric. The retreat of Attila, the most terrible of all the Northern conquerers, before the imposing sanctity, as it was universally believed, of Pope Leo, blended again in indissoluble alliance the sacred security of Rome with the authority of her bishop.

¹ See in Ausonius the curious ordo of the cities of the Empire.—1. Prima urbes inter, divûm domus, aurea Roma.—2. Constantinople, before whom bows 3. Carthage—4. Antioch—5. Alexandria—6. Treves—7. Milan—8. Capua—9. Aquileia—10. Arles—11. Merida—12. Athens—13. 14. Catania, Syracuse—15. Toulouse—16. Narbonne—17. Bordeaux. The poet is a Gaul, a native of Bordeaux. Ravenna seems to have fallen into obscurity. Ausonii. Poem.

Leo himself, as will be hereafter seen, exalts St. Peter and St. Paul into the Romulus and Remus of the new universal Roman dominion.

It was at this period (the commencement of the fifth century), when the Imperial power was declining towards extinction in the hands of the feeble Honorius, and the Roman arms were for the last time triumphant, under Stilicho, over the Northern barbarians, that a prelate was placed on the episcopal throne of Rome, of a bolder and more imperious nature, of unimpeachable holiness, who held the pontifical power for a longer period than usual in the rapid succession of the bishops of Rome. Ambrose was now dead, and there was no Western prelate, at least in Europe, whose fame and abilities could obscure that preëminence, which rank and position, and in his case, commanding character, bestowed on the Bishop of Rome. Innocent, like most of the greater Popes, was by birth, if not a Roman, of the Roman territory. He was born at Albano.¹ The patriotism of a Roman might mingle with his holier aspirations for the spiritual greatness of the ancient mistress of the world. Upon the mind of Innocent appears first distinctly to have dawned the vast conception of Rome's universal ecclesiastical supremacy, dim as yet and shadowy, yet full and comprehensive in its outline.

Up to the accession of Innocent, the steps by which the See of Rome, during the preceding century, had advanced towards the legal recognition of a suprem-

¹ There is an expression in one of St. Jerome's letters, which, taken literally, asserts Innocent to have been the son of his predecessor Anastasius. Qui apostolicæ cathedræ et supradicti viri successor et *filius* est. Is it to be presumed that this is an incautious metaphor of St. Jerome?

acy, were few but not unimportant; the first had been made by the Council of Sardica, the renown of whose resolute orthodoxy gave it peculiar weight in all parts of Christendom, where the Athanasian Trinitarianism maintained its ascendancy. It is not difficult to trace the motives which influenced the Bishops at Sardica. Great principles are often established by measures which grow out of temporary interests. The Western orthodox Bishops at Sardica hardly escaped being out-numbered by their heretical adversaries; there were ninety-four on one side, seventy-six on the other. Had not the turbulent, but irresolute, minority withdrawn to Philippopolis, and there set up a rival synod, the issue might have been almost doubtful; at all events, where parties were so evenly balanced, intrigue, accident, activity on one part, supineness on the other, or the favor of the Emperor, might summon an assembly, in which the preponderance would be in favor of Arianism (it was so a few years after at Rimini); and thus might heresy gain the sanction of a Council of Christendom. But Rome had, up to this time, before the fall of Liberius, so firmly, so repeatedly, so solemnly, embraced the cause of Athanasius, that it might seem to be irrevocably committed to orthodoxy; an appeal to Rome, therefore, would always give an opportunity to an orthodox minority, to annul or to suspend the decrees of an heretical Church. In all causes, therefore, of bishops (and not merely were the bishops in general the chief members of Councils, but the first proceeding of all the Councils, at this period, was to depose the prelates of the opposite party) an appeal to Rome would both secure a second hearing, by more favorable

judges, of the subject under controversy, and might maintain, notwithstanding adverse decrees, all the orthodox bishops upon their thrones. The Council of Sardica, therefore, in its canons, established the law, that on an appeal to the Bishop of Rome, he might decide whether the judgment was to be reconsidered, and appoint judges for the second hearing of the cause; he might even, if he thought fit, take the initiative; and delegate an ecclesiastic "from his side," to institute a commission of inquiry.¹

The right of appeal to Rome, thus established by ecclesiastical, was confirmed by Imperial authority during the reign of Valentinian III. Up to that time the Emperors, if they did not possess by the constitution of the Church, exercised nevertheless by virtue of their supreme and indefeasible authority, and by the irresistible, and, as yet rarely contested, tenure of power, the right of summary decision in religious as in civil causes. A feeble emperor would willingly devolve on a more legitimate court these troublesome and perplexing affairs. To a monarch, another spiritual Monarch would appear at once the most natural and the most efficient delegate to relieve him from these burdens; he would feel no jealousy of such useful and unconflicting autocracy; and the Western Emperor would of course invest in this part of the Imperial prerogative the Bishop of the Imperial City.

Now too the temporal power, the Empire, was sinking rapidly into the decrepitude of age, the Papacy

¹ Et si judicaverit renovandum esse judicium, renovetur, et det iudices; si autem probaverit, talem causam esse, ut non refricetur, ea quæ acta sunt, quæ decreverant, confirmata erant. Can. 3. — Can. 5 permits him to send this presbyterum a latere. Mansi, sub ann.

rising in the first vigor of its youthful ambition. Honorius was cowering in the palace of Ravenna, from the perils which were convulsing the empire on all sides, while the provinces were withdrawing their doubtful allegiance, or in danger of being dis severed from the Roman dominion. Innocent was on the episcopal throne of Rome, asserting his almost despotic spiritual control over those very provinces.

Innocent, in his assertion of supremacy, might seem to disdain the authority of Council or Emperor. He declares, in one of his earliest epistles, that all the churches of the West, not of Italy alone, but of Gaul, Spain, and Africa, having been planted by St. Peter and his successors, owe filial obedience to the parent See, are bound to follow her example in all points of discipline, and to maintain a rigid uniformity with all her usages.¹ To the minutest point Rome will again be the legislator of the world; and it is singular to behold a representative, as it were, of each of these provinces bringing the first fruits of that deference, which was construed into unlimited allegiance, to the feet of the majestic Pontiff. The Bishop of Rouen requests from the Bishop of Rome, the rules of ecclesiastical discipline observed within his See.²

¹ Cum sit manifestum in omnem Italiam, Gallias, Hispanias, Africam atque Siciliam insulasque intervenientes nullum instituisse ecclesias nisi eos quos venerabilis Apostolus Petrus ejusque successores constituerint sacerdotes. Epist. ad Decent. Episcop. Eugubin.

Jaffe dates this Epist. 416. March 19. Labbe, ii. p. 1249.

² In the third rule, which gives the provincial synods of bishops supreme authority in their own province, the words "sine prejudicio tamen Romanæ ecclesiæ, cui in omnibus causis debet reverentia custodiri," are rejected as a late interpolation. Epist. ad Victricium. Labbe, ii. p. 1249.

Dilectio tua institutum secuta prudentium, ad sedem apostolicam referre maluit, quid de rebus dubiis custodiri deberet, potius quam usurpatione

Innocent approves the zeal of the Gaulish Bishop for uniformity, so contrary to the lawless spirit of innovation, which prevailed in some parts of the Christian world; and sends him a book containing certain regulations of peculiar severity, especially as to the
 404. Feb. 15. celibacy of the clergy. Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, is commended in a still more lofty and protecting tone of condescension for his wise recourse to the See of Rome, rather than the usurpation of undue authority. To the Spanish Synod of Toledo, the Bishop of Rome speaks something in the character of an appellant judge. The province of Illyricum, including Macedonia and Greece, on the original division,
 405. Feb. ion, had been adjudged to the Western Empire. The Bishop of Rome exercised a certain jurisdiction, granted or recognized by the Council of Sardica, as the Metropolitan of the West. Damasus had appointed the Bishop of Thessalonica, as a kind of legate or representative of his authority. Innocent, in his epistle to the Bishops of Macedonia, expresses a haughty astonishment that his decisions are not admitted without examination, and gravely insinuates that some wrong may be intended to the dignity of the Apostolical See.¹ More doubtful was the allegiance
 A.D. 414. of Africa. At the commencement of Innocent's pontificate, his influence with the Emperor was

præsumptâ, quæ sibi viderentur, de singulis obtinere. Ad Exup. Episc. Tol. Labbe, ii. p. 1254.

¹ In quibus (epistolis) multa posita pervidi quæ stuporem mentibus nostris inducerent, facerentque nos non modicum dubitare utrum aliter putaremus an ita esse posita, quemadmodum personabant. Quæ cum sæpius repeti fecissem, adverti, sedi apostolicæ ad quam relatio, quasi ad caput ecclesiarum missa esse debebat, aliquam fieri injuriam, cujus adhuc in ambiguum sententia duceretur. Epist. xxii. ad Episc. Macedon. Labbe, ii. 1272.

solicited for the suppression of the obstinate Donatists. Towards the close of his life, a correspondence took place concerning Pelagius and his doctrines. The African Churches, even Augustine himself, did not disguise their apprehension, that Innocent might be betrayed into an approbation of those tenets; they desired to strengthen their own stern and peremptory decrees with the concurrence of the Bishop of Rome. The language of Innocent was in A. D. 417. his wonted imperious style; the African Churches seem to have treated his pretensions to superiority with silent disregard.

In the East, Constantinople, Alexandria, and even Antioch, were driven by their own bitter feuds and hostilities, to court the alliance of Innocent and Chrysostom. Rome; it could hardly be without some com- A. D. 404. promise of independence.

In espousing the cause of Chrysostom against his rival Theophilus of Alexandria, Innocent took that side which was supported by the better and wiser, as well as by the popular voice of Christendom. He was the fearless advocate of persecuted holiness, of eloquence, of ecclesiastical dignity, against the aggressions of a violent foreign prelate, who was interfering in an independent diocese, and against the intrigues of a court notoriously governed by female influence. The slight asperities of Chrysostom's character, the monastic austerities which seemed to some ill suited to the magnificence of so great a prelate, the aggressions on the privileges of some churches not strictly under his jurisdiction, but which were notoriously ventured for the promotion of Christian holiness by the suppression of simony and other worse vices; these less obvious

causes of Chrysostom's unpopularity hardly transpired beyond the limits of his diocese, were lost in the dazzling splendor of his talents and his virtues, or forgotten among his cruel wrongs.¹ Chrysostom appeared before the more distant Christian world as the greatest orator who had ever ascended the pulpit of the church. His name, the Golden Mouth, expressed the universal admiration of his powers.

After having held Antioch under the spell of his oratory for many years, he had been called to the episcopal throne of the Eastern Metropolis by general acclamation. Now, notwithstanding the fond attachment of the greater part of Constantinople, and the manifest interposition, as it was supposed, of heaven, which on his banishment had shaken the guilty city with an earthquake and compelled his triumphant recall, he was again driven from his see, degraded by the precipitate decree of an illegal and partial council, and exposed to the most merciless persecution. The one crime, which could have blinded into hatred the love and admiration of the Christian world, heterodoxy of opinion, was not charged against him by his most malicious enemies. His only ostensible delinquency was the uncompromising rebuke of vice in high places, and disrespect to the Imperial Majesty, which, even if true to the utmost, however it might astonish the timidity, or shock the servility of the East, in the West, to which the dominion of Arcadius and Eudoxia did not extend, would be deemed only a bold and salutary assertion of episcopal dignity and Christian courage. The letter addressed by Chrysostom, according to the

¹ Compare Hist. of Christianity, b. iii. c. ix

copies in the Greek writers, to the three great prelates of the West, the Bishops of Rome, Milan, and Aquileia, in the Roman copies to Innocent alone,¹ was written with all his glowing fervor and brilliant perspicuity. After describing the scenes of outrage and confusion in the church at Easter, the violation of the sanctuary, and the insults inflicted on the sacred persons of priests and dedicated virgins and bishops, the Bishop of Constantinople entreats the friendly interposition of the Western prelates to obtain a general and legitimate Council empowered to examine the whole affair. The answer of Innocent is calm, moderate, dignified, perhaps artful. He expresses his awful horror at these impious scenes of violence, deep interest in the fate of Chrysostom; he does not however prejudge the question, he does not even refuse to communicate with Theophilus, till after the solemn decree of a council. Yet the sympathies of Innocent, as of all the better part of Christendom, were with the eloquent, oppressed, and patient exile. The sentiments as well as the influence of the Roman prelate were ere long proclaimed to the world, by an Imperial letter in favor

¹ There is great variation in different parts of the Roman copy: it is sometimes addressed to persons in the plural number, sometimes to an individual in the singular. This appears to me no very important argument, though adduced by the most candid Protestant writers, *e. g.* Shroeck. This cry of distress would not be carefully or suspiciously worded, so as to provide against any incautious admission of superiority, of which Chrysostom, under such circumstances, thought little, even if any such claims had been already made. But the strongest proof (if I must enter into the controversy) that Chrysostom and his followers addressed themselves to the bishops of Italy, as well as to that of Rome, seems to me the very passage in the Epistle of the Emperor Honorius, which is adduced, even by Pagi, to prove the contrary. *Missi ad sacerdotes urbis æternæ atque Italiæ utraque ex parte legati; expectabatur ex omnium auctoritate sententia Namque hi, quorum expectabatur auctoritas.*

of Chrysostom, which no persuasion but that of Innocent could have obtained from the Emperor of the West. Honorius openly espoused the cause of the A. D. 406. exile : and though, throughout the whole of the transaction, the East, with something of the irritable consciousness of wrong and injustice, resented the interference of the West, and treated the messengers of the Italian prelates with studied neglect and contumely, the defenders of Chrysostom were so clearly on the side of justice, humanity, generous compassion for the oppressed, as well as of ecclesiastical order, that the Bishop of Rome, the Head at least of the Italian prelates, could not but rise in the general estimation of Christendom. The fidelity of Innocent to the cause of Chrysostom did not cease with the death of the persecuted prelate : he refused to communicate with Atticus, his successor, or the usurper, according to the conflicting parties, of the See of Constantinople, unless Atticus would acknowledge Chrysostom to have been the rightful bishop until his death.¹ Common reverence for Chrysostom, and common hostility to Atticus, brought Innocent into close alliance with

¹ There is a regular act of excommunication, in some of the Latin writers — (it was brought to light by Baronius) — in which Innocent boldly excludes the Emperor Arcadius from the communion of the faithful. It is expressed with all the proud humility, the unctuous imperiousness of a later period. It is given up, by all the more sensible writers of the Roman Catholic church, principally on account of a fatal blunder. It includes the Dalila, the Empress Eudoxia, under the anathema. Eudoxia had been dead several years. (See Pagi, sub ann. 407.) I am in constant perplexity ; fearing, on one hand, to omit all notice of, on the other feeling something like contempt for, these forgeries, which are always so injurious to the cause they wish to serve. As an impartial historical inquirer, I continually rise from them with my suspicion, even of better attested documents, so much sharpened, that I have to struggle vigorously against a general scepticism.

Alexander, Bishop of Antioch. During his correspondence with Alexander, Innocent is dis- A. D. 416.
 posed to attribute a subordinate primacy to Antioch, as the temporary See of St. Peter. Rome now chose to rest her title to supremacy on the succession from the great Apostle. Peter could hardly have passed through any see, without leaving behind him some inheritance of peculiar dignity; while Rome, as the scene of his permanent residence and martyrdom, claimed the undoubted succession to almost monarchical supremacy.

That which might have appeared the most fatal blow to Roman greatness, as dissolving the spell of Roman empire, the capture, the con- Siege and Capture of Rome by Alaric.
 flagration, the plunder, the depopulation of Rome by the barbarian Goths, tended directly to establish and strengthen the spiritual supremacy of Rome. It was pagan Rome, the Babylon of sensuality, pride, and idolatry which fell before the triumphant Alaric; the Goths were the instruments of divine vengeance against paganism, which lingered in this its last stronghold. Christianity hastened to disclaim all interest, all sympathy in the fate of the "harlot that sat on the seven hills." Paganism might seem rashly to accept this desperate issue, girding itself for one final effort, and proclaiming, that as Rome had brought ruin on her own head by abandoning her gods, so her gods had forever abandoned the unfaithful capital. The eternal city was manifestly approaching one of the epochs in her eternity. Three times during the first ten years of the fifth century and of the pontificate of Innocent, the first time under Alaric, the second under Rhadagaisus, the third again under

Alaric, the barbarians crossed the Alps with overwhelming forces. Twice the valor and military abilities of one man, Stilicho, diverted the storm from the walls of Rome. In his first expedition 400 to 403. Battle of Pollentia. Alaric, after his defeat at Pollentia,¹ endeavored to throw himself upon the capital. He was recalled by the skilful movements of Stilicho, to suffer a final discomfiture under the walls of Verona. The poet commemorates the victories of Stilicho, the triumph of Honorius in Rome for these victories. In the splendid verses on the ovation of Honorius, it is no wonder that Pope Innocent finds no place. Claudian maintains his invariable and total silence as to the existence of Christianity. From his royal mansion on the Palatine Honorius looks down on no more glorious sight than the temples of his ancestors, which crowd the Forum in their yet inviolable majesty; the eye is dazzled and confounded with the blaze of their bronzed columns and their roofs of gold; and with their statues which studded the skies: they are the household gods of the emperor. That the emperor worshipped other gods, or was ruled by other priests, appears from no one word.² The Jove of the Capitol might seem still the tutelar god of Rome. Claudian had wound up his poem on the Gothic war, in which he equals the

¹ Gibbon, c. xxx.

² "Tot circum delubra videt, tantisque Deorum
Cingitur excubiis. Juvat infra tecta Tonantis
Cernere Tarpelâ pendentes rupe Gigantas,
Cælatasque fores, mediisque volantia signa
Nubibus, et densum stipantibus æthera templis
Acies stupet igne metalli.

Et circumfuso trepidans obtunditur auro.

Agnoscisne tuos, Princeps venerande, Penates?"

de VI. Cons. Hon. 43, 53.

Compare on Claudian note in Hist. of Christianity.

victory of Pollentia with that of Marius over the Cimbrians; he ends with that solemn admonition, "Let the frantic barbarians learn hence respect for Rome."

But three years after, the terrible Rhadagaisus, at the head of an enormous force of mingled barbarians, swept over the whole North of Italy, and encamped before the walls of Florence. Rhadagaisus was a pagan; he sacrificed daily to some deity, whom the Latin writers call by the name of Jove. The party at Rome, attached to their ancient worship, are accused of having contemplated with more than secret joy the approach of, it might seem, the irresistible barbarian. They did this, notwithstanding his terrible threats that he would sacrifice the senate of Rome on the altars of the gods which delight in human blood. The common enmity to Christianity, according to St. Augustine, quenched the love of their country, their proud attachment to Rome. But God himself, by the unexpected discomfiture of Rhadagaisus, A. D. 405. crushed their guilty hopes, and rescued Rome from the public restoration of paganism.

The consummate generalship of Stilicho,¹ by which he gradually enclosed the vast forces of Rhadagaisus among the mountains in the neighborhood of Florence, himself on the ridge of Fæsulæ, till they died off by famine and disease, was utterly incomprehensible to his age. Christianity took to itself the whole glory of Stilicho, the relief of Florence, the dispersion and reduction to captivity of the barbaric forces, and the death of Rhadagaisus, who was ordered to summary execution. A vision of St. Ambrose had predicted

¹ Gibbon, *loc. cit.*, will furnish the authorities.

the relief of Florence, and nothing less than the immediate succor of God, or of his Apostles, could account for the unexpected victory: and this strong religious feeling no doubt mingled with the common infatuation which seized all parties. Rome, it was thought, with a feeble emperor at a distance, with few troops, and those mostly barbarians, was safe in the majesty of her name and the prescriptive awe of mankind. Christ, or her tutelar Apostles, who had revealed the discomfiture of Rhadagaisus, had protected, and would to the end protect, Christian Rome against all pagan invaders, baffle the treasonable sympathy, and disperse the sacrilegious prayers, of those who, true to the ancient religion, were false to the real greatness of Rome. So often as heathen forces should menace the temples, not of the Capitoline Jove, or those yet uncleansed from the pollutions of their idolatries, but those, if less splendid, more holy fanes protected by the relics of Apostles and Martyrs, Rome would witness, as she had already witnessed, the triumph of her Christian emperor, the consecration of the spoils of the defeated barbarians on the altars of St. Paul, St. Peter, and of Christ.¹

The sacrifice of Stilicho² to the dark intrigues of the court of Ravenna was the last fatal sign of this pride and security. Both Christian and pagan writers combine to load the memory of Stilicho with charges manifestly intended to exculpate the court of Honorius from the guilt and folly of his

¹ Paulinus in vit. Ambrosii, c. 50. Augustin. de Civ. Dei, v. 23. Orosius, vii. 37.

² Stilicho was married to Serena, the sister of Honorius. Honorius had married in succession Maria and Thermantia, the daughters of Stilicho.

disgrace, and his surrender by a Christian bishop after he had sought, himself a Christian, sanctuary at the altar of the church of Ravenna, and his perfidious execution. The Christians accuse him of a design to depose the emperor, who was both his brother-in-law and his son-in-law, and to elevate his own heir Eucherius to the Imperial throne. Eucherius, it is asserted, but with no proof, and with all probability against it, was a pagan; the public restoration of paganism, as the religion of the Empire, was to be the first act of the new dynasty.¹ The ungrateful pagans seem to have been ignorant of this magnificent scheme in their favor; they too brand Stilicho with the name of traitor, and ascribe to his perfidious dealings with Alaric the final ruin of Rome.² They hated him as the enemy, the despoiler of their religion; as having robbed the temples of their treasures, burned the Sibylline books, stripped from the doors of the Capitol the plates of gold. Stilicho knew the weakness as well as the strength of Rome; that may have been but wise and necessary policy, in order, by timely concession and tribute under the honorable name of boon or largess, to keep the formidable barbarian beyond the frontiers of Italy, which may have seemed treasonable degradation to the haughty court, blind to its own impotence.

¹ Orosius, vii. 38.

² So Rutilius Numatianus, who hated Christianity —

“Quo magis est facinus diri Stilichonis iniquum,
 Proditor arcani qui fuit imperii.
 Romano generi dum nititur esse superstes,
 Crudelis summis miscuit ima furor.
 Dumque timet, quicquid se fecerat ante timeri,
 Immisit Latæ barbara tela neci.”

Rutil. Itin. li. 41.

³ Compare Gibbon, c. xxx.

The death of Stilicho was the signal for the reap-
Alaric's
second
invasion. appearance of Alaric again in arms in the
 centre of Italy. His pretext for this second
 invasion was the violation of the treaties entered into
 by Stilicho. At all events, the unanswerable testi-
 mony to the abilities of Stilicho, if not to his fidelity,
 is that which seemed to be the immediate, inevitable
 consequence of his disgrace and execution. No sooner
 was Stilicho dead, than Rome lay open to the barba-
 rian conqueror. Unopposed, almost without a skir-
 mish, laughing to scorn the slow and inefficient prepa-
 rations of the emperor and of Olympius who ruled the
 emperor, and who had misguided him to the ruin of
 Stilicho, Alaric advanced from the Alps to the walls
 of Rome. The first act of defence adopted by the
 senate of Rome was the judicial murder of Serena, the
 widow of Stilicho. She was accused of a design to be-
 tray the city to the Goth. Both parties seem to have
 consented to this deed. The heathens remembered
 that when Theodosius the Great had struck the deadly
 blow against the rites and the temples of paganism, by
 prohibiting all public expenditure on heathen ceremo-
A.D. 408. nies, Serena had stripped a costly necklace
 from the statue of Rhea, the most ancient and venera-
 ble of Rome's goddesses, and herself ostentatiously
 wore the precious spoil; that neck was now given up
 to strangulation, a righteous and appropriate punish-
 ment for her impiety. The historian seems to inti-
 mate ¹ that the Romans were surprised that the death
 of Serena produced no effect on the remorseless Goth.
Siege of Rome.
A.D. 408. The siege of Rome was formed; the vast
 population, accustomed to live, the wealthy

¹ Zosimus — Sozomen, ix. 6.

in luxury perhaps to no great extent moderated by Christianity, the poor by gratuitous distributions at the expense of the public or of the rich, to which Christian charity had now come in aid,¹ were suddenly reduced to the worst extremities of famine. The public distributions were diminished to one half, to one third. The heaps of dead bodies, which there wanted space to bury, produced a pestilence. In vain the Senate endeavored to negotiate an honorable capitulation. Alaric scorned alike their money, their despair, their pride. When they spoke of their immense population, he burst out into laughter, — “The thicker the hay, the easier it is mown.” On his demand of an exorbitant ransom, the Senate humbly inquired, “What, then, do you leave us?” “Your lives!” replied the insulting Goth.

During this first siege Innocent was in Rome. The strange story of the desperate proposition to deliver the city by the magical arts of certain Etruscan diviners, who had power, it was supposed, to call down and direct the lightnings of heaven, appears, in different forms, in the pagan and Christian historians.² Innocent himself is said, by the heathen Zosimus, to have assented to the idolatrous ceremony. If this be true, it is possible that the mind of the Christian Prelate may have been so entirely unhinged by the terrors of the siege and the dreadful sufferings of the people, that he may have yielded to any hope, however wild, of averting the ruin. It is possible,

¹ Læta, the wife of Gratian, and her mother, were distinguished by their abundant charities, which at least mitigated the sufferings of multitudes.

² Compare Hist. of Christianity, iii. 181. Zosimus, v. 41. Sozomen, lx. 6.

though less probable, that he may have known or supposed the Etruscans to be possessed of some skilful, and in no way supernatural, means of producing apparent wonders,¹ which might awe the ignorant barbarians, and of which the use might be justified by the dreadful crisis; and if these arts were thought supernatural, it was not for him to expose, at least for the present, the useful delusion. At all events, to judge the conduct of Innocent, we must throw ourselves completely back into the terror and affliction, the confusion and prostration of that disastrous time. The whole history is obscure and contradictory. The Christian writer asserts that the ceremony did take place, but that the Christians (he does not name Innocent) stood aloof from the profane and ineffectual rite. The heathen aver, that the Senate, after grave deliberation, refused to sanction its public performance, and that, in fact, it did not take place. The barbarian, at *Capitulation*. length, condescended to accept a ransom, in some proportion to the wealth of the city — 5000 pounds of gold, 30,000 of silver, four thousand silken robes, 3000 pieces of scarlet cloth, 3000 pounds of pepper. To make up the deficiency of the precious metals, the heathen temples, to the horror of that party, were despoiled; the time-honored statues of gods were melted to make up the amount demanded by the barbarian. The last fatal sign and omen of the departure of Roman greatness was, that the statue of Fortitude, or Virtue, was thrown into the common mass.²

¹ See Eusebe Salverte, on the knowledge possessed by the ancients in conducting lightning. — *Sciences Occultes*.

² Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐχώνευσάν τινα τῶν ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου πεπονημένων, ὧν

Alaric retired from Rome, his army increased by multitudes of slaves from the city and the neighborhood, who, it is said, to the number of 40,000, had found refuge in his camp. The infatuated pride, the insincerity, the treachery of the court of Ravenna, rendered impracticable all negotiations for peace. The minister Olympius, the chief agent in the assassination of Stilicho, has found favor, of which he seems to have been utterly unworthy, from Christian writers, on account of some letters addressed to him by St. Augustine. Even his fall produced no great change. Honorius, indeed, seems to have occupied his time at this crisis in framing edicts against Jews and heretics, and other decrees, as if for a peaceful and extensive empire. Under Olympius, he had promulgated the Imperial rescript, which deprived the heathen temples of their last revenue; it was confiscated for the use of the devout soldiers. The statues of the gods were ordered to be thrown down; the temples in the cities were seized for public uses, others were to be destroyed; the banquets (*epulæ*) prohibited.¹ But he was compelled to repeal a law which deprived him of the services of all heathens. Generides, a valiant and able pagan, was permitted to resume the military belt, and to take the command of part of the Imperial forces. A second time Alaric appeared before Rome. He seized upon the port of Ostia, and this cut off at once almost

ἦν καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀνδρίας, ἣν καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι Οὐιρτούτεμ' οὐπερ διαφθαρέντος, ὅσα τῆς ἀνδρίας ἦν καὶ ἀρετῆς παρὰ Ῥωμαίους ἀπέσβη. . . . Zosimus, v. 41.

¹ This law is dated the 17th of the calends of December, 408. *Templo- rum detrahantur annonæ et rem annonariam jubent, expensis devotissimorum militum profuturæ, &c.* Compare Beugnot, ii. p. 49, *et seqq.* Cod Theodos. xvi. 10, 19.

all the supplies of the city.¹ Rome opened her gates, and Alaric set up a pageant emperor, Attalus, as a rival to the emperor in Ravenna. The Christians beheld the elevation of Attalus, a pagan, who submitted to Arian baptism, but openly attempted to restore the party of paganism, with undisguised aversion. Lampadius, the Senator, at the head of this party, was Prætorian Præfect, Tertullus Consul. Tertullus boldly declared that to the Consulate he should add the High Priesthood.² The Pagan historian describes the universal joy of Rome at the elevation of such just and noble magistrates. The Christians³ looked eagerly to the court of Ravenna. Alaric was encamped between the Christian and pagan cities, between Ravenna and Rome. The feeble government of Attalus had to encounter an enemy even more formidable than the Christians. The Count Heraclian closed the ports of Africa: a famine even more terrible than during the former siege, and even that had reduced men to the most loathsome and abominable food, afflicted the enfeebled and diminished population. A strange and revolting anecdote illustrates at once Roman manners and this dire calamity. The Romans, though they had no bread, had still their Circensian games. In the midst of the excitement, the ears of the Emperor were assailed with a wild cry — Fix the tariff for human flesh.⁴ All these calamities the Christians ascribed to the restoration of heathen rites.

¹ As usual, the dealers in grain were accused of hoarding their stores, in order to possess themselves of all the remaining wealth of the city.

² Sozom. ix. 9.

³ Oros. vii. 42.

⁴ Zosimus inserts the words in Latin — *Pone pretium carni humanæ*. The price of bread, as of all other articles, was fixed by the government. Zosimus, vi. 11.

Attalus, at the word of his Gothic master, descended from his throne, and sank back to his former insignificance. But Rome, when Alaric appeared a third time under its walls, prepared to close her gates, and to act on the defensive (the Emperor Honorius had received the scanty succor of six cohorts from the East, and Rome was in frantic hope of rescue from Ravenna). Weakness or treachery baffled this desperate, if courageous, determination. At the dead of night, the Salarian gate was opened; the morning beheld Rome in the possession of the conqueror; but the conqueror, though a barbarian and a heretic, was a Christian. Over the fall of Rome, history might seem, in horror, to have dropped a veil.¹

However the first appalling intelligence of this event shook the Roman world to the centre, and the fearful scene of pillage, violation, and destruction by fire and sword, was imagined to surpass in its horrors everything recorded in profane or sacred history, yet the shock passed away; and Rome quietly assumed her second, her Christian empire. When the first stunning tidings of the fall of the Imperial City reached Jerome in his retirement in Palestine, even some time after, when he had held intercourse with fugitives from Rome, the capture represents itself to his vivid fancy as one dark and terrific mass of havoc and ruin. It was accompanied by no mitigating or relieving circumstances; by none of those striking incidents of Christian piety and mercy, which, in

Third siege
of Rome.

Capture of
Rome.
A.D. 410.
Aug. 24.

¹ Rome may be said to have fallen without an historian. Her ruin was indeed described by the Greek Zosimus, but his sixth book is lost. Orosius cannot be dignified by the name—his work is but a summary of Augustine's City of God.

the pages of Augustine and Orosius, are thrown across the general gloom. The sudden horror, as well as consternation, joined with the gloomy temperament of Jerome to deepen the darkness of the scene.¹ He asserts that the famine had already so thinned the population, that few remained in the city to be taken. He heaps together the awful passages in the Old Testament, on the capture of Jerusalem and other eastern cities, and the noble lines of Virgil on the sack of Troy, as but feebly descriptive of the night in which fell the Moab of the West. Nor can it be supposed that, whatever the disposition or even the orders of Alaric, the capture of a city so wealthy, so luxurious, so populous, by a vast and ill-disciplined host of barbarians, at least at their first irruption, could be more than a wild tumult of fury, license, plunder, bloodshed, and conflagration. Multitudes of that host, no doubt, still held their old warlike Teutonic faith. In those who were called Christians the ferocity of the triumphant soldier was hardly mitigated by the softening influences of the Gospel. The forty thousand slaves said to have joined the army of Alaric, brought their revenge and their local and personal knowledge of the richest palaces, and of the most opulent families, which would furnish the most attractive victims to lust or to pillage. But the calamities that involved in ruin almost the whole pagan population and the palaces of the ancient families, which

¹ *Terribilis de Occidente rumor affertur . . . — Hæret vox et singultus interceptiunt verba dictantis. Capitur urbs, quæ totum cepit orbem, imo fame perit, antequam gladio, et vix pauci, qui caperentur, inventi sunt. Epist. xciv. Marcellæ Epitaph. Yet, in the same letter, he writes to Marcella — Sit mihi fas audita loqui; imo a sanctis viris visa narrare, qui interfuere præsentibus. — Ibid.*

Nocte Moab capta est, nocte cecidit murus ejus. Hieronym. i. 121, ad Principiam.

still adhered to their ancestral gods, are lost in oblivion ; while Christianity has boastfully, or gratefully, preserved those exceptional incidents, in which through her influence, and in her behalf, the common disaster was rebuked, checked, mitigated. The last feeble murmurs of paganism arraigned Christianity as the cause of the desertion of the city by her an-^{Extinction}cient and mighty gods, and, therefore, of her inevitable fate. Christianity was now so completely the mistress of the human mind, as to assert that it was, indeed, the power of her God — her justly provoked and righteously avenging God — which had brought to its final close the Gentile sovereignty of Rome. Nothing pagan had escaped, but that which found shelter under Christianity. For Alaric, though an Arian, was a Christian. His conduct was strongly contrasted with what might have been feared from the heathen Rhadagaisus, if God had abandoned Rome to his fury. The Goth had been throughout under the awful control of Christianity.¹ He is said to have issued a proclamation, which, while it abandoned the guilty and lux-^{Influence of}urious city to plunder, commanded regard for human life ; and especially the most religious respect for the Churches of the Apostles. In obedience to these com-

¹ The great Christian argument is summed up in this noble passage of Augustine: —

Quicquid igitur vastationis, trucidationis, depredationis, concremationis, afflictionis in istâ recentissimâ Romanâ clade commissum est: facit hoc consuetudo bellorum. Quod autem more novo factum est, quod inusitatâ rerum facie immanitas barbara tam mitis apparuit, ut amplissimæ basilicæ implendæ populo, cui parceretur, eligerentur et decernerentur, ubi nemo feriretur, unde nemo raperetur, quo liberandi multi a miserantibus hostibus ducerentur, unde captivandi nulli, nec a crudelibus hostibus abducerentur: hoc Christi nomini, hoc Christiano tempori tribuendum, quisquis non videt, cæcus; quisquis videt, nec laudat, ingratus; quisquis laudanti reluctatur, insanus est. Augustin. Tract. de excid. Urbis.

mands, and under the especial control of the Almighty, among the smoking ruins, the plundered houses and temples, the families desolated by the sword, or by outrages worse than death, the Christian edifices alone commanded at least some reverence and security. Everywhere else was promiscuous massacre, peace and safety alone in the churches. The heathens themselves fled to these, the only places of refuge; they took shelter, in their terror and despair, under the altars which they despised or hated. The more solid and majestic structures of paganism would, no doubt, defy the injuries which might be wrought by barbarians, more intent on plunder than destruction, but their most hallowed sanctuaries were violated. Before the Christian Churches alone rapacity, and lust, and cruelty were arrested, and stood abashed. When the conflagration raged, as it did in some parts of the city, amid private houses, palaces, or temples, some of the sacred edifices of the Christians might be enveloped in the flames. But the more important churches — those of St. Peter and St. Paul — were respected by the spreading fires, as well as by the infuriated soldiery.¹ There the obedient sword of the conqueror paused in its work of death, and even his cupidity was overawed.² Of all the temple treasures, the public or private hoards of precious metals, which the owners were compelled to betray by the most excruciating tortures, the jewels, the plate, the spoils of centuries of conquest, the accumulated plunder of provinces, only the sacred

¹ Augustin. de Civ. Dei, ii. 1. a. 7. Yet this was unknown to Jerome. He says, *In cineres ac favillas sacræ quondam ecclesiæ conciderunt.* Epist. xciii.

² Perhaps the remote and even extramural situation of these churches might tend to their security.

vessels and ornaments of Christian worship remained inviolate. It was said that sacred vessels found without the precincts of the Church were borne with reverential decency into the sanctuary. Of this Orosius relates a remarkable and particular history. A fierce soldier entered in quest of plunder into the dwelling of an aged Christian virgin. He demanded, in courteous terms, the surrender of her treasures. She exposed to his view many vessels of gold, of great size, weight, and beauty; vessels of which the soldier knew neither the use nor the name. "These," she said, "are the property of the Apostle St. Peter. Take them, if you dare, and answer for your act to God. A defenceless woman, I cannot protect them from your violence; my soul, therefore, is free from sin." The soldier stood awe-struck. A message was sent to Alaric, and orders were instantly despatched that the virgin and her holy treasures should be safely conducted to the Church of the Apostle. The procession (for the virgin's dwelling was far distant from the Church) was led through the long and wondering streets. The people broke out into hymns of adoration, and amid the tumult of disorder and ruin, the tranquil pomp pursued its course; the name of Christ rose swelling above the wild dissonance of the captured city. Even more lawless passions yielded to the holy control. In the loathsome scenes of violation, the chastity of ^{Protection of} females. Christian virgins alone — at least, in some instances — found respect from the lustful barbarian.¹ There is

¹ Demetrias escaped, according to St. Jerome. *Dudum inter barbaras tremuisti manus; aviæ et matris sinu et palliis tegebaris. Vidisti te captivam, et pudicitiam tuam non tuæ potestatis: horruisti truces hostium vultus: raptas virgines Dei gemitu tacite conspexisti.* Hieronym. *Epist.* 8. Compare Augustin. *de Civ. Dei*, i. 16.

an instance of a beautiful virgin who thus preserved her honor. Indignant at her resistance, the young soldier into whose power she had fallen, drew his sword and slightly wounded her. Though bleeding, she calmly held out her neck to the stroke of death. The soldier, though an Arian, observes the Catholic writer, could not but admire her fidelity to Christ her spouse. He led her to the Church, and, with a gift of six pounds of gold, surrendered her to those who were on guard over the sanctuary.¹ Marcella, the friend of Jerome, did not escape so easily the only dangers to which, on account of her age, she was exposed. As he had heard from eye-witnesses of the scene, it was not till she had been beaten and scourged,² to compel her to reveal her secret treasures, treasures long before expended in charity, that her admirable courage and patience enforced the respect of the spoiler, and induced him to lead her to the asylum of the Church of St. Paul.³

¹ Sozomen, H. E. ix. 10.

² *Cæsam fustibus flagellisque, aiunt te non sensisse tormenta.* Hieronym. Epist. loc. cit.

³ The most extraordinary passage relating to the sack of Rome is in St. Jerome's next letter. All the horrors on which he has dwelt,—the capture of Rome, the massacre, rape, pillage, and conflagration,—are not merely *mitigated*, but amply *compensated* to Rome and to the world by the profession of virginity made by Demetrias. It was as great a triumph as the discomfiture of the Gothic army would have been. We can neither understand Jerome nor his age without considering these strange sentences. Her vows of chastity were against the wishes of her whole family; the greater, therefore, their merit. Hence "*invenisse eam quod præstaret generi, quod Romanæ urbis cineres mitigaret.*" After describing the rejoicing of Africa, he proceeds: *Tunc lugubres vestes Italia mutavit, et semirutæ urbis Roræ mænia, pristinum in parte recepere fulgorem, propitium sibi exietimantes Deum, sic alumnae conversione perfectâ.* Putares extinctam Gothorum manum, et colliuim perfugarum et servorum. Domini desuper intonantis fulmine cecidisse. Non sic post Trebiam, Thrasymenum, et Cannas, in quibus locis Romanorum exercituum cæsa sunt millia, Marcelli

Innocent was happily absent from Rome during the last siege and sack of the city. After the second retreat of Alaric from before the walls, ^{Innocent absent from Rome.} he had accompanied a deputation to Ravenna, to seek, and seek in vain, from the powerless Emperor, some protection for the capital. He did not return, and the fate of the city was left to the resolutions of ^{A. D. 409.} the Senate. He thus escaped the horrors of that fatal night, and the three days' pillage of the city. If his presence did not contribute to the comparative security of the Christians, neither did his holy person endure the peril of exposure to insult, or the blind and indiscriminating fury of a heathen soldiery. Innocent returned to a city, if in some parts ruined and desolate, now entirely Christian; the ancient religion was buried under the ruins. Many of the noblest families of Rome were reduced to slavery by the Goths; some had anticipated the capture of the city by a shameful flight: many more abandoned forever their doomed and hopeless country. Alaric and his host, satiated with three days' plunder, at the end of six days broke up from Rome to ravage the rich and defenceless cities of southern Italy. The estates, which had so long maintained the enormous luxury of the Roman patricians, were

primum apud Nolam prælio, se populus Romanus erexit, &c. &c. Jerome has some notion that he is surpassing Tully and Demosthenes, whose eloquence would be unequal to this wonderful event. Compare with this letter the Epistle addressed to the same Demetrius, there is little doubt, by no less a person than the heresiarch Pelagius. Pelagius, in the spirit of his age, is an admirer of virginity. But throughout the Epistle there is a singular calmness as well as elegance of style, which forcibly contrasts with the passionate hyperboles of Jerome. Pelagius, too, alludes to the sack of Rome, and urges it as an image of the last day. *Eadem omnibus imago mortis, nisi quia magis eam timebant illi, quibus fuerat vita jucundior. Si ita mortales timemus hostes, et humanam manum, cum clangore terribili tuba intonare de cælo cæperit, &c.* In *Oper. Hieronym. v. p. 29.*

ravaged or confiscated: whole families swept away into bondage. Without the city, as within, almost all that remained of eminent and famous names, the ancestral houses, which kept up the tradition of the glory of the republic, or the wealth of the Empire, sank into obscurity or total oblivion. The fugitives from Rome were found in all parts of the world,¹ and among these no doubt were almost all the more distinguished heathens,² who, no longer combining into a powerful party, no longer held together by the presence of the old ancestral temples, or by the household gods of their race and family, reduced to poor and insignificant outcasts from descendants and representatives of the noblest houses in Rome, gradually melted into the general Christian population of the empire. Those, whom Jerome beheld at Bethlehem, were doubtless Christians; but the whole coasts, not only of Italy and its islands, of Africa, Egypt, and the East, swarmed with these unfortunate exiles.³ Carthage was full of those who, to the great indignation of Augustine, notwithstanding this visible sign of Almighty wrath, crowded the theatres, and raised turbulent factions concerning rival actors; they carried with them no doubt, and readily promulgated that hostile sentiment towards Christianity, which attributed all the calamities of the

¹ *Nulla est regio, quæ non exules Romanos habeat.* — Hieronym. *Epist. xcvi.*

² Compare *Prefat. ad Ezekiel.*

³ Honorius, in the mean time, was still issuing sanguinary edicts against heretics. *Oraculo penitus remoto, quo ad ritus suos hæreticæ superstitionis obreperant, sciant omnes sanctæ legis inimici, plectendos se pœnâ et proscriptionis et sanguinis, si ultra convenire per publicum execrandâ sceleris sui temeritate tentaverint.* To this law, addressed to Heraclian, count of Africa, (*Cod. Theodos. c. 51, de Hæret.*) Baronius ascribes the speedy deliverance of the city from Alaric, so highly was it approved by God! *Sub Ann. 410.*

times, consummated in the sack of Rome, to the new religion. It was this last desperate remonstrance of paganism which called forth Augustine's City of God, and the brief and more lively perhaps, but meagre and superficial work of Orosius. Babylon has fallen, and fallen forever; the City of God, at least the centre and stronghold of the City of God, is in Christian Rome.

Nor did Innocent return to rule over a desert. The wonder, which is expressed at the rapid res-^{Restoration} toration of Rome, shows that the general con-^{of Rome.} sternation and awe, at the tidings of the capture, had greatly exaggerated the amount both of damage and of depopulation. Some of the palaces of the nobles, who had fled from the city, or perished in the siege, may have remained in ruins; above all the temples, now without funds to repair them from their confiscated estates, from the alienated government, or from the munificence of wealthy worshippers, would be left exposed to every casual injury, and fall into irremediable dilapidation, unless seized and appropriated to its own uses by the triumphant faith. Now probably began the slow conversion of the heathen fanes into Christian churches.¹ It took many more sieges, many more irruptions of barbaric conquerors, to destroy the works of centuries in the capital of the world's wealth and power. If deserted temples were left to decay, churches rose; palaces found new lords; the humbler buildings, which are for the most part the prey of ruin and conflagration, are speedily repaired; it is hardly

¹ In Rome this was rare, till the late conversion of the Pantheon into a Christian church. Few churches stand even on the sites of ancient temples. The Basilica seems to have been preferred for Christian worship.

less labor to demolish than to build solid, massy and substantial habitations; and fire, which probably did not rage to any great extent, was the only destructive agent which, during Alaric's occupation, endangered the grandeur or majesty of the city.

If Christian Rome rose thus out of the ruin of the pagan city, the Bishop of Rome rose in proportionate grandeur above the wreck of the old institutions and scattered society. Saved, as doubtless it seemed, by the especial protection of God from all participation, even from the sight of this tremendous, this ignominious disaster, according to the phrase of the times, as Lot out of the fires of Sodom,¹ he alone could lift up his head, if with sorrow without shame. Honorius hid himself in Ravenna, nor did the Emperor ever again, for any long time, make his residence at Rome. With the religion expired all the venerable titles of the religion, the Great High Priests and Flamens, the Auspices and Augurs. On the Pontifical throne sat the Bishop of Rome, awaiting the time when he should ascend also the Imperial throne; or, at least, if without the name, possess the substance of the Imperial power, and stand almost as much above the shadowy form of the old republican dignities, which still retained their titles and some municipal authority, as the Cæsars themselves. The capture of Rome by Alaric was one of the great steps by which the Pope arose to his plenitude of power. There could be no question that from this time the greatest man in Rome was the Pope; he alone was invested with permanent and real power; he alone

¹ Orosius.

possessed all the attributes of supremacy, the reverence, it was his own fault, if not the love of the people. He had a sacred indefeasible title; authority unlimited, because undefined; wealth, which none dare to usurp, which multitudes lavishly contributed to increase by free-will offerings; he is, in one sense, a Cæsar, whose apotheosis has taken place in his lifetime, environed by his Prætorian guards, his ecclesiastics, on whose fidelity and obedience he may, when once seated on the throne, implicitly rely; whose edicts are gradually received as law; and who has his spiritual Prætors and Proconsuls in almost every part of Western Christendom.

CHAPTER II.

PELAGIANISM.

THE Pelagian question agitated the West during the later years of Innocent's pontificate. This Pelagian controversy. has been the great interminable controversy of Latin, of more than Latin, of all Western Christianity. The nature of the Godhead and of the Christ was the problem of the speculative East: that of man, his state after the fall, the freedom or bondage of his will, the motive principle of his actions, that of the more active West. The East might seem to dismiss this whole dispute with almost contemptuous indifference. Though Pelagius himself, and his follower Celestius, visited Palestine and obtained the suffrages of a provincial council in their favor; though from his cell near Bethlehem, Jerome mingled in the fray with all his native violence, — there the controversy died rapidly away, leaving hardly a record in Grecian theology, none whatever in Greek ecclesiastical history.¹

So completely, however, throughout the Roman Pelagius. world is Christianity now an important part of human affairs, as to become a means of intercourse and communication between the remotest provinces.

¹ Walch has observed, that none of the Greek historians, neither Socrates, Sozomen nor Theodoret notice the Pelagian controversy. *Ketzer-Geschichte*, iv. p. 531.

On the one hand new, and, as they are esteemed, heretical opinions are propagated, usually by their authors or by their partisans, from the most distant quarters, and so spread throughout Christendom; on the other hand, the Christian world is leagued together in every part to suppress these proscribed opinions. A Briton, Pelagius, by some accounts two Britons, Pelagius and Celestius, leave their home at the extremity of the known earth, perhaps the borders of Wales, the uttermost part of Britain, to disturb the whole Christian world. Pelagius is said to have been a monk, and though no doubt bound by vows of celibacy, yet was under the discipline of no community. He arrives in Rome, from Rome he passes to Africa, from Africa to Palestine. Everywhere he preaches his doctrines, obtains proselytes, or is opposed by inflexible adversaries. The fervid religion of the African Churches repudiated with one voice the colder and more philosophic reasonings of Pelagius:¹ they submitted to the ascendancy of Augustine, and threw themselves into his views with all their unextinguishable ardor.

But in the East the glowing writings of Augustine were not understood, probably not known;² his predestinarian notions never seem to have ^{Pelagius in} _{the East.} been congenial to the Christianity of the Greeks. In Palestine, however, Pelagius was encountered by two implacable adversaries, Heros and Lazarus, bishops of

¹ My history of the earlier period of Christianity entered into the general character of Pelagianism, especially as connected with the character and writings of Augustine. I consider it at present chiefly in its relation to Latin Christianity.—Hist. of Christianity, iii. pp. 264, 270.

² Except by Jerome, who, however, received his writings irregularly and with much delay.—The ordinary correspondence between the provinces

Gaul.¹ It is probable indeed, that the persecution was to be traced to the cell of Jerome,² with whose vehement and superstitious temperament his doctrines clashed as violently as with those of Augustine.

Council of
Diospolis. Pelagius was arraigned before a synod of fourteen prelates, at Diospolis (the ancient Lydda), and, to the astonishment and discomfiture of his adversaries, solemnly acquitted of all heretical tenets. It is asserted that the fathers of Diospolis were imposed upon by the subtle and plausible dialectics of Pelagius. Considering, indeed, that his accusers, the Gallic bishops (neither of whom personally appeared), and his third adversary, Orosius, the friend and disciple of Augustine, only spoke Latin, that the Palestinian bishops only understood Greek

seems now to have been slow and precarious. Nothing, writes Augustine to Jerome, grieves me so much as your distance from me—"ut vix possim meas dare, vel recipere tuas litteras, per intervalla non dierum non mensium, sed aliquot annorum.—August. Epist. xxviii. Were any of his works translated into Greek?

¹ Orosius too was in Palestine, it should seem, in search of relics. He had the good fortune to carry off the body of the protomartyr St. Stephen. Compare Baronius, sub ann.

² The letter to Demetrias, in the works of St. Jerome, seems admitted to be a genuine writing of Pelagius. That both Pelagius and his antagonist Jerome should have addressed an epistle to the same Demetrias suggests the suspicion of some strong personal rivalry. They were striving, as it were, for the command of this distinguished and still probably wealthy female.

The whole tenor of the letter of Pelagius confirms the position, that the opinions of Pelagius had no connection with monastic enthusiasm, and did not arise out of that pride "of good works" which may belong to the consciousness of extraordinary austerities. (Compare Neander, *Christliche Kirche*.) Pelagius arrives at his conclusions by a calm, it might seem cold, philosophy. Excepting as to the praise of virginity, the greater part of the letter might have been written by an ancient Academic, or by a modern metaphysical inquirer. Jerome traces the origin of Pelagianism to the Greek, particularly the Stoic philosophy. He quotes Tertullian's saying, *Philosophi, patriarchæ hæreticorum*.—Hieronym Epist. ad Ctesiphont.

(perhaps imperfectly any language but their own vernacular Syrian), and that Pelagius had the command of both languages; that these questions, which demanded the most exquisite nicety of expression and the strictest accuracy of definition, must have been carried on by the clumsy means of interpreters, — the council of Diospolis, to the dispassionate inquirer, cannot carry much weight. The usual consequences of religious controversies in those days, and in those regions, were not slow to appear. Jerome was attacked in his retirement, his disciples maltreated by their triumphant adversaries. Pelagius himself seems entirely exempted from any concurrence in these lawless proceedings; but his fanatic followers (and even his calm tenets in the East could for once kindle fanaticism) are accused of perpetrating every crime, pillage, murder, conflagration, on the peaceful disciples of Jerome, especially on some of the noble Roman ladies who shared his solitude.¹

While ignorance, or indifference, or chance, or personal hostility to the asserters of anti-Pelagian opinions

¹ Innocent Epist. ad Aurel. et ad Johannem, Episcop. Hierosolym. These revengeful violences against Jerome appear to me better evidence that he was at least supposed to be the head of the faction opposed to Pelagius, than the reasons alleged by P. Daniel, Hist. du Concile de Palestine, and Walch, p. 398. The strong expressions as to these acts are from Innocent's letter. *Direptiones, cædes, incendia, omne facinus extremæ dementiæ, generosissimæ sanctæ virgines deploraverunt in locis ecclesiæ tuæ perpetrassæ diabolum, nomen enim hominis causamque reticuerunt.* — Apud Labbe, Concil., ii. p. 1315. If the odious Pelagius had been the man, they would hardly have suppressed his name. And it must be acknowledged that Jerome suffered only the natural results of his own principles. In his third dialogue against the Pelagians he introduces their advocate as scarcely daring to speak out, lest he should be stoned: *Statim in me populorum lapides conjicias, et quem viribus non potes, voluntate interficias.* To this the Catholic rejoins, *Ille hæreticum interficit, qui hæreticum esse patitur.* — Hieronym. Oper., iv. 2. p. 544.

decided the question in the East, the West demanded a more solemn and authoritative adjudication on this absorbing controversy. By the decrees of the Council of Diospolis, Africa and the East were at direct issue; and where should the Africans seek the arbiter, or the powerful defender of their opinions, but at Rome? Constantinople, and Alexandria, and Antioch, took no interest in these questions, or were occupied, especially the two former, by their own religious and political quarrels. The African Church, when such a cause was on the issue, stood not on her independence. As a Western monk, Pelagius was amenable, in some degree, to the patriarchal authority of the Bishop of Rome. Both parties seemed at least to acquiesce in the appeal to Innocent: the event could not be doubtful in such an age and before the representative of Latin Christianity.

All great divergences of religion, where men are really religious (and this seems acknowledged as to Pelagius himself, and still more as to some of his semi-Pelagian followers, Julianus of Eclana and the Monastic Cassian), arise from the undue dominance of some principle or element in our religious nature. This controversy was in truth the strife between two such innate principles, which philosophy despairs of reconciling, on which the New Testament has not pronounced with clearness or precision. The religious sentiment, which ever assumes to itself the exclusive name and authority of religion, is not content without feeling, or at least supposing itself to feel, the direct, immediate agency of God upon the soul of man. This seems inseparable from the divine Sovereignty, even from Providential gov-

Origin of
controversy.

ernment, which it looks like impiety to limit, and of which it is hard to conceive the self-limitation.¹ Must not God's grace, of its nature, be irresistible? What can bound or fetter Omnipotence? This seems the first principle admitted in prayer, in all intercourse between the soul of man and the Infinite: it is the life-spring of religious enthusiasm, the vital energy, not of fanaticism only, but of zeal.² On the other hand, there is an equally intuitive consciousness (and out of consciousness grows all our knowledge of these things) of the freedom, or self-determining power of the human will. On this depends all morality, and the sense of human responsibility; all conception, except that which is unreasoning and instinctive, of the divine justice and mercy. This is the problem of philosophy; the degree of subservience in the human will to influences external to itself, and in no way self-originated or self-controlled, and to its inward self-determining power.³ In Christianity it involved not merely the metaphysic nature, but the whole biblical history of man; the fall, and the sin inherited by the race of Adam; the redemption of Christ, and the righteousness communicated to mankind by Christ.

Pelagius came too early for any calm consideration of his doctrines, or any attempt to reconcile the difficulties which he suggested, with the sacred writings.

¹ The absolute abandonment of free will seems the highest point of true devotion. Prosper thus writes of Augustine:—

*Et dum nulla sibi tribuit bona, fit Deus illi
Omnia, et in sancto regnat Sapientia templo.*

² Compare this argument in another form, *Hist. of Christianity*, iii. p. 267.

³ Edwards on the Will throughout, which on this point coincides with the philosophy of Hume

In his age the religious sentiment was at its height, and to the religious sentiment that system was true which brought the soul most strongly and immediately under divine agency. To substitute a law for that direct agency, to interpose in any way between the Spirit of God and the spirit of man, was impiety, blasphemy, a degradation of God and of his sole sovereignty. This sentiment was at its height in Western Christendom. In no part had it grown to a passion so overwhelming as in Africa, in no African mind to such absorbing energy as in that of Augustine.

Augustine, after the death of Ambrose, was the St. August-
tine. one great authority in Latin Theology: from him was now anxiously expected, if it had not appeared, the great work which was to silence the last desperate remonstrances of Paganism, the City of God.¹ His Confessions had become at once the manual of passionate devotion, and the history of the internal struggle of sin and grace in the soul of man. Augustine had maintained great influence at the court of Ravenna: of the ministers of Honorius some were his personal friends, others courted his correspondence. Africa, the only granary, held the power of life and death over Italy: and political and religious interests were now inseparably moulded together. But it was probably not so much either the authority or the influence of Augustine, which swayed the mind of Innocent to establish the Augustinian theology as the theory of Western Christianity; it was rather its full coincidence with his own views of Christian truth.

¹ On the City of God compare Hist. of Christianity, iii. p. 279, 282.

Augustinianism was not merely the expression of the universal Christianity of the age as administering to, as being in itself the more full, fervent, continuous excitement of the religious sentiment, it was also closely allied with the two great characteristic tendencies of Latin Christianity.

Latin Christianity, in its strong sacerdotal system, in its rigid and exclusive theory of the church, ^{Latin} at once admitted and mitigated the more ^{Christianity} anti-Pelagian repulsive parts of the Augustinian theology. Predestinarianism itself, to those at least within the pale, lost much of its awful terrors. The Church was the predestined assemblage of those to whom ^{Causes.} and to whom alone, salvation was possible; the Church scrupled not to surrender the rest of mankind to that inexorable damnation entailed upon the human race by the sin of their first parents. As the Church, by the jealous exclusion of all heretics, drew around itself a narrower circle; this startling limitation of the divine mercies was compensated by the great extension of its borders, which now comprehended all other baptized Christians. The only point in this theory at which human nature uttered a feeble remonstrance¹ was the abandonment of infants, who never knew the distinction between good and evil, to eternal fires. The heart of Augustine wrung from his reluctant reason, which trembled at its own in-

¹ Julianus of Eclana put well the insuperable difficulty which has constantly revolted the human mind, when not under the spell of some absorbing religious excitement, against the extreme theory of Augustine and of Calvin. Deus, ais, ipse qui commendat caritatem suam in nobis, qui dilexit nos, et filio suo non pepercit, sed pro nobis illum tradidit, ipse sic judicat, ipse est nascentium persecutor, ipse pro malâ voluntate æternis ignibus parvulos tradit, quos nec bonam nec malam voluntatem scit habere

consistency, a milder damnation in their favor. But some of his more remorseless disciples disclaimed the illogical softness of their master.¹

Through the Church alone, and so through the Sacerdotal system. hierarchy alone, man could be secure of that direct agency of God upon his soul, after which it yearned with irrepressible solicitude. The will of man surrendered itself to the clergy, for on them depended its slavery or its emancipation, as far as it was capable of emancipation. In the clergy, divine grace, the patrimony of the Church, was vested, and through them distributed to mankind. Baptism, usually administered by them alone, washed away original sin; the other rites and sacraments of which they were the exclusive ministers, were still conveying, and alone conveying, the influences of the Holy Ghost to the more or less passive soul. This objective and visible form as it were, which was assumed for the inward workings of God upon the mind and heart, by the certitude and security which it seemed to bestow, was so unspeakably consolatory, and relieved, especially the less reflective mind, from so much doubt and anxiety, that mankind was disposed to hail with gladness rather than examine with jealous suspicion these claims of the hierarchy. Thus the Augustinian theology coincided with the tendencies of the age towards the growth of the strong sacerdotal system; and the sacerdotal system reconciled Christendom with the

potuisse.—Apud Augustin. Oper. Imperf. i. 48. Augustine struggles in vain to elude the difficulty. Julianus as well as Pelagius himself strenuously asserted the necessity of infant baptism, not however as giving remission of sins, but as admitting to Christian privileges and blessings.

¹ Compare Hist. of Christ., iii. note, and quotation from Fulgentius.

Augustinian theology. But the invariable progress of the human mind, as to this question, is in itself remarkable; and necessary for the full comprehension of Christian history. All established religions subside into Pelagianism, or at least semi-Pelagianism. The interposition of the priest, or the sacrament, or of both, between the direct agency of God and the soul of man, for its own purposes, gradually admits a growing freedom of the will. Conformity to outward rites, obedience to orders or admonitions, every religious act is required on the one hand, as within the self-determining power of the will, and is in itself a more and more conscious exertion of that power. The sacerdotal system, in order that it may censure with more awfulness, and incite with more persuasiveness, admits a greater spontaneity of resistance to evil, and of inclination to good. It emancipates to a certain extent, that it may rule with a more absolute control. And as it was with Pelagius, so it is with his followers. No Pelagian ever has or ever will work a religious revolution. He who is destined for such a work must have a full conviction that God is acting directly, immediately, consciously, and therefore with irresistible power, upon him and through him. It is because he believes himself, and others believe him to be thus acted upon, that he has the burning courage to undertake, the indomitable perseverance to maintain, the inflexible resolution to die for his religion; so soon as that conviction is deadened, his power is gone. Men no longer acknowledge his mission, he himself has traitorously or timidly abandoned his mission. The voice of God is no longer speaking in his heart; men no longer recognize the voice of God from his lips.

The prophet, the inspired teacher, the all but apostle, has now sunk to an ordinary believer. He who is not predestined, who does not declare, who does not believe himself predestined as the author of a great religious movement, he in whom God is not manifestly, sensibly, avowedly working out his preëstablished designs, will never be Saint or Reformer.

But there was another part of the Augustinian The transmission of original sin. theology, which has quietly dropped from it in all its later revivals, yet in his day was an integral, almost the leading doctrine of the system; and falling in, as it did, with the dominant feelings of Christendom, contributed powerfully to its establishment, as the religion of the Church. Augustine was not content to assert original sin, in the strongest language, against Pelagius, but did not scruple to dogmatize as to the mode of its transmission. This was by sexual intercourse,¹ which he asserts in arguments, which the modesty of our present manners will not permit us to discuss, would have been unknown but for the Fall; and was in itself essentially evil,² though an evil to be tolerated in the regenerate, for the procreation of children, themselves to be regenerate.³

¹ The whole argument of the Book de Concupiscentia et de Nuptiis. *Intentio igitur hujus libri est ut . . . carnalis concupiscentiæ malum, propter quod homo qui per eam nascitur, trahit originale peccatum, discernamus a bonitate nuptiarum.*

² *Sed quia sine illo malo (carnalis concupiscentiæ) fieri non potest nuptiarum bonum, hoc est propagatio filiorum, ubi ad hujusmodi opus venitur, secreta quærantur. Hinc est quod infantes etiam, qui peccare non possunt, non tamen sine peccati contagione nascuntur, non ex hoc quod licet, sed ex hoc quod dedecet. — De Peccat. Origin., c. xxvii.* His standing argument is from natural modesty, which he confounds with the shame of conscious guilt.

³ The doctrine of original sin, as it is explicated by St. Austin, had two parents; one was the doctrine of the Encratites and some other heretics,

Thus this great Oriental principle of the inherent evil of matter, as we have seen in the course of our Christian history, was the dominant and fundamental tenet of Gnosticism, lay at the root of Arianism, and will hereafter appear as the remote parent of Nestorianism ; and this was the primary axiom of all Monasticism, and so became, almost imperceptibly, the first recognized principle of all Latin theology. Augustine, in this theory of the transmission of sin, betrays that invincible horror of the intrinsic evil of the material and corporeal, which had been infused into his mind by his youthful Manicheism.¹ Most of the other leading tenets of the Manicheans, the creation of man by the antagonistic malignant power, the unreality of the Christ, the whole mystic mythology of the imaginative Orientals, Augustine had rejected with indignation, and with the practical wisdom of the West ; but, notwithstanding all his concessions on the dignity of marriage, he is, in this respect, an irreclaimable Manichean. Sin and all sensual indulgence, as it was called, all, however lawful, union between the sexes, were convertible terms, or terms so associated in human thought as to require some vigor of mind to discriminate between them. It was the vice of the theology

who forbade marriage, and supposing it to be evil, thought that they were warranted to say it was the bed of sin, and children the spawn of vipers and sinners ; and St. Austin himself, and especially St. Hierome, speaks some things of marriage, which if they were true, then marriage were highly to be refused, as being the increaser of sin rather than of children, and a semination in the flesh and contrary to the spirit ; and such a thing, which being mingled with sin, produces univocal issues ; the mother and the daughter are so alike that they are worse again.—Jer. Taylor, Answer to a Letter.

¹ Augustine strongly protests against the charge which was even then made against him of Manicheism.—De Concup. et Nupt., lib. ii.

of this period, and not, perhaps, of this period alone, that it seemed to make the indulgence of one passion almost the sole unchristian sin; a passion which is probably strengthened rather than suppressed by compelling the mind to dwell perpetually upon it. This (and on this the whole stress was laid throughout the controversy) was, the concupiscence of the flesh, inherited from Adam, which was not washed away in the sanctifying waters of baptism, but still clave to the material nature of man, and was to be kept under control only by the most rigid asceticism. Celibacy thus became not merely a hard duty, but a glorious distinction: the clergy, and those females who aspired to more perfect Christianity, not merely chose a more difficult, and therefore, if successful, a more noble career — but were raised far above those lower mortals, who, in the most legitimate and holy form, that of faithful marriage, submitted to be the parents of children.

Pelagius himself,¹ so completely was the human mind possessed with this notion, almost rivalled Augustine in his praises of virginity, which he considered the great test of that strength of free will which he asserted to be weakened only, if weakened, by the fall of Adam.

The Augustinian theology, exactly to the extent to which it coincided with Latin Christianity, would no doubt harmonize with the opinions of one so completely representing that Christianity as Innocent I. When the African Churches, in their councils at Carthage, and at Milevis in Numidia, addressed the Pontiff on this momentous subject, the character, as well as the station of Innocent, might

Innocent
Augustinian.
417. Jan. 27.

¹ Epist. ad Demetriad.

command more than respectful deference. Had they felt any jealousy as to their own independence, under the absorbing passion, the hatred of Pelagianism, they would have made any sacrifice to obtain the concurrence of the Bishop of Rome. The letters inform Innocent that the Africans had renewed the unregarded anathema pronounced against this wicked error, especially of Celestius, which had been issued five years before. They assert the power of Innocent to summon Pelagius to Rome to answer for his guilt, and to exclude him from the communion of the faithful.¹ They implore the dignity of the Apostolic throne, of the successor of St. Peter, to complete and ratify that which is wanting to their more moderate power.² Pelagius himself, even if he did not acknowledge the jurisdiction of the tribunal, endeavored to propitiate the favor of the judge: he addressed an explanatory letter, and a profession of faith, to the Bishop of Rome.³

Both parties
appeal to
Rome.

Yet Augustine and the Africans were not without solicitude as to the decision of Innocent. Since Pelagius, they knew, lived in Rome, undisturbed by the inquisitive zeal of the bishop, Augustine, in a private letter, signed by himself and four bishops, informed the Pope that some of these persons boasted that they had won him to their cause, or, at least, to think less unfavorably of Pelagius.⁴

¹ Aut ergo a tuâ veneratione accersendus est Romam, et diligenter interrogandus. — Epist. Conc. Milev. Labbe, ii., p. 1547.

² Ut statutis nostræ mediocritatis, etiam Apostolicæ sedis adhibeatur auctoritas, pro tuendâ salute multorum et quorundam etiam perversitate corrigendâ. — Epist. Conc. Carthag. ad Innocent. Labbe, ii. p. 1514.

³ Augustin. de Grat. Christ., cap. 30. De Pecc. Origin., 17, 21, &c.

⁴ Quidam scilicet quia vos talia persuasisse perhibent. — Ibid.

The answer of Innocent allayed their fears. He did not pass by the opportunity of asserting, as an acknowledged maxim, the dignity of the Apostolic See, the source of all episcopacy, and the advantage of an appeal to a tribunal, which might legislate for all Christendom.¹ On the Pelagian question he places himself on the broad, popular, and unanswerable ground, that all Christian devotion implies the assistance of divine grace; that it is admitted in every response of the service, in every act of worship. He pronounces the opinions anathematized by the African bishops to be heretical; and declares that the unsound limb must be severed without remorse, lest it should infect the living body.² Africa, and all those who held the opinions of Augustine, triumphed in what might seem the unqualified sentence of the Bishop of Rome. At this period in the controversy, and before the arrival of the letter from Pelagius, died Pope Innocent I.

Death of
Innocent.
A.D. 417,
March 12.

So far the Bishop of Rome had floated onwards towards supremacy on the full tide of dominant opinion; his decrees were so acceptable to the general ear, that the tone of authority in which they began to be couched, jarred not on any quivering chord of jealousy

¹ Qui ad nostrum referendum approbastis esse iudicium, scientes quid Apostolicæ sedi (cum omnes hoc loco positi ipsum sequi desideremus Apostolum) debeatur, a quo ipse episcopatus et tota auctoritas nominis hujus emersit. — Innocent. Epist. ad Episc. Afric.

Ut per cunctas orbis totius ecclesias, quod omnibus prosit, decernendum una esse deposcitis. — Ibid.

² The lines of Prosper, who has written a long poem on this abstruse subject, have been referred to this decree of Innocent I. —

In causam fidei flagrantius Africa nostra
Exequeris; tecumque suum jungente vigorem
Juris Apostolici solio, fera viscera belli
Conficis, et lato prosternis limite victos.

or suspicion. The secret of that power lay in Rome's complete impregnation with the spirit of the age; and this lasted, almost unbroken, till the Reformation. It were neither just nor true to call this worldly policy, or to suppose that the Bishops of Rome dishonestly conformed, or bent their opinions to their age for the sake of aggrandizing their power. Their sympathy with the general mind of Christianity constituted their strength; from their conscious strength grew up, no doubt, their bolder spirit of domination; but they became masters of the Western Church by being the representative, the centre, of its feelings and opinions. It was not till a much later period that the claim to personal infallibility, to the sole dictatorship over the Christianity of the world, was either advanced or thought necessary; the present infallibility was but the expression of the universal, or at least predominant sentiment of mankind.

Once at this period, and but for a short time, the Bishop of Rome threw himself directly across the stream of religious opinion. Zosimus, the successor of Innocent, was by birth a Greek,¹ and seemed disposed to treat the momentous questions agitated by the Pelagian controversy with the contemptuous indifference of a Greek. Whether from this uncongeniality of the Eastern mind with these debates; whether from the pride of the man, which was flattered by the submission of both these dangerous heresiarchs to his authority; whether from an earnest and well-intentioned, but mistaken hope, of suppressing what appeared to him a needless dispute, Zosimus annulled at one blow all the judgments of his predecessor, In-

¹ Anastasius Bibliothec., c. 42.

nocent ; and absolved the men, whom Innocent, if he had not branded with a direct anathema, had declared deserving to be cut off from the communion of the faithful.

The address of Pelagius to Innocent had not arrived in Rome before the death of that prelate ; it was accompanied with a creed elaborately and ostentatiously orthodox on all the questions which agitated the Eastern mind, and a solemn and minute repudiation of all the heresies relating to the nature of the Godhead. It might seem almost prophetically intended to propitiate the favor of a Greek Pope. He touched but briefly on the freedom of the will, and the necessity of divine grace ; rejecting, as Manichean, the doctrine, that sin was inevitable ; as a doctrine which he ascribes to Jovinian, the impeccability of the Christian.¹ Celestius, who had remained some time in peaceful retirement at Ephesus, had passed to Constantinople ; from thence he is said to have been expelled by the Bishop Acacius. He now appeared in Rome, and throwing himself, as it were, at the feet of the Pontiff, declared that he was ready to submit to a dispassionate examination and authoritative judgment on his tenets.

A solemn hearing was appointed in the Basilica of St. Clement. Celestius was listened to with favor ; if the positive sentence was delayed, his accusers

Pelagius
and Celestius
declared
orthodox.

Heros and Lazarus, the Gallic bishops, were denounced in the strongest terms to the Afri-

¹ The creed apud Baronium—sub ann. 417—*Liberum sic esse confitemur arbitrium, ut dicamus nos semper Dei indigere auxilio, et tam illos errare qui cum Manicheis dicunt hominem peccatum vitare non posse, quam illos qui cum Joviniano asserunt, hominem non posse peccare: uterque enim tollit libertatem arbitrii.*—Was the first clause aimed at Augustine and the Africans?

can Council as vagabond, turbulent, and intriguing prelates, who had either abdicated or abandoned their sees, and travelled about sowing strife and calumny wherever they went.¹ The African prelates were summoned within a short period to make good their charges against Celestius, who in this first investigation had appeared unimpeachable.² Zosimus went further: he had warned Celestius and his accusers alike to abstain from these idle questions and unedifying disputes, the offspring of vain curiosity, and of the desire for the display of eloquence on subjects unrevealed.³ Such to Zosimus appeared these questions, which had wrought Africa into a frenzy of zeal and distracted the whole West. The trial of Celestius was followed by the public recital of a letter from Praylas, Sept. 21. Bishop of Jerusalem, asserting in the most unqualified terms the orthodoxy of Pelagius. It was read with joy, with admiration, almost with tears of delight. "Would," writes Zosimus to the African bishops, "that one of you had been present at the edifying scene. That such a man should be impeached, and impeached by a Heros and a Lazarus! There was no point in which the grace and assistance of God

¹ Zosimus Aurelio et univ. Episcop. Africæ. — Apud Labbe, ii., 1559.

Heros, according to Zosimus, had been Bishop of Arles, Lazarus of Aix. Their rise was owing entirely to the tyrant (probably the usurper Constantine); it was accompanied with tumult and bloodshed, persecution of the priesthood who opposed them. With Constantine they fell, driven out by the execrations of the people, and abdicating their sees. — So the Bishop of Rome. S. Prosper gives a high character of both. — S. Prosper, Chron.

² Innotescere sanctitati vestræ super absoluta Cœlestii fide nostrum examen. — Ib.

³ Admoneri, has tendiculas quæstionum, et inepta certamina quæ non edificant, sed magis destruunt, ex illâ curiositatis contagione profluere, dum unusquisque ingenio suo et intemperanti eloquentiâ supra scripta abutitur. — Ibid.

could be asserted by a faithful Christian, which was not fully acknowledged by them.”¹

But the authority, which was received with deferential homage, so long as it concurred with their own views, lost its magic directly that it espoused the opposite cause. The African bishops inflexibly adhered to the condemnation of Pelagius, of Celestius, and their doctrines. Carthage obstinately refused to yield to Rome; it appealed to the sentence of Innocent, and disdainfully rejected the annulling power of Zosimus. Augustine, indeed, continued to speak with conciliating mildness of the Roman Prelate; but he let fall some alarming and significant expressions as to the prevarication of the whole Roman clergy.

To the long representation addressed to him by the Council of Carthage, Zosimus replied in a haughty tone, asserting that, according to the tradition, no one might dare to dispute the judgment of the Apostolic See. But the close of the epistle betrayed his embarrassment. Whether his natural sagacity had discovered that he had rashly attempted to stem the torrent of opinion; his brotherly love for the African Churches would induce him to communicate all his determinations to them, in order that they might act together for the common good of Christendom. He had stayed, therefore, all further proceedings in the affair of Celestius.²

It was time for Zosimus to retrace his precipitate course. Augustine and the African bishops had summoned to their aid a more powerful

Appeal to
the Emperor.

¹ Tales enim absolutæ fidei infamari posse? Est ne ullus locus in quo Dei gratia vel adiutorium prætermisum sit? Zosim. ad Episcop. Afric. Labbe, ii. p. 1561.

² Zosim. ad Episcop. Africæ.

ally than even the Bishop of Rome. While the Pope either still adhered to the cause of Pelagius, or but began to vacillate, an Imperial edict was issued from the court of Ravenna, peremptorily deciding on this abstruse question of theology.¹ This law was issued before the final sitting of the Council of Carthage, in which, on the authority of two hundred and twenty-three bishops, eight canons were passed, condemnatory of Pelagianism. There can be no doubt, that the law was obtained by the influence of the African bishops with the Emperor or his ministers; there is great likelihood by the personal authority of Augustine with the Count Valerius. Italy, indeed, could hardly refuse to listen to the voice of Africa. This appeal to the civil magistrate is but another instance, that the ecclesiastical power has no scruple in employing in its own favor those arms of which it deprecates the use, the employment of which it treats as impious usurpation, when put forth against it. By this law it became a crime against the state, to be visited with civil penalties, to assert that Adam was born liable to death.² The dangerous heresiarchs were condemned by name, and without hearing or trial, to banishment from Rome.³ Informers were invited or commanded to apprehend

¹ The law is dated April 30, A.D. 418. The final council was held early in May.

² *Hi parenti cunctorum Deo . . . tam trucem inclementiam sævæ voluntatis assignant . . . ut mortem præmitteret nascituro (Adamo, sc.), non hanc insidiis vetiti fluxisse peccati, sed exegisse penitus legem immutabilis constituti. — Rescript. Honor. et Theodos. apud Augustin. Oper. x., Append., p. 106.*

³ *Hos ergo repertos ubicunque de hoc tam nefando scelere conferentes a quibuscunque jubemus corripere, deductosque ad audientiam publicam promiscuè ab omnibus accusari . . . ipsis inexorati exilii deportationi damnatis. — Ibid.*

and drag before the tribunals, and to accuse the maintainers of these wicked doctrines. In the order issued by the Prætorian Prefects of Italy and the East, to carry this law into effect, not merely were the heresiarchs banished, but their accomplices condemned to the confiscation of their estates, and to perpetual exile.¹

Zosimus threw off the dangerous tenderness with which he had hitherto treated Celestius and his party. Already, before the promulgation of the Imperial edict, he had demanded his unequivocal condemnation of certain errors, charged against him by Paulinus, a Carthaginian deacon, who had been sent to Rome to represent the African opinions. Celestius was now again summoned to render an account of his tenets; under the ban of the Imperial law, an object of hatred to the populace, certain that the Pope had withdrawn his protection, of course he dared not appear: he had quietly retired from Rome.² Zosimus proceeded to condemn the faith, to anathematize the doctrines of Pelagius and Celestius, to excommunicate them from the body of the faithful, if they did not renounce and abjure the venomous tenets of their impious and abominable sect. Nor was this all: the Bishop of Rome addressed a circular letter to all the bishops of Christendom, condemning the doctrines of Pelagius. To this anathema they were expected to subscribe.³

Eighteen bishops alone, of those who took this letter

¹ The convicted heretic, by the edict of Palladius, was to be *facultatum publicatione nudatus*.

² Augustin. de Pecc. Origin., c. 6. The gratulatory letter of Paulinus himself on the condemnation of Celestius, in Baronius, sub ann. 418.

³ Augustin. de Pecc. Orig., 3, 4; in Julian, 1, c. 4. Prosper in Chronic.

into consideration, refused to condemn their fellow Christians unheard. They turned ^{Eighteen} ^{recusants.} against Zosimus his own language to the African bishops, in which he had accused their precipitancy and injustice in condemning these very men without process or trial. They appealed to a General Council.

Of these eighteen, the most distinguished was Julianus, Bishop of Eclana, in Campania. His ^{Julianus of} ^{Eclana.} opinions did not altogether agree with those of Pelagius and Celestius;¹ he was the founder of what has been called Semi-Pelagianism. Julianus from his birth, his character, and the events of his life, was a remarkable man. He was of a noble family, the son of a bishop, Memor, for whom Augustine entertained the warmest friendship.² He was early admitted into the lower order of the clergy, and married a virgin of birth and virtue equal to his own. She was of the Æmilian family, daughter of the Bishop of Beneventum.

The epithalamium of Julianus and Ia was written by the holy Paulinus, Bishop of Nola. The poet urges upon the young and ardent couple not to break off their dangerous nuptials, but after their marriage to preserve their inviolate chastity. The pious bishop has, indeed, some misgivings as to the success of his poetic persuasions, and adds, that if they are betrayed into the weakness of having offspring, he trusts that they will make compensation to that state, which they have robbed of its brightest ornaments, by dedicating

¹ The great point of difference was that Pelagius held Adam to have been born mortal; Julianus admitted that the sin of Adam had brought death into the world.

² Augustin. contr. Julian., i. 12.

all their children, a sacerdotal family, to virginity.¹ Julianus was a man of great accomplishments, well read in the writers, especially the poets of Italy and Greece. But neither his illustrious descent, his Roman or his Christian kindred, nor his talents, nor his virtues, nor his station, availed in the least in this desperate conflict at once with power and popular opinion. There were now arrayed in formidable and irresistible confederacy, the three commanding influences in Western Christendom, the Pope, the Emperor, and Augustine. The Pope, indignant at the demand for a General Council, proceeded to involve Julianus and the rest of the eighteen remonstrants under the anathema pronounced against Pelagius, and to depose him from his see. Julianus had but the unsatisfactory consolation of asserting that Zosimus dared not meet him before a General Council. The Emperor was at first disposed to accede to the demand for a Council, but the influence of Augustine with the Count Valerius changed the impartial judge into an implacable adversary. He is even accused, and by his most respected adversary Julianus, of employing every means, even those of corruption, to inflame the minds of the powerful against the followers of Pelagius.² A new Imperial edict sentenced to exile Julianus and all the bishops who had fallen under the anathema of Zosimus. A second rescript followed, commanding all bishops not

¹ Ut sit in ambobus concordia virginitatis,
 Aut sint ambo sacris semina virginibus.
 Votorum prior hic gradus est, ut nescia carnis
 Membra gerant, quod si corpore congruerint,
 Casta sacerdotale genus ventura propago,
 Et domus Aaron sit tota domus Memoria.

Paull. Nolan. Epithalamium, circa finem.

² See note infra.

merely to subscribe the dominant opinions on these profound and abstruse topics, but to condemn their authors, Pelagius and Celestius, as irreclaimable heretics, and this under pain of deprivation and banishment. Justly might Julianus taunt his ecclesiastical brethren with this attempt to crush their adversaries by the civil power. With shame and sorrow we hear from Augustine himself that fatal axiom, which for centuries reconciled the best and holiest men to the guilt of persecution, the axiom which impiously arrayed cruelty in the garb of Christian charity — that they were persecuted in compassion to their souls;¹ that they ought to be thankful for the kind violence, which did them no real injury, but coerced them for their good; and that if for this end the secular power was called in, it was to restrain them from their sacrilegious temerity.²

Thus, then, on these men had fallen the ban of ecclesiastical and secular power, and in the West, at least, of popular opinion.³ Pelagius vanishes at this time from history; he had been condemned by a Council at Antioch, and driven, a second Catiline as he is called by Jerome, from Jerusalem: of his end nothing is known. The more courageous and active Celestius still kept up the vain strife.

¹ Non impotentiae contra vos precamur auxilium, sed pro vobis potius ut ab ausu sacrilego cohibeamini, Christianae potentiae laudamus officium. — Oper. Imperf., l. ii., c. 14.

² Compare I. 10, where he says that Christian powers (he means the civil powers) are bound to use disciplinam coercionis against all opponents of the Catholic faith.

³ Julianus, it appears, objected to Augustine that all his authorities were Western bishops. This Augustine does not deny, but demands whether the authority of St. Peter and his successor, Innocent, is not enough. — Contr. Julian., 1, c. 13. He quotes, however, Gregory of Nazianzum and Basil.

Twice he returned to Rome during the episcopacy of the successor of Zosimus, and twice again was banished. At length, with Julianus, he took refuge at Constantinople, where he obtained a more favorable hearing both from the reigning Emperor, the younger Theodosius, and from Nestorius, the bishop. But his enemies were watchful, and Constantinople refused to entertain the condemned heresiarch: of his death likewise history is silent. The accomplished Julianus,¹ exiled from his see, proscribed not merely by the harsh edicts of power, but hunted by popular detestation from town to town, wandered through Christendom, as if he bore a divine judgment upon him. His long and weary life was protracted thirty years after his exile.² At length he settled as teacher of a school, in an obscure town of Sicily. The last act of the proscribed heretic was to sacrifice all he had to relieve the poor in a grievous famine. Some faithful follower, it is said, whether in zeal for his tenets or admiration for his virtues, inscribed on his tomb, "Here sleeps in peace Julianus, the Catholic Bishop."

¹ The fragments of the writings of Julianus, especially those in the *Opus Imperfectum* of Augustine, show great acuteness and eloquence, and a facility and perspicuity of style which bears no unfavorable comparison with the great African father. His piety is unimpeachable.

² Julianus constantly taunts Augustine with this appeal to the passions of the rude and ignorant vulgar on such abstruse subjects, and with even worse means of persecuting his adversaries. *Cur seditioes Romæ conductis populis excitastis? Cur de sumptibus pauperum saginastis per totam pœne Africam, equorum greges, quos prosequenti Olybrio, tribunis et centurionibus destinastis? Cur matronarum oblati hæreditatibus potestates sæculi corrupistis, ut in nos stipula furoris publice ardeat? Cur dissipastis Ecclesiarum quietem? Cur religiosi principis tempora persecutionum impietate maculastis?* — *Oper. Imperfect.*, iii. 74.

Augustine contents himself by simply denying these charges, the last of which, by his own showing and by the extant edicts, was too true.

In another place Julianus says, *Ut erecto cornu dogma populare.* — *Oper. Imperfect.*, ii. 2.

While the West in general bowed before the commanding authority of Augustine ; trembled and shrunk from any opinion which might even seem to impeach the sovereignty of God ; laid its free will down a ready sacrifice before divine grace, as contained in the sacraments of the Church and administered by the awful hierarchy ; hesitated not to abandon the whole world, external to the Church, to that inevitable hell which was the patrimony of all the children of Adam ; Semi-Pelagianism arose in another quarter, and under different auspices, and maintained an obstinate contest for considerably more than a century. This school grew up among the monasteries in the south of France. Among its partisans were some of the most eminent bishops of that province. The most distinguished, if not the first founder, of this Gallic Semi-Pelagianism was the monk Cassianus. The birthplace of Cassianus is uncertain, but if not Greek or Oriental by birth, he was either one or the other, or both, by education.¹ His youth was passed in the Eastern monasteries, first in Bethlehem, afterwards in Egypt. Eastern and Egyptian monachism, like its more remote ancestor in India, and its more immediate parent, the Essenism or Therapeutism of the Jews, was anything but a blind or humble Predestinarianism. It was the strength and triumph of the human will. It was the self-wrought victory over the bondage of matter ; the violent avulsion and stern estrangement from all the indulgences, the pursuits,

¹Notwithstanding the express words of Gennadius, Cassianus natione Scytha, he has been supposed an African. He is called Afer in the list of ecclesiastical writers by Honorius (lxi. c. 84) ; an Egyptian (Pagi, Basnage, Fabricius) ; a Latin (Photius, c. 197) ; a Gaul (Card. Norris and the Benedictines, Hist. Lit. de la France).

the affections, the society of the world. The dreamy and passive state of the monk, in which he was surrendered to spiritual influences, began not till his own determination had withdrawn him into the austere and eremetical solitude. There man might be commingled, in absolute identity, with the Godhead. Every act of remorseless asceticism was a meritorious demand on the divine approbation. The divine influence was wrestled for and won by the resolute and prevailing votary, not bestowed as the unsought gift of God. Cassianus passed from Egypt to Constantinople, where he became the favored pupil of that Greek Father whose writings are throughout the most adverse to the Augustinian system. The whole theology of Chrysostom, in its general impression, is a plain and practical appeal to the free will of man. He addresses man as invested in an awful responsibility, but as self-dependent, self-determining to good or evil. The depravity against which he inveighs is no inherited, inherent corruption, to be dispossessed only by divine grace, but a personal, spontaneous, self-originating, and self-maintained surrender to evil influences; to be broken off by a vigorous effort of religious faith, to be controlled by severe self-imposed religious discipline. As far as is consistent with prayer and devotion, man is master of his own destiny. The Augustinian questions of predestination, grace, the foreknowledge of God, even, in general, the atonement and the extent of its consequences, lie without the sphere of Chrysostom's theology. Cassianus received at least the first holy orders from Chrysostom. During the disturbances in Constantinople relating to his deposal, Cassianus was sent to Rome on a mission to Pope Innocent I. To the

memory of Chrysostom he preserved the most fervent attachment. Chrysostom was to him a second John the Evangelist.¹

Probably after the fall of Chrysostom, Cassianus settled at Marseilles, and founded two monasteries, one of men and one of women, in ^{Cassianus} ^{in Gaul.} which he introduced the severe discipline of the East. Marseilles was Greek; it retained to a late period the character and, to some degree, the language of a Grecian colony; no doubt, on that account, it was congenial to Cassianus. But Cassianus became so completely master of Latin as to write in that language his Monastic Institutes, the austere and inflexible code followed in most of the cœnobitic foundations north of the Alps; and it is chiefly from this work that posterity can collect the Semi-Pelagian opinions of its author.² Already, however, some of the faithful partisans of Augustine had given the alarm at this tendency towards rebellion against the dictatorship of their master. Prosper and Hilarius denounced this yet more secret defection of those who presumed to impugn with vain objections the holy Augustine on the grace of God.³ The last works which occupied

¹ *Adoptatus a beatissimæ memoriæ Joanne in ministerium sacrum atque oblatum Deo Mementote magistrorum vestrorum veterum sacerdotumque vestrorum Joannis fide ac puritate mirabilis: Joannis inquam, Joannis illius qui verè ad similitudinem Joannis Evangelistæ, et discipulus Jesu et Apostolus, quasi super pectus domini semper affectumque discubuit Qui communis mihi ac vobis magister fuit; cujus discipuli et institutio sumus, et seqq.* — Cassianus de Incarn. c. 31.

² There has been a controversy whether Cassianus was a Semi-Pelagian. With his works before them, even from the same passages of his works, grave and learned men have argued on both sides.

³ *Gratiam Dei, qua Christiani sumus, qui tam dicere audent a sanctæ memoriæ Augustino Episcopo non rectè esse defensam, librosque ejus contra errorem Pelagianum conditos immoderatis calumniis impetere non quiescunt.* — Prosper contr. Collatorem, c. 1.

Augustine were addressed to Prosper and Hilarius, in order to check this daring inroad, and to establish on irrefragable grounds the predestination of the saints and the gift of perseverance.¹

The partisans of Augustine continued to wage the war with all the burning zeal and imperious authority of their master. A school arose, not of theology alone, but of poetry. Prosper, in a long poem, compelled the reluctant language and form of Latin verse to condemn the "ungrateful," who in their wanton pride ascribed partly to themselves, not absolutely to the grace of God, the work of their salvation. Prosper and Hilarius were followed by a long line of assertors of the Augustinian Predestinarianism, of which Fulgentius was the most rigid and inexorable advocate.²

Cassianus, on the other side, handed down to a succession of more or less bold disciples the aversion to the extreme views of Augustine. It is doubtful whether the Vincentius, who espoused his opinions, was the celebrated Abbot of Lerins, the author of the 'Commonitory.' At a later period Faustus, Bishop of Riez, brought the sanction of learning, high character, and sanctity to the same cause.

Semi-Pelagianism aspired to hold the balance between Pelagius and Augustine;³ to steer a safe and middle course between the abysses into which each, on

¹ De Prædestinatione Sanctorum liber ad Prosperum et Hilarium De dono perseverantiæ liber ad Prosperum et Hilarium secundus.

² Fulgentius was the predecessor of that modern divine who is said to have spoken of the *comfortable* doctrine of the eternal damnation of little children.

³ Sed nec cum hæreticis tibi, nec cum Catholicis plena concordia est . . . tu informe, nescio quid, tertium et utraque parte inconueniens reperisti, quo nec inimicorum consensum acquireres, nec in nostrorum permaneres.— Prosper, c. ii. p. 117.

either side, had plunged in desperate presumption.¹ It emphatically repudiated the heresy of Pelagius in the denial of original sin; it asserted divine grace, but it seemed to confine divine grace to the outward means, the Scriptures and the sacraments, rather than to its inward and direct workings on the soul itself.

But it condemned with equal resolution the system of Augustine, by which the grace of God was hardened into an iron necessity; it reproached him with that Manicheism which divided mankind into two hard antagonistic masses.²

But of all religious controversies this alone had the merit of not growing up into a fatal and implacable schism.³ The Semi-Pelagians, though condemned in several successive councils, were not cast out of the Church, and did not therefore form separate and hostile communities. This rare mutual respect, which now prevailed, is no doubt to be attributed to one important cause. The monasteries, which were held in such profound and universal veneration, were the chief schools of these doctrines; some

¹ Compare Walch, v. p. 56.

² Compare the letter of Prosper to Rufinus, in which Augustine is said to make *duas humani generis massas*, an error as bad as that of heathens or Manicheans.

³ No question has been more disputed in later days, or with less certain result, than whether there was a distinct sect of Predestinarians at this period. The controversy originated in the publication of a remarkable tract, the "*Prædestinatus*," by the Jesuit Sirmond. The great object was to clear the memory of Augustine, who was claimed both by Jesuits and Jansenists. Such a sect, if it existed, would carry off from St. Augustine all the charges heaped upon Predestinarianism at that time. If they were *heretics*, Augustine was of unimpeached orthodoxy, and therefore could not have held a condemnable Predestinarianism. Walch discusses the question at length, vol. v.

of the most austere and most admired of these Cœnobites were the chief assertors of the free will of man.¹

¹ Prosper himself betrays this enforced respect and its peculiar source:—

Nec tibi fallacis subrepat imago decoris,
 Nullum ex his errare putes, licet in Cruce vitam
 Ducant, et jugi afficiant sua corpora morte:
 Abstineant opibus; sint casti; sintque benigni;
 Terrenisque ferant animum super astra relictis;
 Si tamen hæc propria virtute capessere quenquam
 Posse putant, sitve ut dignus labor iste juvari
 Ingenium meruisse aiunt bona vera petentis;
 Crescere quo cupiunt, minuuntur; proficiendo
 Deficiunt; surgendo cadunt, currendo recedunt;
 Unde etenim vani frustra splendescere quærunt,
 Inde obscurantur: quoniam sua, laudis amore,
 Non quæ sunt Christi quærunt, nec fit Deus illis
 Principium et capiti non dant in corpore regnum.

Prosper ad Ingratos, xxxvii.

CHAPTER III.

NESTORIANISM.

ZOSIMUS filled the See of Rome only a year and nine months. His short pontificate was agitated not only by the Pelagian controversy, but by disputes with the bishops of Southern Gaul and of Africa, hereafter to be considered when the relations of those provinces to the See of Rome shall take their place in our history.

Mar. 18, 417.
Dec. 26, 418.
Death of
Zosimus.

The death of Zosimus gave rise to the third contested election for the See of Rome.

The greater the dignity of the Bishop of Rome, and the more lofty his pretensions to supremacy, the more would ambition covet this post of power and distinction; the more, on the other hand, would holy and Christian emulation aspire to place the worthiest prelate in this commanding station; and men's opinions would not always concur as to the ecclesiastic best qualified to preside over Western Christendom. Thus while the most ungovernable worldly passions and interests would intrude themselves into the election, honest religious zeal, often the blindest, always the most obstinate of human motives, would esteem it a sacred duty to espouse, an impious weakness to abandon, some favorite cause.

Disputed
election,
Dec. 27, '28.

The unsettled form of the election, and the unde-

Unsettled form of election. fined rights of the electors, could not but increase the difficulty and exasperate the strife. The absolute nomination by the clergy would have been no security against contested elections; for in every double election a large part of the clergy was ranged on either side, and formed the rival factions. A certain assent of the people was still considered necessary to ratify the appointment. At all events, the people looked on the election with such profound interest, during a contest with such violent excitement, that it was impossible to exclude them from interference: and both factions were so anxious for their support, that only the losing party would see the impropriety of their tumultuous mingling in the fray. The election of the Bishop was now as much an affair of the whole city as that of a consul or a dictator of old, without the ancient and time-honored regulations for collecting the suffrages by centuries or by tribes.

And who were the people? Was this right equally shared by all the members of the religious community, now almost coextensive in number with the inhabitants of the city? Had the Senate any special privilege, or were all these rights of the laity vested in the Emperor alone as the supreme civil power, and so in the Prefect of Rome, the representative of imperial authority? The popular universal suffrage, which, in a small primitive church, one pervaded with pure Christian piety, tended to harmony, became an uncontrolled democratic anarchy when the bishopric included a vast city. It is surprising that this difficulty, which was not removed until, at a comparatively recent period, the election was vested in the College of Cardinals, was not fatal to the supremacy

of Rome. But though the wild scenes of anarchy and tumult, which, especially from the eighth to the eleventh century, impaired the authority of the Pope in Rome itself, and desecrated his person; though the successful Pontiff was often only the head of a triumphant faction, and was either disobeyed, or obeyed with undisguised reluctance, by the defeated party; still distance seemed to soften off all this unseemly confusion, above which the Pope appeared seated on his serene and lofty throne in undiminished majesty. It constantly happened that at the very time at which in Rome the Pope was insulted, maltreated, wounded, imprisoned, driven from the city, the extreme parts of Christendom were bowing to his decrees in unshaken reverence.

Twice already — perhaps more than twice — had Rome been afflicted with a fierce and prolonged contest. The austere bigotry of Novatian had maintained his claim against the authority of Cornelius. Felix had been the antipope to Liberius. The streets of Rome had run with blood, the churches had been defiled with dead bodies, in the more recent strife of Damasus and Ursicinus.

On the death of Zosimus, some of the clergy chose the Archdeacon Eulalius in the Lateran Church; on the same, or the next day, a larger number met in the Church of S. Theodora, and elected the Presbyter Boniface. Three bishops, among whom was the Bishop of Ostia, either compelled, it was said, or, yielding through the weakness of extreme old Dec. 27, 28. age, consecrated Eulalius. Boniface was inaugurated by nine bishops, in the presence of seventy Double election. presbyters, in the Church of St. Marcellus.

Rome might apprehend the return of those terrible and bloody days which marked the elevation of Damasus. The Prefect of Rome was Symmachus, son of that eloquent orator who had defended with so much energy the lost cause of paganism. The outward conformity, at least, of Symmachus to Christianity may be presumed from the favor of Honorius; but it is curious to find a contest for the Papacy dependent for its decision on the son of such a father. Symmachus, in his report to the Emperor, inclines toward the party Eulalius. of Eulalius. Boniface was summoned to Ravenna. He delayed to obey the mandate, which reached him when he was performing his sacred functions without the city; the officers of the Prefect were maltreated by the populace of his party. The gates of Rome, therefore, were closed upon Boniface, and Jan. 6. Eulalius, in great state, amid the acclamations of part, at least, of the people, took possession of St. Peter's, the Capitol, as it were, of Christianity.

The party of Boniface were not inactive, or without influence at the court of Ravenna. The petition to the Emperor declared that all the Presbyters of Rome would accompany Boniface, to make known her will, or, rather, the judgment of God.¹ Honorius issued a Edict of Honorius. rescript, with supercilious impartiality commanding both prelates to remain at a distance from the city, until the cause should be decided by a synod of bishops from Italy, Gaul, and Africa. In the mean time, as the Roman people could not be deprived of the solemn rites of Easter, Achilleus, Bishop of Spoleto, was ordered to officiate during the vacancy.

¹ *Prelectis singulis Titulis, presbyteri omnes aderunt, qui voluntatem suam, hoc est, judicium Dei proloquantur. — Apud Baronium, sub ann. 419.*

Eulalius would not endure this sacrilegious usurpation of the powers of his see. He surprised by night, at the head of that part of the populace which was on his side, the Lateran Church; and in contempt of the Emperor's orders, celebrated the holy rites. But the days of successful conflict with the civil power were not yet come. The rashness of Eulalius estranged even Symmachus from his cause: ¹ this act was treated as one of rebellion. Eulalius was expelled from the city. He was threatened, as well as all the Mar. 18-28. clergy who adhered to him, with still more fearful penalties. The laity who communicated with Eulalius were to be punished, the higher orders with banishment and confiscation, slaves with death. The primates of the Regions of Rome were to be responsible for all popular tumults. Such was the commanding judgment of the Emperor.²

Boniface took possession without further contest of the Pontifical throne. He was the son of a Boniface Pope, Apr. 10. presbyter³ named Jocondus, a Roman by birth; he was an aged prelate, of mild and blameless character; wisely anxious to prevent, as far as possible, the scandals, and even crimes, in which he had been so nearly involved. He addressed the Emperor, urging the enactment of a law, a civil law, which should restrain ecclesiastical ambition, and coerce those who aspired to obtain by intrigue, what ought to be the reward of piety and holiness. Honorius issued an edict, that in case of a contested election both the rival candidates should be excluded from the office, and a new appointment made. Thus the Imperial power

¹ Symmachi rescript. apud Baron.

² See the rescript of Honorius, apud Baronium

³ Platin. vit. Bonifac.

assumed, and was acknowledged to possess, full authority to regulate the election of Bishops of Rome.¹ During the three years of the pontificate of Boniface, the Pelagian controversy was still drawing out its almost interminable length.

On the death of Boniface,² Eulalius refused to leave the seclusion into which he had retired ; the decline of life may have softened his ambition — for he died the Sept. 4, 422. following year. Celestine was elected, and ruled in peace the See of Rome. The Pontificates of Celestine I.³ and his successor Sixtus I.⁴ were occupied by the Nestorian controversy : occupied, but hardly disturbed. The East, as it has appeared, had stood aloof serene and unimpassioned throughout the Pelagian controversy ; in Palestine, the Latin Jerome alone, and his partisans the two Western bishops of doubtful fame, would not endure the presence of Pelagius. In Alexandria and Constantinople, Predestination, Grace, Free Will, excited no tumults, arrayed against each other no hostile factions, demanded no councils. The Bishop of Constantinople pronounced his authoritative decrees, which no one desired to question ; and expelled from his diocese Celestius, or Pelagius himself, whom no one cared to defend. They alone, of all powerful heresiarchs in Constantinople, neither distracted the Imperial court, nor maddened popular faction.

Latin Christianity contemplated with almost equal indifference Nestorianism, and all its prolific race, Eutychianism, Monophysitism, Mono-

Indifference
of the West.

¹ Rescriptum Honorii, apud Baronium.

² Boniface died Nov. 4, 422.

³ Celestine I., Nov. 10, 422 ; died July, 432.

⁴ Sixtus I., 432 ; died 440.

thelitism. While in this contest the two great Patriarchates of the East, Constantinople and Alexandria, brought to issue, or strove to bring to issue, their rival claims to ascendancy; while council after council promulgated, reversed, reënacted their conflicting decrees; while separate and hostile communities were formed in every region of the East; and the fears of persecuted Nestorianism, stronger than religious zeal, penetrated for refuge remote countries, into which Christianity had not yet found its way: in the West there was no Nestorian, or Eutychian sect. Some councils condemned, but with hardly an audible remonstrance, these uncongenial heresies: the doctrines are condemned, but there appears no body of heretics whom it is thought necessary to strike with the anathema.

In the East, religion ceased more and more to be an affair of pure religion. It was mingled up with all the intrigues of the Imperial court, with all the furies of faction in the great cities. The council was the arena, not merely for Christian doctrine, but for worldly ascendancy. Secular ambition could no longer be distinguished, nor could the warring prelates themselves distinguish it, from zeal for orthodoxy. Religious questions being decided by the favor of the Emperor, the Empress, or the ruling minister, eunuch or barbarian, that favor was sought by the most unscrupulous means — by intrigue, by adulation, by bribery; and these means became hallowed. There was no sacrifice with which Alexandria would not purchase superiority over Constantinople, or Constantinople over Alexandria: the rivalry of the sees darkened into the fiercest personal hostility.

In the mean time the Bishop of Rome, unembarrassed

with the intricacies of the question, which had no temptation for his more practical understanding, with the whole West participating in his comparative apathy, could sit, at a distance, a tranquil arbiter, and interfere only when he saw his own advantage, or when all parties, exasperated or wearied out, gladly submitted to any foreign or unpledged judgment. The Eastern prelates, too eager to destroy each other, were either blind to, or in the heat of mutual detestation disregarded this silent aggression, and admitted principles without suspicion fatal to their own independence.

On the nature of the Godhead the inexhaustible East had not yet nearly run the whole round of speculative thought; the Greek language still found new gradations on which it might employ its fine and subtile distinctiveness. All these controversies, which began anew with Nestorianism, sprang by lineal and unbroken descent from the great ancestral principle. The same Oriental tenet (however it may not, at first sight, be apparent) which gave birth to the various Gnostic sects, and to Manicheism, had lain at the root of Arianism,¹ now quickened into life Nestorianism and all its kindred race. Arianism had arisen out of that profound sense of the malignancy of matter, which in its grosser influence had led to

¹ Hist. of Christianity, vol. ii. p. 443. Add to the authorities there quoted this decisive passage from Arius himself, apud Athanas. xvi. de Syn. *εἰ δὲ τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἐκ γαστρὸς* (Psalm, cx. 3) *καὶ τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξηλθόν, καὶ ἦκω, ὡς μέρος αὐτοῦ ὁμοούσιον καὶ ὡς προβολὴ ὑπὸ τιῶν νοεῖται, σύνθετος ἔσται ὁ πατὴρ καὶ διαμετὸς καὶ τρεπτὸς καὶ σῶμα κατ' αὐτοῦς.* Arius accused his adversaries of destroying this pure spirituality of the Father, by asserting the *ὁμοούσια* of the Son. The Father became likewise composed of parts, divisible, mutable, corporeal, and to him this was an unanswerable argument.

the Manichean Dualism. The pure, primal, parental Deity must stand entirely aloof from all connection with that in which evil was inherent, inveterate, inextinguishable. This was the absolute essence of Deity; this undisturbed, unattainted Spiritualism, which disdained, repelled, abhorred the contact, the approximation of the Corporeal, which once assimilating to, or condescending to assume any of the attributes of Matter, ceased to be the Godhead.

By the triumph of the Athanasian Trinitarianism, and by the gradual dominance which it had ob-^{Trinitarian-}tained over the general mind of Christendom, ^{ism estab-}lished. the coequal and consubstantial Godhead in the Trinity had become an article of the universal creed in the Latin Church. Arianism survived only among the barbarians. The East adhered almost as generally to the Creed of Nicea. The Son, therefore, had become, if the expression may be ventured, more and more divine; he was more completely not merely assimilated, but absolutely identified, with the original, perfect, uncontaminated Godhead. Yet his descent into the material world, his admixture with the external, the sensible, the created — his assumption of the form and being of man (which all agreed to be essential to the Christian scheme, not in seeming alone, according to the Docetic notion, but actually and really) — must be guarded by the same jealousy of infecting his pure and spiritual essence by the earthly contagion: that which would have been fatal to the spirituality of the Father, might endanger the same prerogative of the Son. The divine and human nature could not indeed be kept separate, but they must be united with the least possible sacrifice of their essential at-

tributes. If (according to Nestorius) the Eternal and Coequal Word were *born*, this was a denial of his preëxistence; and to assert that he could be liable to passion or suffering,¹ in the same manner violated the pure spirituality of the Godhead. He proposed, therefore, that the appellation, Christ, should be confined, and, as it were, kept sacred, as signifying the Being, composed of the blended, yet unconfounded, God and man; and that the Virgin should be the mother of Christ, the God-man, not the mother of God, of the unassociated divinity.² This is the key to the whole controversy. Never was there a case in which the contending parties approximated so closely. Both subscribed, both appealed to the Nicene Creed; both admitted the preëxistence, the impassibility of the Eternal Word; but the fatal duty, which the Christians in that age, and unhappily in subsequent ages, have imposed upon themselves, of considering the detection of heresy the first of religious obligations, mingled, as it now was, with human passions and interests, made the breach irreparable. Men like Cyril of Alexandria, in whom religion might seem to have inflamed and embittered, instead of allaying, the worst passions of our nature, pride, ambition, cruelty, rapacity; and Councils like that of Ephesus, with all the tumult and violence without the dignity of a senate or popular assembly, convulsed the East, and led to a fierce and irreconcilable schism.

The stern repudiation of the term, the Mother of God, encountered another sentiment, which had been rapidly growing up, as one of the

Worship of
the Virgin.

¹ Patibilis.

² Χριστοτοκός, not Θεοτοκός.

dominant influences of the Christian mind. The worship of the Virgin had arisen from the confluence of many pure and gentle, and many natural feelings. The reverence for everything connected with the Redeemer, especially by ties so close and tender, would not with cold jealousy watch and limit its ardent language. The more absolute deification, if it may be so said, of Christ; the forgetfulness of his humanity induced by his investment in more remote and awful Godhead,—created a want of some more kindred and familiar object of adoration. The worship of the intermediate saints admitted that of the Virgin as its least dangerous, most affecting, most consolatory part. The exquisite beauty and purity of the images, the Virgin Mother and the Divine Infant, though not as yet embodied in the highest art, by painting or sculpture, appealed to the unreasoning and unsuspecting heart. To this was added, the superior influence with which Christianity had invested the female sex, and which naturally clung to this gentler and kindred object of adoring love. In one of the earliest documents relating to this controversy, the honor conferred on the female sex by the birth of the Lord from the Virgin Mary is dwelt upon in glowing terms: woman's glory is inseparably connected with that of the Virgin Mother. The power exercised by females at the court of Constantinople, now by the sisters and wives, the Pulcherias and Eudoxias, at other times, by the mothers of Emperors, the Helenas and Ireneas, as in some degree springing from Christianity, was strengthened by, and in its turn strengthened, this adoration of the Virgin Mary, which interposed itself between that of Christ, and

still more that of God the Father, and the worshipping Christian.

With this view accords the whole course of the Promotion of history. On the death of Sisinnius Bishop Nestorius, A.D. 428. of Constantinople, the Emperor, the younger Theodosius, to terminate the intrigues and factions among the clergy of the city, summoned Nestorius from Antioch to the Episcopal Throne of the Eastern Rome.¹ Nestorius appeared, simple in his dress, grave in his demeanor, pale and meagre from ascetic observances, and with the fame of surpassing eloquence.² He revived to the expecting city the fond remembrance of Chrysostom, who, like him, had been called from Antioch to Constantinople.³ The Golden Mouth was again to appall and delight the city. But the religion of Chrysostom, from its strong practical character, had escaped that speculative tinge which seemed natural to the Syrian mind. The last lingering vestiges of Gnosticism survived in Syria. Arius, though not a Syrian Presbyter, found his most ardent adherents in that province; and now from the same quarter sprang this new theory, which, though it rested its claim to orthodoxy on its irreconcilable hostility to Arianism, grew out of the same principle.

Anastasius, a presbyter, who accompanied Nestorius from Antioch, first sounded the clarion of Commence-ment of Nestorianism, A.D. 429. strife and confusion. He publicly preached that it was improper and even impious to

¹ Nestorius was a Syrian, a native of Germanicia. — Socrat. vii. 29. Theodoret, Hæret. Fab. iv. 12. Simeon Batharsam. apud Assemanni, Biblioth. Orient. i. 346.

² Tantâ antea opinione vixisti, ut tuis te aliena civitas invideret. Such is the honorable testimony borne to the character of Nestorius by Pope Celestine. — Epistol. ad Nestor., Mansi, iv. 1206.

³ Cassian De Incarn. vii. 30. Tillemont, page 286.

address the Virgin Mary as the Mother of God. The indignation and excitement of the city was heightened by fast-spreading rumors, that the Bishop not merely refused to silence the sacrilegious Presbyter, but openly avowed the same opinion.¹ As is usual, the subtle distinctions of Nestorius were unheard or unintelligible to the common ear. He proscribed an appellation to which the pulpits and the services of the Church had habituated the general mind. The tenet jarred upon the high-strung sensitiveness of an inveterate faith, and awoke resentment, on which the finest argument was lost. In the great Metropolitan Church the Bishop delivered a sermon on the Incar-
Sermons of Nestorius.
 nation of the Lord.² As an orator he placed his own theory in the most brilliant light. He dwelt on the omnipotence, the glory, and all the transcendent attributes of God the Creator, and of God the Redeemer. "And can this God have a mother?"³ "The heathen notion of a God born of a mortal mother is directly confuted by St. Paul, who declares the Lord without father and without mother. Could a creature bear the Uncreated? Could the Word which was with the Father before the worlds, become a new-born infant? The human nature alone was born of the Virgin: that which is of the flesh is flesh.⁴ The manhood was the instrument of the divine purposes, the outward and visible vesture of the Invisible. God was incarnate, indeed, but God died not; his death was but casting off the weeds of mortality, which he had assumed for a time." A second

¹ Socrates, H. E. vii. 29, 32.

² Socrates, H. E. vii. 32. Evagrius, i. 2. Liberatus, Breviar. c. 4

³ Socrates, ut supra.

⁴ Marius Mercator, edit. Garnier, ii. p. 5.

and a third sermon followed, in which Nestorius still further unfolded his opinions: "Like can but bear like; a human mother can only bear a human being. God was not born — he dwelt in that which was born; the Divinity underwent not the slow process of growth and development during the nine months of pregnancy." But the more perplexing and subtle are arguments addressed to those whose judgment is already ratified by their passions, they only inflame resentment instead of working conviction. The whole city was in an uproar; every ecclesiastical rule broken asunder. The presbyters, in every quarter, preached against their bishop; and a bold monk (the monks were always the faithful representatives of the religious passions of their age) forbade the Bishop, as an obstinate heretic, to approach the altar. Nestorius (and in all his subsequent afflictions it must be remembered that, when in power, he scrupled not to persecute) did not bear these insults with Christian equanimity, or repress them with calm dignity. The refractory priests and the tumultuous people were seized, tried, and scourged more cruelly than in a land of barbarians. Nestorius, it is said, with his own hand, struck the presumptuous monk, and then made him over to the officers, who flogged him through the streets, with a crier going before to proclaim his offence, and then cast him out of the city.¹

¹ This is the account indeed of a partisan — the report of Basilius to the Emperor Theodosius. Labbe, Concil. But his whole history shows the persecuting spirit of Nestorius:—"The fifth day after his consecration he endeavored to deprive the Arians of their church: they burned it down in despair. He was called by his enemies Nestorius the Incendiary." Socrat. vii. 29. He excited also a violent persecution against the Novatians, Quarto-decimans and Macedonians.—Ibid. et c. 31. The most damning fact against him, however, is his own boast that he procured

Nestorius found in Constantinople itself a more dangerous antagonist. On a festival in honor of the Virgin, Proclus Bishop of Cyzicum (an unsuccessful rival, it is said, of Nestorius for the Metropolitan See) delivered a passionate appeal to the dominant feeling. The worship of the Virgin, in the most poetic ages of Christianity, has hardly surpassed the images which Proclus poured forth in lavish profusion in honor of the Mother of God. "Earth and sea did homage to the Virgin, the sea smoothing its serene waters, earth conducting the secure travellers who thronged to her festival. Nature exulted, and womankind was glorified." "We are assembled in honor of the Mother of God" (the appellation condemned by Nestorius); "the spotless treasure-house of virginity; the spiritual paradise of the second Adam; the workshop, in which the two natures were annealed together; the bridal chamber in which the Word wedded the flesh; the living bush of nature, which was unharmed by the fire of the divine birth; the light cloud which bore Him which sate between the Cherubim; the stainless fleece, bathed in the dews of Heaven, with which the Shepherd clothed his sheep; the handmaid and the mother, the Virgin and Heaven;" — and so on through a wild labyrinth of untranslatable meta-

an imperial law of the utmost severity against all heretics: *Ego, certe legem inter ipsa meæ ordinationis initia contra eos, qui Christum purum hominem dicunt, et contra reliquas hæreses innovavi.* Mansi, v. 731 or 763. For the Law, see *Cod. Theodos. de Hæret.* Vincentius Lirinensis writes of Nestorius, *Ut uni hæresi aditum patefaceret, cunctarum hæreseon blasphemias insectabatur.* — *Commonit. c. 16.* Nestorius was in character a monk, without humility. "Give me (such is the speech ascribed to him as addressed to the Emperor) a world freed from heresy, and I will give you the kingdom of heaven. Aid me in subduing the heretics, I will aid you in routing the Persians."

phor.¹ The cloudy opening cleared off into something like argument; it became an elaborate reply to Nestorius, the declaration of war from one who felt his strength in the popular feeling.

But the war was not confined to Constantinople; it involved the whole East. Now rushed forward an adversary far more formidable in station, in ability, in that character for Christian orthodoxy of doctrine which then hallowed every act, even every crime, but from which true Christianity would avert its sight in shame and anguish, that such a champion should be accepted as the representative of the Gospel of peace and love. Cyril of Alexandria, to those who esteem the stern and uncompromising assertion of certain Christian tenets the one paramount Christian virtue, may be the hero, even the saint: but while ambition, intrigue, arrogance, rapacity, and violence are proscribed as unchristian means — barbarity, persecution, bloodshed as unholy and unevangelic wickednesses — posterity will condemn the orthodox Cyril as one of the worst of heretics against the spirit of the Gospel. Who would not meet the judgment of the Divine Redeemer loaded with the errors of Nestorius, rather than with the barbarities of Cyril?

Cyril was the nephew of Theophilus, Patriarch of Alexandria, the worthy successor to the see and to the character of that haughty and unscrupulous pre-

¹ This sermon of Proclus (to be found Labbe, Concil. sub ann.) is said, in the ancient preface, to have been delivered in the great church, in the presence of Nestorius. Nestorius appears to have answered this attack with moderation. In dieser ganzer Rede (the answer of Nestorius) herrschet so viel Bescheidenheit, als gewiss in andern polemischen Schriften dieses Zeitalters kaum angetroffen wird. — Walch, p. 376.

ate, the enemy of Chrysostom. Jealousy and animosity towards the Bishop of Constantinople was a sacred legacy bequeathed by Theophilus to his nephew, and Cyril faithfully administered the fatal trust. He inherited even the bitter personal hatred of Chrysostom; refused to concur in the general respect for his memory, and in the reversal, after his death, of the unjust sentence of deposition from his see. He scrupled not to call the eloquent, and in all religious tenets and principles absolutely blameless Christian orator, a second Judas.¹ The general voice of Christendom alone compelled him to desist from this posthumous persecution. Nor was Cyril content without surpassing his haughty kinsman in the pretensions of his archiepiscopate. From his accession, observes the ecclesiastical historian of the time, the bishops of Alexandria aspired, far beyond the limits of the sacerdotal power, to rule with sovereign authority.² They confronted, and, as will appear, contended on equal terms and with the same weapons, against the Imperial magistracy.³

The first act of Cyril's episcopacy was that of a persecutor. He closed the churches of the Novatians, seized and confiscated all their sacred treasures, and stripped the bishop of all his possessions. The war which he commenced against the heretics he continued against the Jews and heathens. But the numerous and wealthy Jews of Alexandria, who multiplied as fast as they

¹ Epist. ad Attic. apud Labbe, 204.

² Καὶ γὰρ ἐξ ἐκείνου ἡ ἐπισκόπη Ἀλεξανδρείας, παρὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς τάξεως καταδυναστεύειν τῶν πραγμάτων ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχὴν. Socrat. H. E. vii. 7.

³ Ibid. loc. cit.

were diminished by their own feuds or feuds with the Christians, were not to be oppressed so easily as a small and unpopular sect of Christians. Cyril must have been well acquainted with the fierce and violent temperament of the Alexandrian populace, and with their proverbial character, that their factions never ended without bloodshed.¹ But Cyril had himself too much of the hot Egyptian blood in his veins; and the bishop, instead of allaying this sanguinary propensity by the gentle and humanizing influences of Christianity, was rarely the last to raise the banner of strife, never the first to lay it down, never laid it down until his enemies were prostrate at his feet. Both Jews and Christians in Alexandria had so far departed from the primitive habits of their religion, that their most frequent and dangerous collisions took place in the theatre; and the drama, in its noblest form a part of the pagan religion, had now degenerated into such immodest or savage exhibitions, or in itself gave rise to such maddening factions that, instead of allaying hostile feelings by the common amusement and hilarity, it inflamed them to fiercer animosity.² The contested merits of a pantomimic actor now exasperated the mutual hatred of the religious parties. Orestes, the prefect of the city, determined to suppress these tumults, and ordered strict police regulations to that effect to be hung up in the theatre. Certain partisans of the archbishop entered the theatre, with the innocent design, it is said, of

¹ Δίχα γὰρ αἵματος οὐ παύεται τῆς ὄρμης. Socrat. vii. 13.

² These entertainments usually took place on the Jewish Sabbath, and on that idle day the theatre was thronged with Jews, who preferred this profane amusement to the holy worship of their Synagogue.—Hist. of Jews, iii. 199.

reading this proclamation. Among these was one Hierax, a low schoolmaster, a man conspicuous as an admirer of Cyril, whom he was wont (according to common usage in the church) to applaud vehemently whenever he preached. From what cause is not quite clear, the Jews supposed themselves insulted by the presence of Hierax;¹ they raised a violent outcry that the man was there only to stir up a tumult. Orestes, jealous, it is said, of the archbishop on account of his encroachments on the civil authority, sided with the Jews, ordered Hierax to be seized as a disturber of the peace and publicly scourged. The archbishop sent for the principal Jews, and threatened them with exemplary vengeance, if they did not cause all tumults against the Christians to cease. The Jews determined to anticipate the menace of their adversaries. Having put on rings of palm bark, in order to distinguish each other in the dark, they suddenly, at the dead of night, raised a cry that the great church, called that of Alexander, was on fire. The Christians rose and rushed from all quarters to save the church. The Jews fell upon them and massacred on all sides. When day dawned, the cause of the uproar was manifest. The archbishop placed himself at the head of a formidable force, attacked the synagogue of the Jews, expelled the whole race, no doubt not without much bloodshed, from the city, and allowed the populace to pillage all their vast wealth. The Jews, who from the time of Alexander had inhabited the city, were thus cast forth

¹ My suggestion, in a former work, that these regulations might have appointed different days for the different races of the people to attend the theatre, would make the story more clear. The excuse which Socrates suggests for the presence of Hierax implies that he had no business there.

naked and outraged from its walls. The strong part which Orestes took against the archbishop, and his regret at the expulsion of so many thriving and opulent Jews from the city, warrant the suspicion that their rising was not without great provocation. Both parties sent representations to the Emperor: in the interval Cyril was compelled by the people of Alexandria to make overtures of reconciliation.¹ On one occasion he went forth to meet Orestes with the Gospel in his hand: the prefect, probably supposing that he had not much of its spirit in his heart, refused his advances.

The monks of the Nitrian desert had already been employed in the persecutions by Theophilus. Monks of Nitria. These fiery champions of the Church took arms, to the number of five hundred, and poured into the city to strengthen the faction of the patriarch. They surrounded the chariot of the prefect, insulted him, and heaped on him the opprobrious names of heathen and idolater. The prefect protested, but in vain, that he had been baptized by Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople. One of these monks, named Ammonius, hurled a great stone and struck him on the head; the blood gushed forth, and his affrighted attendants fled on all sides. But the character of Orestes stood high with the people. The Alexandrians rose in defence of their magistrate; the monks were driven from the city; Ammonius seized, tortured, and put to death. Cyril commanded his body to be taken up: the honors of a Christian martyr were prostituted on this insolent ruffian; his panegyric was pronounced in the Church, and he was named Thaumasius, the Won-

¹ Τοῦτο γὰρ ὁ λαὸς τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων αὐτὸν ποιεῖν κατηνάγκαζεν
Socrat. loc. cit.

derful. But the more Christian of the Christians were shocked at the conduct of the Archbishop. Cyril was for once ashamed, and glad to bury the affair in oblivion.

But before long his adherents were guilty of a more atrocious and an unprovoked crime, of the guilt of which a deep suspicion attached to Cyril. All Alexandria respected, honored, took pride in the celebrated Hypatia. Hypatia. She was a woman of extraordinary learning; in her was centered the lingering knowledge of that Alexandrian Platonism cultivated by Plotinus and his school. Her beauty was equal to her learning; her modesty commended both. She mingled freely with the philosophers without suspicion to her lofty and unblemished character. Hypatia lived in great intimacy with the prefect Orestes; the only charge whispered against her was that she encouraged him in his hostility to the patriarch. Cyril, on the other hand, is said not to have been superior to an unworthy jealousy at the greater concourse of hearers to the lectures of the elegant Platonist than to his own sermons.¹ Some of Cyril's ferocious partisans seized this woman, dragged her from her chariot, and with the most revolting indecency tore her clothes off, and then rent her limb from limb.² The Christians of Alexandria did this, professing to be actuated by Christian zeal in the cause of a Christian prelate. No wonder, in the words of the ecclesiastical historian, that by such a deed a deep stain was fixed on Cyril and the Church of Alexandria.³

¹ Socrates, H. E. vii. 13.

² Damascius apud Suidam.

³ Τοῦτο οὐ μικρὸν μῶμον Κυρίλλῳ, καὶ τῇ Ἀλεξανδρεῶν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐργασίαι. Socrat. loc. cit.

It was this man who now stood forth as the head and representative of Eastern Christendom, the assertor of pure Christian doctrine, the antagonist of heresy on the episcopal throne of Constantinople. Cyril was not blind to the advantage offered by this opportunity of humiliating or crushing by this odious imputation the Bishop of the Imperial See, which aspired to dispute with Alexandria the primacy of the East. The patriarchs of Alexandria had seen the rise of Constantinople with undissembled jealousy. To this primacy Antioch, perhaps Jerusalem, might advance some pretensions. Ephesus boasted of her connection with St. John. But Byzantium had been a poor see under the jurisdiction of Heraclea; its claim rested entirely on the city having become the seat of empire. This jealousy had been, no doubt, the latent cause of the bitter and persevering hostility of Theophilus towards Chrysostom. The more ambitious Cyril might now renew the contest with less suspicion of unworthy motives; he was waging war, not against a rival, but against a heretic.

The intelligence of the disturbances in Constantinople and the unpopular doctrines favored at least by Nestorius spread rapidly to Alexandria; the monks of both regions probably maintained a close correspondence. Cyril commenced his operations by an Easter sermon, in which, without introducing the name of Nestorius, he denounced his doctrines. He followed up the blow with four epistles, at certain intervals: one addressed to his faithful partisans, the monks of Egypt; one to the Emperor; one to the Empress mother, the guardian of her son; the last to Nestorius himself. The address to the Emperor commences in

an Oriental tone of adulation, the servility of which would have been as abhorrent to an ancient Roman as its impiety to a primitive Christian. The Emperor is the image of God upon earth: as the Divine Majesty fills heaven and awes the angels, so his serene dignity the earth, and is the source of all human happiness. This emperor was the feeble boy, Theodosius II. To the Empresses, the mother and the sister of Theodosius, as more worthy auditors, and judges better qualified to enter on such high mysteries, Cyril pours out all the treasures of his theology. In the letter to Nestorius, who, it seems, had taken offence at the dissemination of the address to the Egyptian monks in Constantinople, Cyril states, with some calmness, that the whole Christian world, Rome, Syria, Alexandria, were equally shocked by the denial of the title "Mother of God" to the Blessed Virgin.¹ This epistle was followed by a second, which called forth an answer from Nestorius. This answer, as well as the whole of the controversy, more completely betrays the leading notions which had obtained such full possession of the mind of Nestorius. The Godhead, as immaterial, is essentially impassible. The coeternal Word must be impassible, as the coeternal Father.² The human

¹ Labbe, Concil. iii. p. 51.

² Καὶ τὸν θεῖον ἐκείνον τῶν πατέρων εὐρήσεις χορὸν, οὐ τὴν ὁμοούσιον θεότητα παθητὴν εἰρήκοτα, οὐδε ἀναστῆσαν τὸν λελυμένον ναδν ἀναστήσαντα. Epist. Nestor., apud Labbe, p. 321. Τὸν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις ἀπαθῆ, κηρύχθεντα, καὶ δευτέρας γεννήσεως ἄδεκτον, πάλιν παθητὸν, καὶ νεόκτιστον οὐκ ὀδ' ὅπως εἰσηγεν, p. 322. This is throughout the point at issue. Compare the third part (in the Concil. Labbe) containing the twelve chapters of Cyril, the objections of the Oriental prelates, and the apology of Cyril for each separate chapter. The one party contend against the passibility, the mutability of the Godhead; Christ being God, is ἀπαθῆς καὶ ἠναλλοίωτος. The flesh, which endured all the passion and the change,

nature was the temple in which dwelt the serene and impassive Divinity. To degrade the Divinity to the brute and material processes of gestation, birth, passion, death, the inalienable accidents of the flesh and the flesh alone, was pure heathenism, or a heresy worse than that of Arius or Apollinaris. Cyril himself is driven by this difficulty to the very verge of Nestorian opinions, and to admit that the Godhead cannot properly be asserted to have suffered wounds and death.¹ But throughout this age the strong repulsive power of religious difference subdues the feebler attractive force of conciliation and peace. The epistolary altercation between Cyril and Nestorius grew fiercer, and with less hope of reconcilment. Nestorius, though he might not foresee the formidable confederacy which was organizing itself against him, might yet have known on what dangerous ground he stood even in Constantinople. The clergy of both factions, who had engaged in the strife for the advancement of Philippus or of Proclus, the rivals of the ruling archbishop for the see, mutually indignant at the intrusion of a stranger, were already combined in hatred towards Nestorius. All the monks were furious partisans of the "Mother of God." Against

State of Constantinople.

was intimately connected with the Deity; was its pavilion, its dwelling-place; and this may explain "The Word became Flesh." Compare pp. 844, 881, 892.

¹ Cyril was reduced to the expression *ἀπαθῶς ἔπαθε*. We find, too, this remarkable passage: *οὐχ ὅτι πάλιν αὐτὸς ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ κατὰ φύσιν γεννηθεὶς λόγος ἀπέθανεν, ἢ ἐνύχθη τῇ λόγῃ εἰς τὴν πλευρὰν, ποίαν γὰρ ἔχει, εἶπε μοι, πλευρὰν τὸ σῶματον, ἢ πῶς ἂν ἀπέθανεν ἡ ζωὴ· ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐνώθεις τῇ σαρκί, εἶτα πασχούσης αὐτῆς, ὡς τοῦ ἰδίου πάσχοντος σώματος, ἄντος πρὸς ἑαυτὸν οἰκειοῦται τὸ παθῆς*. In the Alexandrian Liturgy of S. Gregory, this expression has been introduced, *καὶ παθῶν ἐκουσίως σαρκί, καὶ μείνας ἀπαθῆς ὡς θεός*. Apud Renaudot, I. p. 114.

this confederacy Nestorius could array only the precarious favor of the Emperor, the support of some of his Syrian brethren, his archiepiscopal authority, and the allegiance of some of his clergy. Nestorius rashly precipitated the strife. Dorotheus, a bishop of his party, in his presence pronounced a solemn anathema on all who should apply the contested appellation to the Virgin.¹ A fiery and injurious protest² was immediately issued, professing to speak the sentiments of the whole clergy of Constantinople, and peremptorily condemning the bishop, as guilty of heresy, and comparing his language to the unpopular and proscribed opinions of Paul of Samosata. It was read in most of the churches.³

Both parties, Nestorius and Cyril themselves, could not but look with earnest solicitude to Rome. Both parties turn to Rome. She held the balance of power. If the Bishop of Rome had been the most unambitious of mankind, he could hardly have declined the arbitration, which was almost an acknowledgment of his supremacy. Nothing tended more to his elevation in the mind of Christendom than these successive Eastern controversies, if considered only as affecting his dignity in the eyes of the world. The deeper the East was sunk in anarchy and confusion, the more commanding the stately superiority of Rome. While the episcopal throne of Constantinople had been held in succession

¹ The chronology of the events is not quite clear, but this seems to be the natural order.

² This protest preserves some of the expressions attributed to Nestorius. "How could a mother, born in time, give birth to him who was before the ages?" The word "birth," it occurred to neither party was used in directly opposite senses.

³ Compare the strong address of the monks to the emperor, p. 225.

by the persecuted Chrysostom, by the heretic Nestorius, as it was afterwards by Flavianus, who, if not murdered, died of ill usage in a council of bishops; that of Alexandria by Theophilus, and his nephew Cyril, whose violence disgraced their orthodoxy; a succession of able, at least blameless, Pontiffs of Rome was now about to close with Leo the Great.¹

Each, too, of these Eastern antagonists for ascendancy was disposed to admit one part of the claims on which rested the supremacy of Rome. Alexandria, that of the descent from St. Peter: ancient and apostolic origin was so clearly wanting to Constantinople, that on this point the Roman superiority was undeniable. On her side, Constantinople was content to recognize the title of Rome to superiority as the city of the Cæsars, from whence followed her own secondary, if not coequal dignity as New Rome.

Celestine, of Roman birth, who had held high language to the Churches of Africa and of Gaul, at this present period was bishop of Rome.

Nestorius was the first who endeavored to propitiate the Roman Pontiff. Some misunderstanding had already arisen between them concerning certain Pelagians, the only heretics whom Nestorius was slow to persecute; and whom, as if ignorant how obnoxious they were to Rome and the West, he had treated with something of Eastern indifference. He addressed to Celestine a letter, fully explaining the grounds of his aversion to the term "Mother of God." This he wrote in Greek; it was sent into Gaul, to be correctly translated by the famous monk Cassianus.²

¹ Not immediate succession, but the succession of the greater names.

² Celestinus ad Nestorium. Walch rather throws doubt on this translation by Cassian, p. 433.

In the mean time arrived the Deacon Posidonius from Alexandria, with an elaborate letter from Cyril,¹ which, with the Sermons of Nestorius, he had the forethought to send already translated into Latin. Thus the hostile representations of Cyril, though delivered last, obtained the advantage of preoccupying the minds of the Roman clergy.²

To them, indeed, the Nestorian opinions were utterly uncongenial, as to the whole of Western Christendom. They had not comprehended and could not comprehend that sensitive dread of the contamination of the Deity by its connection with Matter: they were equally jealous of any disparagement of the Virgin Mary. Already her name, with the title of Mother of God, had sounded in hymns ascribed to St. Ambrose, and admitted into the public service. The Latin language was not flexible to all the fine shades of expression by which Nestorius defined his distinctive differences from the common creed.

Still Nestorius was not entirely without hope of obtaining a favorable hearing from Celestine. The first reply of the Roman was not devoid of courtesy. But his hopes were in a short time utterly confounded. A synod of Western Bishops, presided over by Celestine, met at Rome. The sentence A. D. 430.
August. was decisive, condemnatory, imperious. Celestine, in the name of the Synod, and in his own,³ Mandate of
Celestine. commanded Nestorius to recant his novel and

¹ Posidonius was instructed not to deliver the letters of Cyril, if those of Nestorius had not been delivered to Celestine. — Statement of Peter the Presbyter, Concil. Ephes. in init.

² Nestorius bitterly complained of the misrepresentations of Cyril in this letter, by which he deceived Celestine, a man of too great simplicity to judge of religious doctrines with sufficient acuteness. — Irenæi Traged. in Synodic.

³ Φανερά καὶ ἑγγράφῳ ὁμολογία. p. 361.

unauthorized opinions in a public and written apology within ten days from the arrival of the monition: in Aug. 11. case of disobedience, he was to hold himself under excommunication from the Church.¹

This haughty mandate to Nestorius was accompanied by an address to the clergy and people of Constantinople. It expressed the parental care of Celestine for their spiritual welfare, and announced the decree which had been issued against Nestorius by the Bishop of Rome. The Western Church would take no account of any anathema or excommunication pronounced by the Bishop of Constantinople; but having declared such anathema null and void, would continue to communicate with all persons under such interdict. And because the presence of Celestine in the East, however necessary, was impossible, on account of the distance by land and sea, he delegated his full power in the affair to his brother Cyril, in order to arrest the spreading pestilence.²

The Syrian bishops alone, of those who, from their station and character, had weight in the Christian world, were yet uncommitted in the strife, Acacius of Berea, the Patriarchs of Jerusalem and of Antioch. Each party courted their support. Cyril, with his usual activity, urged them to unite in the confederacy against Nestorius. Either from the sincere love of peace, or some clearer perception of the principles on which Nestorius grounded his opinions, or some secret sympathy with them,

Bishops of
Syria.

¹ Epist. Cyrill. p. 396.

² Καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἐν τηλικούτῳ πράγματι ἡ ἡμετέρα σχεδὸν παρουσία ἀναγκαία ἐφαίνετο, τὴν ἡμετέραν διαδοχὴν, διὰ τὰ κατὰ θαλάτταν καὶ γῆν διαστήματα, αὐτῷ τῷ ἀγίῳ ἀδελφῷ μου Κυρίλλῳ ἀπενείμαμεν, μὴ αὐτῇ ἡ νόσος ἀφορμῇ τῆς μακρότητος ἐπίτριβῃ. Epist. Cyril. p. 373.

these bishops endeavored to allay the storm. John of Antioch, in a letter full of Christian persuasiveness, entreated Nestorius not to plunge Christendom into discord on account of a word, and that word not incapable of being interpreted in his sense, but which had become familiar to the Christian ear: Rome, Alexandria, even Macedonia, had declared against him. John required no degrading concession, no disingenuous compromise or suppression of opinion. If his enemies were strong and violent before the correspondence had begun with Rome and Alexandria, how would their boldness increase after these unhappy letters¹ from Cyril and from Celestine! But the time for reconciliation was passed. Four bishops, Theopemptus, Daniel, Potamon, and Komarius, arrived in Constantinople, with the ultimate demands of Rome and Alexandria. They entered, after divine service, the Bishop's chamber, where were assembled the whole clergy, and many of the most distinguished laity: they delivered the letters to Nestorius. Nestorius received them coldly, and commanded them to return the next day for the answer. The next day when they presented themselves, they were refused admission.² Nestorius ascended the pulpit, and preached in sterner and more condemnatory language than before. Celestine and Cyril had demanded unqualified submission: Cyril had declared that it was not enough to subscribe the

Celestine's
envoys in
Constanti-
nople.

¹ Γραμμάτων τούτων τῶν ἀπεικτῶν. Epist. Joan. Antioch. p. 393. Nestorius had almost consented to yield so far as to assert that it was not so much the word itself as the abuse of it which was irreconcilable with his views of the Godhead.

² The account of this transaction is given by the Bishops Theopemptus and the rest.

Creed of Nicea, without receiving the sense of that Creed according to the interpretation of the Bishops of the Church. The twelve articles of excommunication were promulgated, by the zeal of the Bishop's adversaries, throughout Constantinople. But Nestorius, unappalled, on his side launched forth his interdict; anathema encountered anathema. Nestorius excluded from salvation those who denied salvation to him. For in the awful meaning which the act of excommunication conveyed to the Christian mind of that age, it meant total exclusion, unless after humiliating penitence, and hard-wrung absolution, from the mercy of the Most High,—inevitable, everlasting damnation.

With stern serenity the enemies of Nestorius contemplate these awful consequences; those of worldly strife they behold almost with satisfaction. Cyril applies to these times the much misused words of the Saviour, — “*Think not that I am come to send peace upon earth: for I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother.*” If faith be infringed—faith even in these minutest points—away with idle and dangerous reverence for parents; cast off all love of children and of brethren. Death is better than life to the pious (those who adhere to the orthodox opinions), for to them alone is the better resurrection.¹

The anathemas of Nestorius are not less remorseless. They also aim at involving Cyril in the odious charge of heresy. Throughout is man-

¹ Πίστewς γὰρ ἀδικουμένης * * * ἐβρέτω μὲν ὡς ἔωλος καὶ ἐπισφαλῆς ἡ πρὸς γονεῶς αἰδῶς ἠρεμεῖτω δὲ καὶ ὁ τῆς εἰς τέκνα καὶ ἀδελφοὺς φιλοστοργίας νόμος. Cyril. Epist. p. 396.

ifest the peculiar jealousy of Nestorius lest he should mingle up the Deity in any way with the material flesh of man. Christ was the Emmanuel, the God with us. The Divinity assumed at his birth the mortal form and attributes, and so became the Christ, the co-existent God and man. The Christ laid aside the manhood, which he had associated to his divinity, after his death and resurrection. Accursed is he who asserts that the Word of God was changed into flesh. Accursed is he who disparages the dignity of the divine nature by attributing to it the acts and passions of the human nature which it assumed for the display of its Godhead.¹

The secret of the undaunted courage shown by Nestorius was soon revealed. He had still un-^{His influence at Court.}shaken possession of the mind of the Imperial Court. The triumph of Cyril was arrested by an humiliating rescript from Theodosius. He was arraigned not merely for disturbing the peace of the world, but even that of the Imperial family. The rescript addressed to Cyril, in unambiguous language, relates his haughty and dictatorial demeanor, reproves him as the author of all the strife and confusion which disturbed the tranquillity of the Church. In order to sow dissension even in the palace, Cyril had written in different language to his august sister Pulcheria, and to the Empress and himself. The same curious, restless, insolent, and unpriestly spirit had led him to pry into the

¹ The anathemas of Nestorius are extant only in a bad Latin translation. It is curious to find the Syrian bishop, Acacius, urging that the poverty of the Latin language prevented it from forming expressions with regard to the Trinity equivalent to the Greek. *Τῷ ἐστενωδῶσαι τὴν Ῥωμαικὴν φωνήν, καὶ μὴ δύνασθαι πρὸς τὴν ἡμετερὰν τῶν Γραικῶν φρασὶν τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις λέγειν.* Epist. Acac. p. 384.

secrets and disturb the harmony of the Imperial family, as well as to confound the quiet of the Church, as though this confusion were his only means of obtaining fame and distinction.¹

Theodosius had already acceded to the universal demand for a General Council. This alone, according to the opinion of the time, could allay the intestine strife which had set Rome and Alexandria at variance with Constantinople, divided Constantinople into fierce and violent factions, and appeared likely to renew the fatal differences of the Arian and Macedonian contests. The Imperial summons was issued, and in obedience to that mandate assembled the first General Council of Ephesus.

It might have been supposed that nowhere would Christianity appear in such commanding majesty as in a Council, which should gather from all quarters of the world the most eminent prelates and the most distinguished clergy; that a lofty and serene piety would govern all their proceedings, profound and dispassionate investigation exhaust every subject; human passions and interests would stand rebuked before that awful assembly; the sense of their own dignity as well as the desire of impressing their brethren with the solemnity and earnestness of their belief would at least exclude all intemperance of manner and language. Mutual awe and mutual emulation in Christian excellence would repress, even in the most violent, all un-Christian violence. Their conclusions would be grave, mature, harmonious, for if not harmo-

¹ Καὶ μὴ γεγονός (hostility in the Imperial family) ποιῆσαι βούλεσθαι παντός, μᾶλλον ἢ ἱερέως· ὁρμῆς μέντοι μῶς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς προθεσέως τὰ τε τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, τὰ τε τῶν βασιλέων μέλλειν χωρίζειν βούλεσθαι, ὡς οὐκ ὀψης ἀφορμῆς ἐτέρας εὐδοκίμησεως. Sacr. Theodos. Imper. ad Cyrill.

nious the confuted party would hardly acquiesce in the wisdom of their decrees; even their condemnations would be so tempered with charity as gradually to win back the wanderer to the still open fold, rather than drive him, proscribed and branded, into inflexible and irreconcilable schism. History shows the melancholy reverse. Nowhere is Christianity less attractive, and, if we look to the ordinary tone and character of the proceedings, less authoritative, than in the Councils of the Church. It is in general a fierce collision of two rival factions, neither of which will yield, each of which is solemnly pledged against conviction. Intrigue, injustice, violence, decisions on authority alone, and that the authority of a turbulent majority, decisions by wild acclamation rather than after sober inquiry, detract from the reverence, and impugn the judgments, at least of the later Councils. The close is almost invariably a terrible anathema, in which it is impossible not to discern the tones of human hatred, of arrogant triumph, of rejoicing at the damnation imprecated against the humiliated adversary. Even the venerable Council of Nicea commenced with mutual accusals and recriminations, which were suppressed by the moderation of the Emperor; and throughout the account of Eusebius¹ there is an adulation of the Imperial convert, with something of the intoxication, it might be of pardonable vanity, at finding themselves the objects of royal favor, and partaking in royal banquets. But the more fatal error of that Council was the solicitation, at least the acquiescence in the infliction of a civil penalty, that of exile, against the recusant Prelates. The degeneracy is rapid from the Council of Nicea to that

¹ Hist. of Christianity, ii. p. 440.

of Ephesus, where each party came determined to use every means of haste, manœuvre, court influence, bribery, to crush his adversary; where there was an encouragement of, if not an appeal to, the violence of the populace, to anticipate the decrees of the Council; where each had his own tumultuous foreign rabble to back his quarrel; and neither would scruple at any means to obtain the ratification of their anathemas through persecution by the civil government.

Some considerations will at least allay our wonder at this singular incongruity. A General Council is not the cause, but the consequence, of religious dissension. It is unnecessary, and could hardly be convoked, but on extraordinary occasions, to settle some questions which have already violently disorganized the peace of Christendom. It is a field of battle, in which a long train of animosities and hostilities is to come to an issue. Men, therefore, meet with all the excitement, the estrangement, the jealousy, the antipathy engendered by a fierce and obstinate controversy. They meet to triumph over their adversaries, rather than dispassionately to investigate truth. Each is committed to his opinions, each exasperated by opposition, each supported by a host of intractable followers, each probably with exaggerated notions of the importance of the question; and that importance seems to increase, since it has demanded the decision of a general assembly of Christendom. Each considers the cause of God in his hands: heresy becomes more and more odious, and must be suppressed by every practicable means. The essentially despotic character of the government, which entered into all transactions of life, with the deeply rooted sentiment in the human mind of the supreme

and universal power of the law, the law now centred in the person of the Emperor, who was the State ; the apparent identification of the State and Church by the adoption of Christianity as the religion of the Empire, altogether confounded the limits of ecclesiastical and temporal jurisdiction. The dominant party, when it could obtain the support of the civil power for the execution of its intolerant edicts, was blind to the dangerous and unchristian principle which it tended to establish. As the Council met under the Imperial authority, so it seemed to commit the Imperial authority to enforce its decisions. Christianity, which had so nobly asserted its independence of thought and faith in the face of heathen emperors, threw down that independence at the foot of the throne, in order that it might forcibly extirpate the remains of Paganism, and compel an absolute uniformity of Christian faith.

The Council of Ephesus was summoned to open its deliberations at Pentecost ; the fifty days from Easter were allowed for the assembling of the Prelates.

Meeting of
Council, A. D.
431. Easter,
April 19 ;
Whit-Sun-
day, June 7.

Candidianus, Count of the domestics, a statesman of high character, was appointed to represent the Emperor in the Council. His instructions were, not to interfere in the theological question, the exclusive province of the Bishops ; to expel all strangers, monks and laymen, from the city, lest they should disturb the proceedings ; to maintain order, lest the animosities of the Bishops should prevent the fair investigation of the truth ; to permit no one to leave the Council, even under pretence of going to the Court ; to permit no extraneous discussions to be introduced before the assembly. Candidianus did not arrive till after Pentecost.

Already, however, Ephesus had begun to be crowded with strangers from all quarters. Nestorius came accompanied by not more than sixteen Bishops of his party. Cyril arrived attended by fifty Egyptian Bishops; Memnon, the Bishop of Ephesus, a declared enemy of Nestorius, had summoned thirty Prelates from Asia Minor. Nor were these antagonists content with mustering their spiritual strength; each was accompanied by a rabble of followers of more unseemly character; Cyril by the bath-men and a multitude of women from Egypt; Nestorius by a horde of peasants, and some of the lower populace of Constantinople. The troops of Candidianus, after his arrival, begirt the city; Irenæus, with a body of soldiers, was intrusted, by the special favor of the Emperor, with the protection of the person of Nestorius.

The adverse parties could not await the opening of the Council without betraying their hostility; skirmishing disputes took place,¹ and no opportunity was passed of darkening the fame and the opinions of Nestorius in the popular mind. If Nestorius came under the fond hope of being heard on equal terms, and allowed to debate in a calm and dispassionate spirit the truth of his tenets, such were not the views of Cyril or of Celestine. To them the Bishop of Constantinople was already a condemned heretic; the business of the Council was only the confirmation of their anathema,

¹ Ἀκροζολίσμους τῶν λογῶν. Socrat. vii. 34. Joanne Antiocheno remorante * * * Cyrillus deflorationes quasdam librorum Nestorii faciebat, eum perturbare volens. Et quum plurimi Deum confiterentur Jesum Christum, ego, inquit Nestorius, qui fuit duorum vel trium mensium nunquam confiteor Deum; quâ gratiâ mundus sum a sanguine vestro, et ammodo ad vos non veniam. Liberatus, Chron. c. 5. This is a good illustration of the Latin misconception of the opinions of Nestorius.

and the more authoritative deposition of the unorthodox Prelate. With them the one embarrassing difficulty was whether, in case Nestorius recanted his opinions, they were to annul the sentence of excommunication and of deposal, and admit him to a seat in the Council.¹

Memnon of Ephesus lent himself eagerly to all the schemes of Cyril. Nestorius was treated as ^{Memnon of Ephesus.} a man under the ban of excommunication: all intercourse, even the common courtesies of life were refused. All the Churches of Ephesus were closed against the outcast from Christian communion. When he expressed his solicitude, if not to attend the morning and evening service, at least to partake in the solemn mysteries of that season, not merely was he ignominiously repelled from the Churches, even from that of the Martyr St. John, but the avenues were beset by throngs of rude peasants brought in from the country, and prepared for any violence, and by the Egyptian sailors from the vessels of Cyril.²

Pentecost had passed; five days after arrived Juvenalis, Bishop of Jerusalem, a prelate known ^{Juvenal of Jerusalem.} to be hostile to Nestorius. But John of Antioch, with the greater part of the Eastern Bishops, did not appear. The Patriarchs of Constantinople and of Alexandria were arrayed as parties in the cause:

¹ Etenim quæris utrum sancta synodus recipere debet hominem a se prædicata damnantem; an quia induciarum tempus emensum est, sententia dudum lata perduret. This is from an answer to a letter of Cyril which is lost. Celestine's reply to this question is perhaps studiously ambiguous. But the letter, as extant, is probably a translation. The secret instructions of Celestine to his legates (apud Baluzium, p. 331) show his intimate alliance with Cyril. — Labbe, Conc. p. 622. Compare Walch, p. 466.

² Epist. Nestorii, p. 565. Epist. ad Imper. p. 602. Epist. ad Senat. 303.

each charged the other with heresy. The Roman Patriarch of the West was not present in person: the Patriarch of Antioch, therefore, might seem necessary, if not to the validity, to the weight and dignity of the Council. Cyril and his partisans were clamorous for the immediate opening of the Council; the Bishops had been already too long withdrawn from their dioceses. Nestorius insisted on awaiting the arrival of John of Antioch and his prelates; Candidianus gave the weight of the Imperial authority for delay. The Emperor had required the presence of John of Antioch and the Eastern Prelates at the Council.¹ Strong reasons were afterwards alleged by John of Antioch for his tardy arrival. His departure from Antioch had been arrested by a famine in the city, and daily insurrections of the people on that account; inundations had impeded his march.² Many of the Bishops of his vast province were ten or twelve long days' journey beyond Antioch; they could not leave their cities before Easter.³ Cyril himself had received a courteous letter from John of Antioch, stating that he had arrived within six stations of Ephesus; that he was travelling with the utmost speed, but that the roads were bad; they had lost many of their beasts of burden; and some of the more aged Bishops had been unable to proceed at that rapid rate.

Cyril, however, chose to consider the delay of the Bishop of Antioch intentional and premeditated, either in order to shield the guilty Nestorius from the anathema of the Council, or to escape any participation in

¹ Defens. trium Capitular. Facundus, apud Sirmont Opera, ii. p. 607

² The epistle of John of Antioch to the Emperor.

³ Evagrius, H. E. i. 3, 4. Labbe, Concil. p. 443.

such a sentence against one so well known, and formerly at least so popular, in Antioch.¹

Only sixteen days were allowed to elapse by the impatient zeal (the noblest motive that can be assigned) of Cyril for the opening a Council which was to represent Christendom, to absolve or to condemn as an irreclaimable heretic the Bishop of the second capital of the world. On Monday the 22nd of June, in the Church of the Virgin Mary, (an ill-omened scene for the cause of Nestorius,) met the Council of Ephesus.²

The Count Candidianus, in a public report to his Imperial master, describes the violence, unfairness, even the treachery of the proceedings. No sooner had he heard that Cyril, Memnon, and their partisans were prepared to open the assembly, than he hastened to the Church. In the Emperor's name, he inhibited the meeting; he condescended to entreaties that they would await the arrival of the Eastern Bishops; he declared that they were acting in defiance of the Imperial Rescript. They answered that they were ignorant of the contents of that ordinance. Thus compelled, and lest he should be the cause of popular insur-

¹ Cyril's imputations against John of Antioch are inconsistent and contradictory. In one place he charges him with hypocrisy, and insinuates that he kept aloof to favor Nestorius (if the partisan of Nestorius, his presence would have been more useful than his absence); in another that, conscious of the badness of the cause of Nestorius, he kept aloof to avoid taking any part in his inevitable condemnation: "Do what you will (*πράττετε ἢ πράττετε*), only let me not be personally involved in the business." Compare Cyril's Letter to the Clergy of Constantinople, p. 561, with the Epistol. Imper., p. 602.

² The effect of this arrangement may be conceived from the Sermon of Cyril (Labbe, p. 584), in which he lavishes all his eloquence in her praise, through whom (*δὲ ἡς*) all the wonders and blessings of the Gospel, which he recites, descended on man.

rection and rebellion, Candidianus read the Rescript; and concluded by solemnly warning them against their indecent precipitation. This was their object; the reading the Rescript they considered as legalizing the Council; it was followed by loud and loyal clamors. The Count fondly supposed that these cries intimated obedience to the Imperial command; instead of this, they instantly commanded Candidianus to withdraw from an assembly in which he had no longer any place; insultingly and ignominiously they cast out the representative of the Emperor. They proceeded summarily to eject the few Bishops attached to Nestorius; and then commenced their proceedings as the legitimate Senate of Christendom.¹

The council consisted of rather more than one hundred and fifty bishops—about forty from Egypt, thirty from Asia Minor, several from Palestine with Juvenalis of Jerusalem, the rest from Thrace, Greece, the islands Crete, Rhodes, and Cyprus, and from some parts of Asia. Rufus of Thessalonica professed to represent the bishops of Illyricum.² The proceedings, according to the regular report, now that all opposition was expelled, flowed on in unobstructed haste and unprecedented harmony. Peter, an Alexandrian presbyter, who acted as chief secretary,³ opened the business with a statement of the dispute between Nestorius on one hand, Cyril and the Bishop of Rome on the other. On the motion of Juvenal of Jerusalem was then read the Imperial convocation of the bishops. It was asked

¹ See the statement of Candidianus, pp. 589–592. In another place he says, “A vobis injuriosè et ignominiosè ejectus sum.”—In Synodico.

² According to Nestorius, not only the Eastern bishops were expected but those of Italy and Sicily.

³ Πριμμικῆριος Νοταρίων. Primicerius Notariorum.

how long a period had elapsed since the day appointed by the Emperor for the meeting ; Memnon of Ephesus replied " sixteen days." Cyril then rose, and asserting that on account of the long delay (of sixteen days !) some bishops had fallen ill, and some had died, declared that it was imperative to proceed at once to determine a question which concerned the whole sublunary world.¹ The Imperial Rescript itself had commanded the prelates to proceed without delay.

One citation had been already sent by four bishops, summoning Nestorius to appear before the council. Nestorius had declined, not uncour-^{Citation of Nestorius.}teously, to acknowledge the validity of the assembly before the arrival of all the bishops. A second and a third deputation of the same number of bishops was sent. The first reported that they were not permitted by the guard to approach the presence of Nestorius, but received from his attendants the same answer ; the third that they were exposed to the indignity of being kept standing in the heat of the sun, and not allowed to enter the palace.

The proceedings now commenced: the Nicene Creed was read, and then Cyril's letter to Nestorius.^{Proceedings commence.} The bishops in succession declared their full faith in the creed, and the perfect concordance of Cyril's exposition with the doctrines of the Nicene Fathers. Then followed the answer of Nestorius to Cyril. Cyril put the question of its agreement with the creed of Nicea. One after another the bishops rose, and in language more or less vehement, pronounced the tenets of Nestorius to be blasphemous, and uttered the stern anathema. All then joined in

¹ Εἰς ὠφέλειαν ἀπόσης τῆς ἐκ' οὐρανοῦ. p. 453.

one tumultuous cry, "Anathema to him who does not anathematize Nestorius." The church rang with the fatal and reëchoed word, "Anathema, anathema! The whole world unites in the excommunication: anathema on him who holds communion with Nestorius!"

The triumph of Cyril ceased not here. The condemnatory letters of Celestine of Rome to Nestorius were read and inserted in the acts of the council. Certain bishops averred that of their personal knowledge Nestorius had not retracted his obnoxious doctrines. Then were read extracts from the works of the great theologians, Athanasius, Gregory, Basil, and others; many of these were of very doubtful bearing on the question raised by Nestorius; they were contrasted with large extracts from his writings. A letter was read from Capreolus, Bishop of Carthage, excusing the absence of the African clergy on account of the miserable desolation and the wars which afflicted the province, asserting in general terms their cordial adherence to the Catholic doctrine, and their abhorrence of heretical innovations.

The Council, it is said, compelled by the sacred
Decree of Council. canons and amid the tears of many bishops, proceeded to deliver its awful sentence;¹ Jesus Christ himself, blasphemed by Nestorius, (so ran the decree,) declares him deposed from his episcopal rank, and from all his ecclesiastical functions. All the bishops subscribed the sentence.² The whole of this solemn discussion, with its fearful conclusion, was crowded into one day! The impatient populace

¹ Ἀναγκάϊως κατεπειχθέντες ὑπό τε τῶν κανόνων * * * δακρύσαντες πολλακίς * * * σκυθρωπήν ἀπόφασιν. Labbe, p. 533.

² Above two hundred names appear. Some perhaps were added as concurring in the sentence.

had been waiting from morn till evening the issue of the Council. No sooner had they heard the deposition of this new Judas, than they broke out into joyous clamors; escorted the Prelates with torches to their homes; women went before them burning incense. A general illumination took place. Thus did the Saviour, writes Cyril, proudly recounting these popular suffrages, show his Almighty power against those who blasphemed his name.¹

Five days after arrived John of Antioch, and the Eastern Prelates; they were received with ^{Arrival of Syrian Bishops.} great honor by Count Candidianus, by the other bishops not only with studied discourtesy, but with tumultuous and disorderly insult.² Nestorius kept aloof in judicious seclusion. These Prelates proceeded to instal themselves as a Council, under the sanction of the Imperial Commissary. Their first inquiry was whether the former Council had been conducted with canonical regularity, and the sentence passed after dispassionate investigation. Candidianus bore testimony to the indecent haste and precipitation of the decree. But instead of calmly protesting against these violent proceedings, and declaring them null and void, as wanting their own concurrent voice, this small synod of between forty and fifty bishops,³ rushed into the error which they had proscribed in others; with no calmer or longer inquiry, before they

¹ Cyril's letter to the people of Alexandria.

² Compare, however, the statement of Memnon, a suspicious witness, p. 763.

³ These bishops did not all come with John; some were of those previously assembled at Ephesus, who had refused to take part in the council. Their adversaries assert that some of them were deprived bishops, others not bishops at all. According to this statement John's party did not amount to more than thirty.—Epist. Cyril. et Memnon. p. 638.

had shaken the dust off their feet,¹ they condemned the doctrines of Cyril, as tainted with Arianism, Eunomianism, and Apollinarianism; pronounced the sentence of deposition against the most religious Cyril (ecclesiastical courtesy held this appellation inseparable from that of bishop) and against Memnon of Ephesus; and recorded their solemn anathema against the Prelates of the adverse Council.² The sentence condemned not their heresy alone, but likewise their disobedience to the Imperial authority, and their impious violence in excluding the faithful from the holy ceremonies of Pentecost, their closing the churches, and besetting them with gangs of Egyptian sailors and ecclesiastics, and with Asiatic boors. The excommunication was published throughout the city with the solemnity of an Imperial proclamation. Cyril and Memnon launched a counter-anathema; and instead of abstaining, as excommunicated persons, from the sacred offices, celebrated them with greater pomp and publicity.

In the mean time letters arrived from the Bishop of Rome, Celestine. Cyril's council reassembled to receive them; every sentence was in such full accordance with their views, that the whole assembly rose in acclamation. "The council renders thanks to the second Paul, Celestine; to the second Paul, Cyril; to Celestine, protector of the faith; to Celestine, unanimous with the council. One Celestine, one Cyril, one faith in the whole council, one faith throughout the world."³ The Bishops Arcadius and Projectus, with Philip the Presbyter, the legates of Rome, gave their deliberate sanction to the deposi-

July 10.
Letters of
Celestine,

¹ Cyril, Epist. ad Celestin. p. 663.

² Labbe, Concil. 599.

³ Actio Secunda Concilii, p. 618.

tion of Nestorius. At another sitting it was reported that endeavors had been made to bring John of Antioch, now accused as an accomplice in the guilt and heresy of Nestorius, to an amicable conference. Three bishops, deputed to him, had been repelled by the fierce and turbulent soldiery who guarded his residence. A second deputation had been admitted to his presence: he loftily refused to enter into negotiations with excommunicated persons. On this report the council proceeded to annul all the decrees of John and his synod. Having thrice cited him to appear, they declared John of Antioch deposed and excommunicated, as well as all the bishops of his party.¹ Cyril was not idle in his more public sphere of influence. He thundered from the pulpit against the bold man who had interfered in his triumphant conflict with the dragon of heresy, which vomited out its poison against the Church; he asserted that he was ready to encounter this new Goliath with the arms of faith.²

Both parties were disposed to employ weapons of a more worldly temper. John of Antioch ^{Violent} threatened the election of a new Bishop of ^{contest.} Ephesus in the place of the deprived Memnon.³ A peaceful band of worshippers according to one account, more probably an armed host, determined to force their way into the cathedral of St. John. They found it

¹ The Bishop of Jerusalem claimed jurisdiction, as of ancient usage, over the see of Antioch. — p. 642.

² Ἐπῆρεν, ὡς ὄρας, ὁ πολυκέφαλος δράκων τὴν ἀνόσιον καὶ βέβηλον κεφαλὴν, τοῖς τῆς ἐκκλησίας τέκνοις τὸν τῆς ἰδίας ἀνοσιότητος ἰδὸν ἐπιπτύων. "This Goliath from the East shall fall by stones from the scrip of Christ; and what is the scrip of Christ? the Church, which contains many stones, elect and precious." This is a specimen of the Archbishop's religious rhapsody. Homil. Cyril. p. 667.

³ Labbe, p. 710.

beset by Memnon with a strong garrison. Content, according to their own partial statement, with worshipping without the doors, they were retreating in peace, when the partisans of Memnon made a desperate sally, took men and horses prisoners, assailed them, and drove them through the streets with clubs and stones, not without much bloodshed.¹

The court of Theodosius was perplexed with the contradictory and doubtful reports from Constantinople. Ephesus. Candidianus and the party of Nestorius jealously watched the issues of the city, that no representations from Cyril and his council should reach the imperial ear. Theodosius still maintained his impartiality, or more probably a minister favorable to Nestorius ruled in the court. An imperial letter arrived, written in the interval between the deposition of Nestorius and the arrival of John of Antioch,² strongly reproving the proceedings of the council, annulling all its decrees, commanding the reconsideration of the creed by the whole assembly, forbidding any bishop to leave Ephesus till the close of the council, and announcing the appointment of a second commissary to assist the Count Candidianus. But all the watchfulness of the government and of Nestorius could not intercept the secret correspondence of Cyril's party with their faithful allies, the earliest and most inveterate enemies of Nestorius, the monks of Constantinople. A beggar brought a letter, announcing to them the glad tidings of the deposition of Nestorius, which the court had not condescended to communicate to the people.

¹ Their own despatches urged, and no doubt exaggerated, the contempt of the imperial authority, the lawlessness of the rabble at the command of Cyril and of Memnon.

² It was sent in great haste, by the imperial officer, Palladius.

The court must be overawed; these spiritual demagogues would not await the tardy and doubtful orthodoxy of the Emperor.

Dalmatius, a monk of high repute for his austere sanctity, who, it is said, had in vain been solicited by the Emperor himself to quit his cell and intercede for the city during an earthquake, now, compelled by this more weighty call, came forth from his solitude. A vision had confirmed his sense of the imperious necessity. At the head of a procession of archimandrites and monks he passed slowly through the streets and sate down, as it were, to besiege the palace. Wherever he passed, the awed and wondering people burst out into an anathema against Nestorius.

But the court did not as yet stoop from its lofty dictatorship in ecclesiastical affairs. A new Imperial Commissary, one of the highest ^{Emperor's} _{rescripts.} officers of state, named John, appeared in Ephesus. His first measure was one of bold and severe impartiality, a vigorous assertion of the civil supremacy, humiliating to the pride of sacerdotal dignity. The Imperial letters sanctioned equally the decrees of each conflicting party, the deposition of Cyril and Memnon, as well as of Nestorius. John summoned all the Prelates to his presence. At the dawn of morning appeared Nestorius with John of Antioch. Somewhat later, Cyril presented himself with the bishops of his party; Memnon alone refused to come. Hereupon arose a clamorous debate. Cyril and his bishops would not endure the presence of the heretical and excommunicated Nestorius. The divine and awful letters could not be read either in the absence of Cyril, or in the presence of Nestorius. The party

of Nestorius and John as peremptorily demanded the expulsion of the deposed and excommunicated Cyril. The debate maddened into sedition, sedition into a battle. The Imperial Representative was compelled to use his military force to restrain the refractory churchmen, before he could read the Emperor's letters. At the sentence of deposition against Cyril and Memnon, the clamors broke out with fresh violence. John, the Prefect, took a commanding tone; he ordered the arrest and committal to safe but honorable custody of all the contending prelates. Nestorius and John of Antioch submitted without remonstrance. Cyril, after a homily to the people, in which he represented himself as the victim of persecution, incurred by Apostolic innocence and borne with Apostolic resignation, yielded to the inevitable necessity. Memnon at first concealed himself, and attempted to elude apprehension, but at length voluntarily surrendered to the Imperial authority.

The throne was besieged, and confused by strong representations on both sides. At length it was determined that eight deputies for each party should be permitted to approach the court, and stand before the sacred presence of the Emperor. In Constantinople this assembly might cause dangerous tumults: they met therefore in the suburb of Chalcedon. On the side of Cyril appeared Philip the Presbyter, the representative of Pope Celestine. and the Western Bishop Arcadius, Juvenal of Jerusalem, Flavianus of Philippi, Firmus of the Cappadocian Cæsarea, Acacius of Melitene, Theodotus of Ancyra, Euoptius of Ptolemais. On that of the Orientals, the Metropolitans John of Antioch, John of Damascus,

Council of
Chalcedon.

Himerius of Nicomedia; the Bishops Paul of Emesa, Macarius of Laodicea, Apringius of Chalcis, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Helladius of Ptolemais. Though the Bishop of Chalcedon endeavored to close the churches on the Oriental bishops, and the fanatic Monks from Constantinople threatened to stone them,¹ the people, according to their statement, listened with absorbed interest to the eloquence of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, and to the mild exhortations of John of Antioch. The youthful Emperor himself, when they taunted the adverse doctrine with degrading the Godhead to a passible being, rent his robes at the blasphemy.² The Oriental Bishops gradually began to separate the cause of Nestorius from their own. They insisted much more on the heresy of Cyril than on the orthodoxy of Nestorius. They accused him of asserting that the Godhead of the only begotten Son of God suffered, not the Manhood.³ They protested that they would rather die than subscribe the twelve chapters of Cyril, in which the anti-Nestorian doctrine had now taken a determinate form; or communicate with a Prelate deposed by their legitimate authority.

Other influences were now at work at the court of Constantinople. The masculine but ascetic mind of Pulcheria, the sister, the guardian, the Em-
Pulcheria.
 press, she may be called, of the Emperor, with her

¹ "Nam Constantinopoli neque nos, neque adversarii nostri intrare permisi sumus, propter seditiones *bonorum* monachorum." — Epist. Oriental. p. 732.

² See the short but curious statement in Latin: — "Passibilem esse deitatem. Quod usque adeo gravatim tulit pius rex noster, ut excuteret pallium, et retrorsum cederet præ blasphemiarum multitudinem." — p. 716.

³ Ὡς ἡ θεότης τοῦ μονογενοῦς Θεοῦ υλοῦ ἐπαθε, καὶ οὐκ ἡ ἀνθρωπότης. This they considered nearly allied to Arianism, as making the Son a created being. See the full view of their tenets in the Epist. Oriental. p. 740

rigid devotion to orthodoxy and her monastic character, was not likely to swerve from the dominant feeling of the Church; to comprehend the fine Oriental Spiritualism which would keep the Deity absolutely aloof from all intercourse with matter, as implied in his passibility: least of all, to endure any impeachment on the Mother of God, the tutelar Deity, and the glory of her sex. The power of the Virgin in the Court of Heaven was a precedent for that of holy females in the courts of earth. To the Virgin Empress, in later times, the gratitude of the triumphant party of Cyril and of the West attributed the glory of the degradation and banishment of Nestorius, and the discomfiture and dispersion of his followers. Still later, the Pope Leo addresses her as having expelled the crafty enemy from the Church: and her name was constantly saluted in the streets of Constantinople as the enemy of heretics.¹

Nestorius was quietly abandoned by both parties.

Nestorius
abandoned.

The secret of this change lies deeper in the recesses of the Imperial councils. The Eunuch minister, who had been his powerful supporter, died; he might, indeed, not long have enjoyed this treacherous favor, for the Eunuch had most impartially condescended to receive bribes from the opposite faction also. When the Emperor ordered his vast treasures to be opened, confiscated no doubt to the Imperial use, a receipt was found for many pounds of gold received from Cyril through Paul, his sister's son.²

Nestorius was allowed the vain honor of a voluntary

¹ "Quo dudum subdolum sanctæ religionis hostem, ab ipsis visceribus ecclesiæ depulistis, quum hæresin suam tueri impietas Nestoriana non potuit." — S. Leon. Epist. 59.

² Epist. Acacii Berœens. ad Alexandrum Episc. Hierapol. Acacius heard this from John of Antioch.

abdication. From Ephesus he was permitted to retire to a monastery at Antioch. This monastery, of St. Euprepus, had been the retreat of his early youth; he returned to it, having endured all the vicissitudes of promotion and degradation. There he lived in peace and respect for four years.

Cyril in the mean time had escaped or had been permitted to withdraw from the custody of the Imperial officers at Ephesus. He returned ^{Cyril in} Alexandria. to Alexandria, where he was received in triumph as the great Champion of the Faith. Thence, from the security of his own capital, almost with the pride of an independent potentate, but with the unscrupulous use of all means at his command, he directed the movements of the theologic warfare, which was maintained for three weary years with the Oriental Prelates. The wealth of Alexandria was his most powerful ally. While yet at Chalcedon, the desponding Orientals complain that their judges are all bought by Egyptian gold.¹ But this fact rests even on more conclusive testimony. Maximian, a Roman, had been raised to the vacant see of Constantinople. His first measure betrayed his bearing. He commanded all the churches of Constantinople to be closed against the Oriental Bishops, who desired to pass over from Chalcedon to visit the capital, as being under the unrepealed ban of the Church. A letter has survived, addressed by Cyril's avowed agents to the Bishop of Constantinople. They urge the willing Prelate to endeavor to rouse the somewhat languid zeal of the Princess Pulcheria in the

¹ This is asserted in the letter of Theodoret of Cyrus: "Nihil enim hinc boni sperandum, eo quod iudices omnes auro confidunt." . . . "Sic enim poterit Ægyptius omnes excæcare muneribus suis." — *Epist. Legat.* p. 746.

cause of Cyril, to propitiate all the courtiers, and, if possible, to satisfy their rapacity.¹ The females of the court were to be solicited with the utmost importunity; the monks, especially the Abbot Dalmatius, and Eutyches (afterwards himself an heresiarch), were to overawe the feeble Emperor by all the terrors of religion, and by no means neglect to impress the Lords of the Bedchamber with the same sentiments. They were to be lavish of money; already enormous sums had been sent from Egypt; 1500 pounds of gold had been borrowed of Count Ammonius; and the wealth of the Church of Constantinople was to be as prodigally devoted to the cause. Ministers were to be degraded, more obsequious ones raised to their posts by the influence of Pulcheria, in order to strengthen the pure doctrine, "the pure doctrine of Christ Jesus!"²

Theodosius, weary of the strife, dissolved the meeting at Chalcedon, and thus the Council of Ephesus, which had assumed the dignity of the third Ecumenical Council, was at an end. All, however, was still unreconciled hatred and confusion. The Oriental Bishops, as they returned home, found the churches at Ancyra and other cities of Asia Minor closed against them, as being under an

Synod of Chalcedon dissolved, A.D. 481.

¹ Eunapius, the heathen, gives a frightful picture of the venality of the court of Pulcheria. See the new fragment in Niebuhr's Byzantine historians, p. 97.

² The Letter in the Synodicon. The Latin is very bad; in some parts unintelligible. A few sentences must be given:—"Et Dominum meum sanctissimum abbatem roga ut Imperatorem mandet, terribili cum conjuratione constringens, et ut cubicularios omnes ita constringat. . . . Sed de tuâ Ecclesiâ præsta avaritiæ quorum nosti, ne Alexandrinorum Ecclesiam contristent. . . . Festinet autem Sanctitas tua rogare Dominam Pulcheriam, ut faciat Dominum Lausum intrare et Præpositum fieri, ut Chrysorellis potentia dissolvatur, et sic *dogma nostrum roboretur*. Alioquin semper tribulandi sumus."

interdict. They met together, on the other hand, at Tarsus, and afterwards at Antioch, condemned the twelve articles of Cyril, confirmed the deposition of Cyril and Memnon, and included under their ban the seven Bishops, their antagonists at Chalcedon. Maximian ventured on the bold step of deposing four Nestorian Bishops. The strife was hardly allayed by the vast mass of letters¹ which distracted and perplexed the world; there was scarcely a distinguished Prelate who did not mingle in the fray. Theodosius himself interfered at length in the office of conciliation. Misdoubting, however, the extent of the Imperial authority, which had so manifestly failed in controlling this contest into peace, he cultivated the more potent intercession of the famous Simeon Stylites: the prayers of the holy "Martyr in the air" might effect that which the Emperor had in vain sought by his despotic edicts. John of Antioch and his party deputed Paul, the aged Bishop of Emesa, to Alexandria, to negotiate a reconciliation. Paul bore with him a formulary agreed upon at Antioch, the subscription to which by Cyril was the indispensable preliminary of peace. On the acceptance of this formulary, and the consent of Cyril to anathematize all who should assert that the Godhead had suffered, or that there was one nature of the Godhead and the Manhood, he and the Orientals would revoke the sentence of excommunication against Cyril.²

But Paul of Emesa, amiably eager for peace, and not insensible to the dignity of appearing as arbiter between these two great factions, was

¹ They occupy page after page of the great Collection of the Councils.

² Ibas. Epist. ad Maron. in Synodico.

no match for the subtlety of Cyril. Cyril was ill at the time of Paul's arrival, and some time elapsed in fruitless negotiation. At length, after an ambiguous assent to the formulary of Antioch by Cyril, a treaty was concluded, in which Paul unquestionably exceeded his powers. But no sooner were the terms agreed upon than the doors of the Alexandrian churches flew open, and the contending parties vied with each other in flattering homilies.¹ At first the Orientals were startled at what appeared the unwarrantable concessions of Paul: "it was a peace," in the language of one, "which filled us with confusion of face and apprehension of the just judgment of God."² The more violent of Cyril's friends were equally displeased with the event. Isidore of Pelusium openly reproached him with his time-serving concessions and with the recantation of his own doctrines.³

After some further contest, the peace negotiated in Alexandria was ratified at Antioch. The Orientals yielded their assent to the deposition of Nestorius, the condemnation of his doctrines, and acknowledged the legitimate nomination of his successor Maximianus in

¹ See the three homilies of Paul, and one of Cyril.

² Epist. Theodoret. Cyren. ad finem.

³ Isidor. Pelus. Epist. ad Cyrill. Facundus de Trib. Capit. xi. 9. Isidore of Pelusium was no friend of Cyril. From the first he saw through his character. During the Council of Ephesus he solemnly admonished his bishop in terms like these: "Strong favor is not keensighted, hate is utterly blind: keep thyself unsullied by both these faults: pass no hasty judgments: try every cause with strict justice. . . Many of those summoned to Ephesus mock at thee (*σε κωμωδοῦσι*) as one who seeks only to glut his private revenge, and has no real zeal for the orthodoxy which is in Christ Jesus. He, they say, is the sister's son of Theophilus, and follows the example of his uncle. As he manifestly gave free scope to his animosity against the God-inspired and God-beloved Chrysostom, so does this man against Nestorius," &c. &c. — Isid. Pelus. Epist. i. 310. See also the Letters to the Emperor Theodosius, 311, and to Cyril, 323, 324, 370.

the see of Constantinople. On the other hand Cyril, though spared the public disavowal of his own tenets, had purchased, in the opinion of many, his restoration to communion with the Orientals by a dishonorable compromise of his bolder opinions.

It was a peace between John of Antioch and Cyril of Alexandria, not between the contending factions, which became more and more estranged and separated from each other. But the peace between John and Cyril soon grew into a close alliance, and John began to persecute his old associates. The first victim was Nestorius himself, now sunk to so low a state of insignificance as to expose him to the suspicion and hatred of his enemies, without retaining the attachment of his former friends. His obscure fate contrasts strongly with the vitality of his doctrines. By an Imperial edict, obtained not improbably by John of Antioch, who was weary of a troublesome neighbor, Nestorius in his old age was exiled to the Egyptian Oasis, as the place most completely cut off from mankind, so that the contagion of his heresy might be confined to the narrowest limits. Even there he did not find repose. The Oasis was overrun by a tribe of barbarous Africans, the Blemmyes. These savages, out of respect or compassion, released their aged captive, who found himself in Panopolis ; and, having signified his arrival and his adventures to the Prefect of the city, expressed his hope that the Roman Government would not refuse him that compassion which he had found among the savage heathen. The heretic reckoned too much on human sympathies. He was hastily despatched under a guard of soldiers to Elephantine, the very border of the Roman territory, and recalled as has

tily. These journeys wore out his old and infirm body ; and, after a vain appeal to the court to be spared a fourth exile, which is mocked by the ecclesiastical historian as a new proof of his obstinacy, he sunk into the grave. But there the charity of the historian Evagrius does not leave him in peace : he relates with undisguised satisfaction a report that his tongue was eaten with worms ; and from these temporal pains he passed to the eternal and unmitigable pains of hell.¹

The three great Sees were now in possession of the anti-Nestorians. Cyril ruled in Alexandria ; Maximian had been succeeded in Constantinople by Proclus, the ancient and inveterate antagonist of Nestorius ; and John in Antioch. But, besides the Nestorians, there was a strong anti-Cyrellian party among the Orientals, the former allies of John of Antioch, who protested against the terms of the peace. They maintained the uncanonical deposition of Nestorius, though they disclaimed his theology ; they asserted the unrepealed excommunication of Cyril. Alexander, Bishop of Hierapolis, declared that he would suffer death or exile rather than submit to Church communion with the Egyptians on such terms ; and declared that John must be lost to all sense of shame. On this principle the leading Bishops of nine provinces revolted against their Patriarchs, — the two Syrias, the two Cilicias, Bithynia, Mœsia, Thessalia, Isauria, the second Cappadocia. They even ventured to send a protest to Sixtus, who had now succeeded Celestine in the See of Rome, in which they inveighed against the versatility and perfidy of John of Antioch. But an edict, obtained by the two dominant influences in the Byzan

¹ Evagrius, H. E. i. 6.

tine court, that of gold¹ and that of the Princess Pulcheria, armed John with powers to expel the refractory Prelates from their sees; and John had no scruples in punishing that mutinous spirit which he had encouraged so long. Nor were these Bishops prepared to suffer the martyrdom of degradation. Andrew of Samosata, Theodoret of Cyrus, Helladius of Tarsus, the leaders of that party, submitted to the hard necessity. It is probable, however, that the milder terms enforced upon them only required communion with John; they were not compelled to give their formal assent to the deposition of Nestorius, or to withdraw their protest against the twelve articles of Cyril, or to repeal the anathema against him. Some, however, were more firm; Meletius of Mopsuestia was forcibly expelled from his city by a rude soldiery, and fourteen other Bishops bore degradation rather than submit to these galling concessions.

At the same time that Nestorius was banished from Antioch, an Imperial edict proscribed Nestorianism.² The followers of Nestorius were to be branded by the odious name of Simonians, as apostates from God; his books were prohibited, and, when found, were to be publicly burned; whoever held a conventicle of the sect was condemned to confiscation of goods. But however oppressed in the Roman Empire, Nestorianism was too deeply rooted in the Syrian mind to be extinguished either by Imperial or by ecclesi-

¹ "Audivimus olim quod multum saterit Verius, qui pro Joanne Constantinopoli latitat, et *aurum multum* distribuerit aliquibus ut posset obtinere sacram, quæ nos cogeret aut communicare Joanni, aut exire ab ecclesiis: quod etiam veraciter contigit." — Meletii Epist. ad Maximin. Anagarb.

² Codex Theodos. de Hæret. xvi. v. 66.

astical persecution. It took refuge beyond the frontiers, among the Christians of Persia. It even overleaped the stern boundary of Magianism, and carried the Gospel into parts of the East as yet unpenetrated by Christian missions. The farther it travelled eastwards the more intelligible and more congenial to the general sentiment became its Eastern element, the absolute impassibility of the Godhead. Even in the Roman East it maintained, in many places a secret, in some an open resistance to authority.¹ The great Syrian School, that of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus, the most popular of the Syrian theologians, were found to have held opinions nearly the same with those of Nestorius. Cyril and Proclus demanded the proscription of these dangerous writers; but the Eastern Prelates, those of Edessa, and the successors of Theodore, indignantly refused submission. A new controversy arose, which was not laid to rest, but was rather kept alive by the new heresy which, during the next twenty years, confused the Eastern Churches and demanded a fourth General Council — Eutychnianism.

A. D. 432-440. Sixtus, the successor of Celestine, had
July 31;
Aug. 18. ruled in Rome during these later transactions
in the East; he was to be succeeded by one of greater
name.

¹ Gibbon, at the close of his 47th chapter, has drawn one of his full, rapid, and brilliant descriptions of the Oriental conquests of the Nestorians, from Assemani, Renaudot, La Croze, and all other authorities extant in his day. Nestorianism and its kindred or rival sects retired far beyond the sphere of Latin Christianity; it was not till the Portuguese conquests in the East that they came into contact and collision. The very recent works of Layard and the Rev. Mr. Badger reveal to us the present state of the settlements of the Nestorians—the latter, their creed and discipline—in the neighborhood of the Tigris and Euphrates.

CHAPTER IV.

LEO THE GREAT.

THE Pontificate of Leo the Great is one of the epochs in the history of Latin, or rather of universal Christianity. Christendom, wherever mindful of its divine origin, and of its proper humanizing and hallowing influence, might turn away in shame from these melancholy and disgraceful contests in the East. On the throne of Rome alone, of all the greater sees, did religion maintain its majesty, its sanctity, its piety; and, if it demanded undue deference, the world would not be inclined rigidly to question pretensions supported as well by such conscious power as by such singular and unimpeachable virtue; and by such inestimable benefits conferred on Rome, on the Empire, on civilization. Once Leo was supposed to have saved Rome from the most terrible of barbarian conquerors; a second time he mitigated the horrors of her fall before the King of the Vandals. During his pontificate, Leo is the only great name in the Empire; it might almost seem in the Christian world. The Imperial Sovereignty might be said to have expired with Theodosius the Great. Women ruled in Ravenna and in Constantinople, and their more masculine abilities, even their virtues, reflected a deeper shame on the names of Theodosius II. and Valentinian III., the boy Sov-

ereigns of the East and West. Even after the death of Theodosius, Marcian reigned in the East, as the husband of Pulcheria. In the West the suspected fidelity impaired the power, as it lowered the character of Aëtius; his inhuman murder deprived the

A. D. 430.
Nov. 28.

Empire of its last support; and the Count Boniface, the friend of Augustine, in his fatal revenge, opened Africa to the desolating Vandal. Leo stood equally alone and superior in the Christian world. Two years before the accession of Leo, Augustine had died. He had not lived to witness the capture and ruin of Hippo, his episcopal city.

A. D. 445.

The fifth year after the accession of Leo, died Cyril of Alexandria; Nestorius survived, but in exile, his relentless rival. Cyril was succeeded by Dioscorus, who seemed to have inherited all which was odious in Cyril, with far inferior polemic ability; afterwards, an Eutychian heretic, and hardly to be acquitted of the murder of his rival, Flavianus. This future victim of the enmity of Dioscorus filled the see of Constantinople. Domnus, a name of no great distinction, was Patriarch of Antioch. In the West there are few, either ecclesiastics or others, who even aspire to a doubtful fame, such as Prosper, the poet of the Pelagian controversy, and Cassianus, the legislator of the Western monasteries.

Leo, like most of his great predecessors and successors, was a Roman. He was early devoted to the service of the Church; and so high was the opinion of his abilities, that even as an acolyte he was sent to Africa with letters condemnatory of Pelagianism. By the great African Prelates, Aurelius and St. Augustine, he was confirmed in his strong aversion to

those doctrines, which might seem irreconcilable with his ardent piety. He urged upon Pope Sixtus the persecution of the unfortunate Julianus.¹ When Leo was yet only a Deacon, Cassianus dedicated to him his work on the Incarnation. At the decease of Pope Sixtus, Leo was absent on a civil mission, ^{Election of Leo.} the importance of which shows the lofty estimate of his powers. It was no less than an attempt to reconcile the two rival generals, Aëtius and Albinus, whose fatal quarrel hazarded the dominion of Rome in Gaul. There was no delay; all Rome, clergy, senate, people, by acclamation, raised the absent Leo to the vacant see. Leo disdained the customary hypocrisy of compelling the electors to force the dignity upon him. With the self-confidence of a commanding mind he assumed the office,² in the pious assurance that God would give him strength to fulfil the arduous duties so imposed. Leo was a Roman in sentiment as in birth. All that survived of Rome, of her unbounded ambition, her inflexible perseverance, her dignity in defeat, her haughtiness of language, her belief in her own eternity, and in her indefeasible title to universal dominion, her respect for traditionary and written law, and of unchangeable custom, might seem concentrated in him alone.³ The

¹ "His insidiis Sixtus Papa, diaconi Leonis hortatu, vigilanter occurrens, nullum aditum pestiferis conatibus patere permisit, et . . . omnes catholicos de refectione fallacis bestię gaudere fecit." — Prosper. in Chronic.

² "Etsi necessarium est trepidare de merito, religiosum est gaudere de dono . . . ne sub magnitudine gratię succumbat infirmus, dabit virtutem, qui contulit dignitatem." — Sermo 11.

³ Nothing can be stronger than the Popes' declarations that even they are strictly subordinate to the *law* of the church. "Contra statuta patrum concedere aliquid vel mutare nec hujus quidem sedis potest auctoritas." Zos. Epist. sub ann. 417. "Sumus subjecti canonibus, qui canonum præcepta servamus." — Cœlest. ad Episc. Illyr. "Privilegia sanctorum pa-

union of the Churchman and the Roman is singularly displayed in his sermon on the day of St. Peter and St. Paul; their conjoint authority was that double title to obedience on which he built his claim to power, but chiefly as successor of St. Peter, for whom and for his ecclesiastical heirs he asserted a proto-Apostolic dignity. From Peter and through Peter all the other Apostles derived their power. No less did he assert the predestined perpetuity of Rome, who had only obtained her temporal autocracy to prepare the way, and as a guarantee, for her greater spiritual supremacy. St. Peter and St. Paul were the Romulus and Remus of Christian Rome. Pagan Rome had been the head of the heathen world; the empire of her divine religion was to transcend that of her worldly dominion. Her victories had subdued the earth and the sea, but she was to rule still more widely than she had by her wars, through the peaceful triumphs of her faith.¹ It was because Rome was the capital of the world that the chief of the Apostles was chosen to be her teacher, in order that from the head of the world the light of truth might be revealed over all the earth.

The haughtiness of the Roman might seem to predominate over the meekness of the Christian. Leo is indignant that slaves were promoted to the dignity of the sacerdotal office; not merely did he require

trum canonibus instituta et Nicææ synodi fixa decretis nulla possunt improbitate convelli, nulla novitate violari." — S. Leo. Epist. 78: compare Epist. 80. "Quoniam contra statuta paternorum canonum nihil cuiquam audire conceditur, ita si quis diversum aliquid decernere velit, se potius minuet, quam illa corrumpat; quæ si (ut oportet) a sanctis Pontificibus observantur per universas ecclesias, tranquilla erit pax et firma concordia." — Epist. 79.

¹ "Per sacram beati Petri sedem caput orbis effecta, latius præsideres religione divinâ quam dominatione terrenâ." — Sermon. lxxxiii.

the consent of the master, lest the Church should become a refuge for contumacious slaves, and the established rights of property be invaded, but the baseness of the slave brought discredit on the majesty of the priestly office.¹

Though Leo's magnificent vision of the universal dominion of Rome and of Christianity blended the indomitable ambition of the ancient Roman with the faith of the Christian, the world might seem rather darkening towards the ruin of both. Leo may be imagined as taking a calm and comprehensive survey of the arduous work in which he was engaged, the state of the various provinces over which he actually exercised, or aspired to supremacy. In Rome heathenism appears, as a religion, extinct; but heretics, especially the most odious of all, the Manicheans, were in great numbers. In Rome, Leo ruled not merely with Apostolic authority, but took upon himself the whole Apostolic function. He was the first of the Roman Pontiffs whose popular sermons have come down to posterity. The Bishops of Constantinople seem to have been the great preachers of their city. Pulpit oratory was their recommendation to the see, and the great instrument of their power.² Chrysostom was not the first, though

¹ "Tanquam servilis vilitas hunc honorem capiat. . . . Duplex itaque in hac parte reatus est, quod et *sacrum ministerium talis consortii vilitate polluitur*, et dominorum . . . jura solvuntur."—Epist. iv.

² Sozomen asserts that it was a peculiar usage of the Church of Rome that neither the bishop nor any one else preached in the Church οὔτε δὲ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος οὔτε ἄλλος τις ἐνθάδε ἐπ' ἐκκλησίας διδάσκει. H. E. vii. 19. This statement, defended by Valesius, is vehemently impugned by many Roman Catholic writers. Quesnel confines it to sermons on particular occasions. But the assertion of Sozomen is clearly general, and contrasted with the usage of Alexandria, where the bishop was the only preacher. If this be true, the usage must have been subsequent to the beginning of Arianism, perhaps grew out of it. The presumption of

the greatest, who had been summoned to that high dignity, for the fame of his eloquence. From the pulpit Nestorius had waged war against his adversaries. Leo, no doubt, felt his strength; he could cope with the minds of the people, and make the pulpit what the rostrum had been of old. His sermons singularly contrast with the florid, desultory, and often imaginative and impassioned style of the Greek preachers. They are brief, simple, severe; without fancy, without metaphysic subtlety, without passion: it is the Roman Censor animadverting with nervous majesty on the vices of the people; the Roman Prætor dictating the law, and delivering with authority the doctrine of the faith. They are singularly Christian — Christian as dwelling almost exclusively on Christ, his birth, his passion, his resurrection; only polemic so far as called upon by the prevailing controversies to assert with especial emphasis the perfect deity and the perfect manhood of Christ.¹ Either

ignorance or error in Sozomen arises out of the generality of his statement, that there was in fact no preaching in Rome. The style of Leo's sermons, brief, simple, expository, is almost conclusive against any long cultivation of pulpit-oratory. They are evidently the first efforts of Christian rhetoric — the earliest, if vigorous, sketches of a young art. Compare page 21.

¹ One class were what may be described as charity-sermons. At a certain period of the year, collections were made for the poor throughout all the regions of Rome. This usage had been appointed to supersede some ancient superstition, it is supposed the *Ludi Apollinares*, held on the 6th of July. The alms of the devout were to surpass in munificence the offerings of the heathen. These collections seem to have replaced in some degree the *sportula* of the wealthy, and the ostentatious largesses of the Emperors. On alms-giving Leo insists with great energy. It is an atonement for sin. — *Serm. vii.* In another place, "*eleemosynæ peccata delent.*" Fasting, without alms, is an affliction of the flesh, no sanctification of the soul. There is a beautiful precept urging the people to seek out the more modest of the indigent, who would not beg: *Sunt enim qui palam poscere ea, quibus indigent, erubescunt; et malunt miseriam tacitæ egestatis affligi,*

the practical mind of Leo disdained, or in Rome the age had not yet fully expanded the legendary and poetic religion, the worship of the Virgin and the Saints. St. Peter is not so much a sacred object of worship as the great ancestor from whom the Roman Pontiff has inherited supreme power. One martyr alone is commemorated, and that with nothing mythic or miraculous in the narrative — the Roman Laurentius, by whose death Rome is glorified, as Jerusalem by that of Stephen.¹

Leo condemns the whole race of heretics, from Arius down to Eutyches; but the more immediate, more dangerous, more hateful adversaries of the Roman faith were the Manicheans. That sect, in vain proscribed, persecuted, deprived of the privilege of citizens, placed out of the pale of the law by successive Imperial edicts; under the abhorrence not merely of the orthodox, but of almost all other Christians; were constantly springing up in all quarters of Christendom with a singularly obstinate vitality. At this time they unquestionably formed a considerable sect in Rome and in other cities of Italy. Manicheism, according to Leo, summed up in itself all which was profane in Paganism, blind in carnal Judaism, unlawful in magic, sacrilegious, and blasphemous in all other heresies.² It does not appear how far the Manicheism of the West had retained the wilder and more creative system of its Oriental founder; or, subdued to the more practical spirit of the West, adhered

quam publicâ petitione confundi . . . paupertati eorum consultum fuerit et pudori." — Serm. ix. p. 32-3. Leo denounces usury — "fœnus pecuniæ, funus animæ." — Serm. xvii.

¹ Serm. lxxxv.

² Serm. xvi.

only to the broader anti-Materialistic and Dualistic tenets. But these more general principles were obnoxious in the highest degree to the whole Christianity of the age. Where the great rivalship of the contending parties in Christendom was to assert most peremptorily, and to define most distinctly, the Godhead and the humanity of the Redeemer, nothing could be more universally abhorrent than a creed which made the human person of the Redeemer altogether unreal, and was at least vague and obscure as to his divinity: which in that Redeemer was clearly extraneous and subordinate to the great Primal Immaterial Unity. All parties would unite in rejecting these total aliens from the Christian faith.¹ But Leo had stronger reasons for his indignation against the Roman Manicheans. Whether the asceticism of the sect in general had recoiled into a kind of orgiastic libertinism, or whether the polluting atmosphere of Rome, in which no doubt much of pagan licentiousness must have remained, and which would shroud itself in Christian, as of old in pagan mysteries, the evidence of revolting immoralities is more strong and conclusive against these Roman Manicheans than against any other branch of this condemned race at other times. The public, it might seem the ceremonial violation of a maiden of tender years, in one of their religious meetings, was witnessed, it was said, by the confession of the perpetrator of the crime; by that of the elect who were present; by the Bishop, who sanctioned the abominable wickedness.² The investigation took place before a great assembly

¹ S. Leo, Serm. xvi. and xlii.

² Epist. ad Turib. xiv. Epist. viii. Rescript. Valentin. "Coram Senatu amplissimo manifestâ ipsorum confessione patefacta sunt.

of the principal of the Roman priesthood, of Oct. 10, 443. the great civil officers, of the Senate, and of the people. We cannot wonder that the penalties fell indiscriminately upon the whole sect. Some, indeed, were admitted to penance, on their forswearing Manes and all his impious doctrines, by the lenity of Leo; others were driven into exile; still, however, no capital punishment was inflicted. Leo wrote to the Jan. 444. Bishops of Italy, exhorting them to search out these pestilent enemies of Christian faith and virtue, and to secure their own flocks from the secret contamination. The Emperor Valentinian III., no doubt by the advice of Leo, issued an edict confirmatory of those laws of his predecessors by which the Manicheans were to be banished from the whole world. They were to be liable to all the penalties of sacrilege. It was a public offence. The accusers were not to be liable to the charge of delation. It was a crime to conceal or harbor them. All Manicheans were to be expelled from the army, and not permitted to inhabit cities; they could neither make testaments nor receive bequests. The cause of the severity of the law was their flagrant and disgraceful immorality.

If Italy did not fully acknowledge, it did not contest the assumed supremacy of the Roman See. Leo writes not only to the Bishops of Tuscany and Campania, but to those of Aquileia and of Sicily, as under his immediate jurisdiction.

Africa was among the provinces of the Western Empire. It was a part of the Latin world — Africa. an indispensable part — as being now, since the Egyptian supplies were alienated to the East, with Sicily, the sole granary of Rome and of Italy. If the patri-

archate of Rome was coextensive with the Western Empire, Africa belonged to her jurisdiction, and the closest connection still subsisted between these parts of Latin Christendom. Latin had from the first been the language of African theology; and of the five or six greatest names among the earlier Western fathers, three, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine, were of those provinces. In every struggle and in every controversy Africa had taken a leading part. She had furnished her martyrs in the days of persecution; she had contended against all the heresies of the East, and repudiated the subtle metaphysics of Greek Christendom; orthodoxy had in general triumphed in her deliberations. By the voice of St. Augustine she had discomfited Manicheism; and it was her burning temperament which, in the same great writer, had repelled the colder and more analytic Pelagianism, and made the direct, immediate, irresistible action of divine grace upon the soul an established article of the Western creed. Her councils had been frequent, and commanded general respect; her bishops were incredibly numerous in the inland districts; and, on the whole, Christianity might seem more completely the religion of the people than in any other part of the empire.

But the fatal schism of the Donatists had, for more than a century, been constantly preying upon her strength, and induced her to look for foreign interference. The orthodox church had, in her distress, constantly invoked the civil power. The emperor naturally looked for advice to the bishops around him, especially to the Bishop of Rome; and from the earliest period, when Constantine had referred this controversy to a council of Italian prelates, they had been

thus indirectly the arbiters in the irreconcilable contest. For even down to the days of St. Augustine, and beyond the Vandal conquest of Africa, the Donatists maintained the strife, raised altar against altar, compared the number of their bishops with advantage to those of their adversaries, resisted alike the reasonings of the orthodox, and the more cogent arguments of the imperial soldiery. The more desperate, the more fierce and obstinate the fanaticism. The ravages of the Circumcellions were perpetually breaking out in some quarter; the civilization which had covered the land, up to the borders of the desert, with peaceful towns and villages, so much promoted by the increased cultivation of corn, and which at once contributed to extend Christianity and was itself advanced by Christianity, began to suffer that sad reverse which was almost consummated by the Vandal invasion. The wild Moorish tribes seemed training again towards their old unsubdued ferocity, and preparing, as it were, to sink back, after two or three more centuries, into the more congenial state of marauding Mahometan savages.

But Africa, notwithstanding the difficulties which arose out of these sanguinary contentions, and the constant demands of assistance from the civil power in Italy, conscious of her own intellectual strength, and proud of the unimpeached orthodoxy of her ruling churches, by no means surrendered her independence. If Rome at times was courted with promising submissiveness, at others it was opposed with inflexible obduracy. Though Cyprian, by assigning a kind of primacy to St. Peter, and acknowledging the hereditary descent of the Roman Bishop from the great apostle,

had tended to elevate the power of the Pontiff, yet his great name sanctioned likewise almost a contemptuous resistance to the Roman ecclesiastical authority. The African Councils had usually communicated their decrees, as of full and unquestioned authority, not submitted them for a higher sanction. The inflexibility of the African Bishops had but recently awed the Pelagianizing Zosimus back into orthodoxy. Some events, which had brought the African churches into direct collision with the Roman Pontiff, betrayed in one case an admission of his power, on the other a steadfast determination of resistance, which would disdain to submit to foreign jurisdiction. In the first, Augustine himself might seem to set the example of homage — opposing only earnest and deprecatory arguments to the authority of the Roman Pontiff.¹ It was the African usage to erect small towns, even villages, into separate sees. St. Augustine created a bishopric in the insignificant neighboring town of Fussola. He appointed a promising disciple, named Antonius, to the office. But, removed from the grave control of Augustine, the young bishop abandoned himself to youthful indulgences, and even to violence, rapine, and extortion. He was condemned by a local council; but, some of the worst charges being insufficiently proved, he was only sentenced to make restitution, deprived of his episcopal power, but not degraded from the dignity of a bishop. Antonius appealed to Rome; he obtained the support of the aged Primate of Numidia, by the plausible argument that, if he had been guilty of the alleged enormities, he was unworthy of, and ought to have been degraded

Antonius
Bishop of
Fussola.

¹ Augustin. Epist. 261. ^

from, the episcopal rank. Boniface, who was then Pope, commanded the Numidian bishops to restore Antonius to his see, provided the facts, as he stated them, were true. Antonius, as though armed with an absolute decree, demanded instant obedience from the people of Fussola: he threatened them with the Imperial troops, whom, it would seem, he might summon to compel the execution of the Papal decree. The people of Fussola wrote in the most humble language to the new Pope, Celestine, entreating to be relieved from an oppression, as they significantly hinted, more grievous than they had suffered under the Donatist rule, from which they had but recently passed over into the Catholic Church. They threw the blame on Augustine himself, who had placed over them so unworthy a bishop. Augustine confessed his error, and urged the claims of the people of Fussola for redress in the most earnest terms. He threatened to resign his own see. The dispute ended in the suppression of the see of Fussola, by the decree of a Council of Numidia, and the assent of Celestine. It was reunited to that of Hippo.

But the second dispute was not conducted with the same temper—it terminated in more Apiarius. important consequences. Apiarius, a presbyter of Sicca, was degraded for many heinous offences by his own bishop. On his appeal, he was taken under the protection of Rome without due caution or inquiry by the hasty Zosimus. Zosimus commanded A. D. 419. his restoration to his rank, as well as to the communion of the Church. The African bishops protested against this interference with their episcopal rights. In an assembly of 217 bishops at Carthage,

appeared Faustinus, Bishop of Picenum, and two Roman presbyters. They boldly produced two canons of the Council of Nicea, that first and most sacred legislative assembly, to which Christendom owed the establishment of the sound Trinitarian doctrine, and which was received by all the orthodox world with unbounded reverence. These canons established a general right of appeal from all parts of Christendom to Rome. The Bishop of Rome might not only receive the appeal, but might delegate the judgment on appeal to the neighboring bishops, or commission one of his own presbyters to demand a second hearing of the cause, or send judges, according to his own discretion, to sit as assessors, representing the Papal authority with the bishops of the neighborhood.¹ The African bishops protested, with exemplary gravity, their respect for all the decrees of the Nicene Council; but they were perplexed, they said, by one circumstance — that in no copy of those decrees, which they had ever seen, did such Canons appear. They requested that the authentic copies, supposed to be preserved at Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, might be inspected.² It turned out, that either from ignorance in himself, almost incredible, or from a bold presumption of ignorance in others, not less inconceivable, the Bishop of Rome had adduced Canons of the Synod of Sardica, a council of which the authority was in many respects highly questionable, and which did not aspire to the dignity of a General Council, for the solemn decrees of the great Œcumenic Senate. The

¹ "E latere suo Presbyterum" is the expression — probably heard for the first time in these canons.

² "Habentes auctoritatem ejus a quo destinati sunt." — Labbe, Conc. ii. p. 1500.

close of this affair was as unfavorable as its conduct to the lofty pretensions of the Roman Bishop. While the Africans calmly persisted in asserting the guilt of Apiarius, the Bishop of Rome, through his legate, obstinately pronounced him to be the victim of injustice. Apiarius himself, seized by a paroxysm of remorse, suddenly and publicly made confession of all the crimes imputed to him — crimes so heinous and offensive, that groans of horror broke forth from the shuddering judges. The Bishop of Rome was left in the humiliating position of having rashly embarked in an iniquitous cause, and set up as the judge of the African bishops on partial, unsatisfactory, and as it appeared, utterly worthless evidence. The African bishops pursued their advantage, adduced the genuine Canons of Nicea, which gave each Provincial Council full authority over its own affairs, and quietly rebuked the Roman Prelate for his eagerness in receiving all outcasts from the Churches of Africa, and interfering in their behalf concerning matters of which he must be ignorant. They asserted that God would hardly grant to one that clear and searching judgment which he denied to many.¹ Thus, in fact, they proclaimed the entire independence of the African Churches on any foreign dominion: they forbade all appeals to transmarine judgments.²

But Africa had not to contest that independence with the ambition and ability of Leo. The long age

¹ "Nisi forte quispiam est qui credat, unicuilibet posse Deum nostrum examinis inspirare justitiam, et innumerabilibus congregatis in unum concilium denegare." — Labbe, Concil. ii. p. 1675.

² "Quod si ab eis provocandum putaverunt, non provocent ad transmarina judicia, sed ad Primates suarum Provinciarum (aut ad Universale Concilium) sicut et de Episcopis sæpe constitutum est." — Ibid.

of peace, wealth, fertility, and comparative happiness which had almost secluded Africa, since the battle of Thapsus, from the wars and civil contentions of the Empire, and had permitted Christianity to spread its beneficent influence over the whole province, was drawing to a close. The Vandal conquest began that long succession of calamities — the Arian persecutions under Hunneric and Thrasimund, the successors of Genseric — the re-conquest by the Eastern Empire, and the internal wars, with their train of miseries, famine, pestilence, devastation, which blasted the rich land into a desert; silenced altogether the clamors of Christian strife still maintained by the irreclaimable Donatists, and quenched all the lights of Christian learning and piety; until, at length, the whole realm was wrested by the strong arm of Mahomedanism from its connection with Christendom and the civilization of Europe.

The Vandal conquest under Genseric alone belongs Vandal conquest of Africa. to this period. The Vandals, until the invasion of the Huns, had been dreaded as the most ferocious of the Northern or Eastern tribes. Their savage love of war had hardly been mitigated by their submission to Arian Christianity. Yet the invasion of Genseric was at first a conquest rather than a persecution. The churches were not sacred against the general pillage, but it was their wealth which inflamed the cupidity, rather than the oppugancy of the doctrine within their walls which provoked the insults of the invaders. The clergy did not escape the general massacre: many of them suffered cruel tortures, but they fell in the promiscuous ruin: they were racked, or exposed to other excruciat-

ing torments to compel the surrender of their treasures, which they had concealed, or were supposed to have concealed. After the capture of Carthage, bishops and ecclesiastics of rank, as well as nobles, were reduced to servitude. The successor of Cyprian, "Quod vult Deus," ("What God wills," — the African prelates had anticipated our Puritans in their Scriptural names,) and many of his clergy were embarked in crazy vessels, and cast on shore on the coast of Naples. Yet Genseric permitted the elevation of another orthodox bishop, Deo Gratias, at the prayer of Valentinian, to the see of Carthage. Valentinian might seem prophetically to prepare succor and comfort for the Romans who should hereafter be carried captives to Carthage.

During the later years of his reign Genseric became a more cruel persecutor. He would admit only Arian counsellors about his court. The honors of martyrdom are claimed for many victims, perhaps rather of his jealousy than of his intolerance; for the Vandal dominion was that of an armed aristocracy, few in numbers when compared with the vast population of Roman Africa. He closed the churches of the orthodox in Carthage after the death of Deo Gratias; they were not opened for some time, but at length, at the intervention of the Emperor of the East, they were permitted a short period of peace, until the reign of Genseric's more fiercely intolerant successors, Huneric and Thrasimund.¹

Gaul was the province of the Western empire, beyond the limits of Italy (perhaps excepting Gaul.

¹ Victor Vitensis, lib. i., with the notes of Ruinart, *Hist. Persecutionis Vandalicæ*.

Africa), which was most closely connected by civil and ecclesiastical relations with the centre of government. But Northern and Western Gaul, as well as the two Germanies, were already occupied by Teutonic conquerors, Goths, Burgundians, and Franks, and were either independent, or rendered but nominal allegiance to the descendants of Theodosius. Britain appeared entirely lost to the Roman empire and to Christianity. Her Christianity had retired to her remote mountain fastnesses in Wales, Cornwall, Cumberland, and to the more distant islands; it was cut off altogether from the Roman world. But in Gaul the clergy, at least the orthodox clergy, were as yet everywhere of pure Roman, or Gallo-Roman race: the Teutonic conquerors, who were Christians, Goths, Burgundians, Vandals, had not shaken off the Arianism into which they had been converted; and the Franks were still fierce and obstinate pagans. The Southern Province alone retained its full subordination to the Court of Ravenna; and the jealousies and contests among the Bishops of Gaul had already driven them to Rome, the aggrieved for redress against the oppression, the turbulent for protection against the legitimate authority of their Bishops or Metropolitans, the Prelates whose power was contested, for confirmation of their dominion. The acknowledged want of such a superior jurisdiction would thus have created, even if there had been no pretensions grounded on the succession to St. Peter, a jurisdiction of appeal. Nowhere indeed can the origin of appeals be traced more clearly, as arising out of the state of the Church. The Metropolitan power over Narbonese Gaul was contested by the Churches of Arles and Vienne. The circumstances

of the times, the retirement of the Prefect of Gaul from Treves to Arles, the dignity which that city had assumed as the seat, however of an usurped empire, had given a supremacy to Arles. But neither would the metropolitan nor the episcopal dignity be administered with such calm justice as to command universal obedience. Severe discipline and strict adherence to the canons by the austere would excite rebellion, laxity and weakness encourage license. A remote tribunal would be sought by all, by some out of despair of finding justice nearer home, by some in the hope that a bad cause might find favorable hearing where the judges must be comparatively ignorant, and propitiated by that welcome deference which submitted to their authority. Yet, though there are several instances of Bishops deposed, not seldom unjustly, by synods of Gallic Bishops, none had carried his complaint before the Bishop of Rome until towards the end of the fourth century.¹ Priscillian appealed from the Council of Bourdeaux, not to the Bishop of Rome, but to the Emperor. During the Pontificate of Zosimus, Proculus, Archbishop of Arles, was involved in an implacable feud with Proculus, Bishop of Marseilles.² That degradation of Proculus which he could not A.D. 385. inflict by his own power, the Metropolitan of Arles endeavored to obtain by that of Zosimus.³ Zosimus,

¹ Quesnel, Dissertat. v. p. 384.

² Every point in this controversy has been discussed with the most unwearied pertinacity by the advocates, — on one side of the high Papal supremacy; on the other, by the defenders of the Gallican liberties. I have endeavored to hold an equal hand, and to dwell only on the facts which rest on evidence. There is an implacable war between the successive editors of the works of Leo the Great, — the Frenchman Quesnel, and the Italians, the Ballerinis.

³ Sulpic. Sever. 11.

it appears to be admitted, was deceived by the misrepresentations of Patroclus, and scrupled not to issue Feb. 9, 422. the sentence of degradation against the Bishop of Marseilles.¹ Proculus defied the sentence, and continued to exercise his episcopal powers. The more prudent Pope, Boniface, in a case of appeal from the clergy of Valence against their Bishop, referred the affair back to the Bishops of the province.²

Under Leo, the supremacy of the Roman See over Gaul was brought to the issue of direct assertion on his part, of inflexible resistance on that of his opponent. Hilarius, a devout and austere prelate, invested by his admiring biographer in every virtue, in the holiness and charity of a saint, a perfect monk and a consummate prelate — (as a preacher, it was said that Augustine, if he had lived after Hilarius, would have been esteemed his inferior) — was Archbishop of Arles.³ His zeal or his ambition aspired to raise that metropolitan seat into a kind of Pontificate of Gaul. He was accustomed to make visitations, accompanied by the holy Germanus of Auxerre, not improbably beyond the doubtful or undefined limits of his metropolitan power.⁴ During one of these visitations,

¹ Zosim. Epist. 12 ad Patrocl.

² Bonifac. Epist. ad Episcop. Galliæ.

³ The account of his election, by his biographer, is curious. He was designated as bishop by his predecessor Honoratus. He was then a monk of Lerins. A large band of the citizens of Arles, with a troop of soldiers, set out to take him by force. They did not know him: "spiritualis præda adstat ante oculus inquirentium, et nihilominus ignoratur." He is discovered, but requires a sign from heaven. A dove settles on his head. — S. Hilar. Vit. apud Leon. Oper. p. 323.

⁴ "Ordinationes sibi omnium per Gallias ecclesiarum vindicans, et debitam metropolitanis sacerdotibus in suam transferens dignitatem; ipsius quoque beatissimi Petri reverentiam verbis arrogantibus minuendo . . . ita suæ vos cupiens subdere potestati, ut se Beato apostolo Petro non patiatur

charges of disqualification for the episcopal office were exhibited against Celidonius, Bishop, according to some accounts, of Besançon. He was accused of having been the husband of a widow, and in his civil state of having pronounced as magistrate sentences of capital punishment. Hilarius hastily summoned a council of Bishops, and pronounced sentence of deposition against Celidonius. On the intelligence that Celidonius had gone to Rome to appeal against this decree, Hilarius set forth, it is said, on foot, crossed the Alps, and travelled without horse or sumpter mule to the Great City. He presented himself before Leo, and with A. D. 445. respectful earnestness entreated him not to infringe the ancient usages of the Gallic Churches, significantly declaring that he came not to plead before Leo, or, as an accuser in a case of appeal, but to protest against the usurpation of his rights.¹ Leo proceeded to annul the sentence of Hilarius and to restore Celidonius to his bishopric. He summoned Hilarius to rebut the evidence adduced by Celidonius, to disprove the justice of his condemnation. So haughty was the language of Hilarius, that no layman would dare to utter, no ecclesiastic would endure to hear such words.² He inflexibly resisted all the authority of the Pope and of St. Peter; and confronted the Pope with the bold assertion of his own unbounded metropolitan power. Hilarius thought his life in danger; or he feared lest

esse subjectum.” — Leo. Epist. This may have been stated by Leo under indignation at the resistance of Hilarius to his authority, and on the testimony of the enemies of Hilarius; but his biographer admits that the very humility of Hilarius had generated a kind of supercilious haughtiness; he was rigid, but to the proud, terrible, but to the worldly. — p. 326.

¹ “*Se ad officia non ad causam venisse; protestandi ordine non accusandi quæ sunt acta suggerere.*” — Vit. Hil.

² “*Quæ nullus laicorum dicere, nullus sacerdotum posset audire.*” — Ibid

he should be seized and compelled to communicate with the deposed Celidonius. He stole out of Rome, and though it was the depth of winter, found his way back to Arles.¹ The accounts of St. Hilarius, hitherto reconcilable, now diverge into strange contradiction. The author of his Life represents him as having made some weak overtures of reconciliation to Leo, as wasting himself out with toils, austerities, and devotions, and dying before he had completed his forty-first year. He died, visited by visions of glory, in ecstatic peace; his splendid funeral was honored by the tears of the whole city; the very Jews were clamorous in their sorrow for the beneficent Prelate. The people were hardly prevented from tearing his body to pieces, in order to possess such inestimable relics.²

The counter-statement fills up the interval before the death of Hilarius with other important events. Leo addresses a letter to the Bishops of the province of Vienne, denouncing the impious resistance of Hilarius to the authority of St. Peter, and releasing them from all allegiance to the See of Arles. For hardly had the affair of Celidonius been decided by the See of Rome than a new charge of ecclesiastical tyranny had been alleged against Hilarius. The Bishop Projectus complained, that while he was afflicted with illness, Hilarius, to whose province he did not belong, had consecrated another Bishop in his

Hilarius died,
A.D. 449.

¹ The accounts of this transaction in the Life and in the Letters of Pope Leo appear to me, considered from the point of view of each writer, strictly coincident, instead of obstinately irreconcilable.

² The writer describes himself as a witness of this remarkable fact: "Etiam Judæorum concurrunt agmina copiosa. . . . Hebræam concinentium linguam in exequiis honorandis audisse me recolo. Nam nostros ita mœror obsederat, ut ab officio solito impatiens doloris inhibuerit magnitudo." — p. 339.

place, and this in such haste, that he had respected none of the canonical forms of election; he had awaited neither the suffrage of the citizens, the testimonials of the more distinguished, nor the election of the Clergy. In this, and in other instances of irregular ordinations, Hilarius had called in the military power, and tumultuously interfered in the affairs of many churches. It is significantly suggested, that on every occasion Hilarius had been prodigal of the last and most awful power possessed by the Church, that of excommunication.¹ Hilarius was commanded to confine himself to his own diocese, deprived of the authority which he had usurped over the province of Vienne, and forbidden to be present at any future ordinations. But a sentence, in those days more awful than that of the Bishop of Rome, was pronounced against Hilarius. At the avowed instance of Leo, Valentinian promulgated an Imperial Edict, denounced the contumacy of Hilarius against the primacy of the Apostolic throne, confirmed alike by the merits of St. Peter, the chief of the episcopal order, by the majesty of the Roman city, and by the decree of a holy Council. Peace can alone rule in the Church, if the universal Church acknowledge its Lord. Hilarius is accused of various acts of ecclesiastical tyranny and violence, irregular ordinations, depositions of Bishops without authority: of entering cities at the head of an armed force, of waging war instead of establishing peace. The sentence of so great a Pontiff as the Bishop of Rome did not need Imperial confirmation; but as Hilarius had offended against the Majesty of

¹ "Sed quod mirum eum in laicos talem existere, qui soleat in sacerdotum damnatione gaudere?" — S. Leon. Epist. ad Vienn.

the Empire, as well as against the Apostolic See, he was reminded that it was only through the mildness of Leo that he retained his see. He and all the Bishops were warned to observe this perpetual Edict, which solemnly enacted that nothing should be done in Gaul, contrary to ancient usage, without the authority of the Bishop of the Eternal City; that the decree of the Apostolic See should henceforth be law; and whoever refused to obey the citation of the Roman Pontiff should be compelled to do so by the Moderator of the Province.¹

Spain was already nearly dissevered from the empire of Rome. It had been overrun, it was in great part occupied, by Teutonic conquerors, Suevians, Goths, and Vandals, all of whom, as far as they were Christians, adhered to the Arianism to which they had been converted by their first Apostles. The land groaned under the oppression of foreign rulers, the orthodox Church under the superiority of Arian sovereigns. If the provinces looked back, at least with the regret of interrupted habit, to the Imperial government, and in vain hoped for deliverance from the sinking house of Theodosius, the orthodox Church uttered its cry of distress to the Bishop of Rome. It was not however against Arianism, but a more formidable and dangerous antagonist; one kindred to that which Leo had suppressed with such difficulty in his own immediate territory.

The blood of the Spanish Bishop Priscillian, the first martyr of heresy, as usual had flowed in vain. He had been put to death by the usurper Maximus, at the

¹ *Constitutio Valentiniani*, iii. Augusti, apud S. Leonis Opera, Epist. xi. p. 642.

instigation of two other Spanish prelates, Ithacius and Valens ; but to the undisguised horror of such Churchmen as Ambrose and Martin of Tours. Leo more sternly approved this sanguinary intervention of the civil power. But, in justice to Leo, it was the moral and social, rather than civil offence of which he supposed the Priscillians guilty, which justly called forth the vengeance of the temporal Sovereign. In such case alone the spiritual power, which abhorred legal acts of bloodshed, would recur to the civil authority.¹ But the opinions of Priscillian still prevailed, and even seemed to have taken deeper root in Spain. Prelates were infected with the indelible contagion. Turibius, the Bishop of Astorga, laid the burden of his sorrows before Leo ; he asked his advice in what manner to cope with these dangerous adversaries. The doctrines of the Priscillians are summed up in sixteen articles. In these appear the great universal principles of Gnosticism or Manicheism, or rather of Orientalism : the sole existence of the primal Godhead, which preceded the emanation of his virtues. In this primal Godhead, if they recognized a Trinity, it was but a trinity of names. In these articles their enemies detected Arianism and Sabellianism. To the Godhead was opposed the uncreated Power of darkness, equally eternal, sprung from chaos and gloom. The *Christ* existed not till he was born of the Virgin ; it was his office to

¹ "Videbant enim omnem curam honestatis auferri, omnem conjugiorum copulam solvi, simulque divinum jus humanumque subverti, si hujusmodi hominibus usquam vivere cum tali professione licuisset. Profuit diu ista districtio ecclesiasticæ lenitatis, quæ etsi sacerdotali contenta iudicio, cruentas refugit ultiones, severis tamen Christianorum principum constitutionibus adjuvatur, dum ad spiritale nonnunquam recurrunt remedium, qui timent corporale supplicium."—S. Leon. Epist. See Hist. of Christianity, iii. 262.

deliver the souls of men, those souls being of the divine Essence, from the bondage of the body, that body created by the spirit of darkness. The Priscillianites fasted rigidly on the day of the Nativity, and on every Sunday, as the day of Resurrection, no doubt not on account of the unreality of the Saviour's body, but for an opposite reason, because at his birth he was degraded to an union with a material body, and at his resurrection reassumed that infected condition. It was this that set them in perpetual, implacable antagonism, not merely in their secret opinions, but in their public and outward usages, with the rest of the Christian world. Their austere proscription of marriage, and aversion to the procreation of beings with material bodies, led to the accustomed charge, perhaps in many

A. D. 447. cases, among the rude and ignorant, to the natural consequence, gross licentiousness. The peculiarity of the Priscillian system was an astrological Fatalism. The superstition which prevailed for so long a period in Europe, of assigning certain parts of the human body to the influences of the signs of the Zodiac, assumes its first distinct form in their tenets.¹ It was the earthly part which was subject to these powers, who in some mysterious way were concerned in its creation. Leo proceeded not, by a summary edict, to evoke this question from the Churches of Spain; he recommended the convocation of a general Council of Bishops from the four Provinces of Tarragona, Carthage, Lusitania, and Gallicia. If the times prevented

¹ Cap. xiv. apud Leon. Oper. p. 705. "Ad hanc insaniam pertinet prodigiosa illa totius humani corporis per duodecim cœli signa distinctio, ut diversis partibus diversæ præsidant potestates; et creatura, quam Deus ad imaginem suam fecit, in tantâ sit obligatione siderum, in quantâ est connexionem membrorum." — S. Leon. Epist. xv.

this general assembly, the Bishop of Astorga might appeal to a Provincial Council from Galicia alone. Two Councils were held, one at Toledo, the other at Braga in Galicia, in which Priscillianism was condemned in the usual terms of anathema.¹

Illyricum, in the primary division of the Empire, had been assigned to the West; it would be Illyricum. comprehended under the patriarchal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. As early as the pontificate of Siricius, the metropolitan of Thessalonica was appointed as delegate of the Bishop of Rome to rule the province. To this precedent Leo appeals, when he invests Anastasius, Metropolitan of the same city, with equal powers.² But he does not rest his title to supremacy on his Patriarchal power, or on the claim of the Western Empire to the allegiance of Illyricum; he grounds it on the universal dominion which belongs to the successors of St. Peter. The province appears to have acquiesced in his authority, and received with due submission his ordinances concerning the election of Bishops and Metropolitans. But all graver causes were to be referred to Rome for judgment.

The East, again plunged into a new controversy, might look with envy on the passive peace of The East. the West. Supremacy, held by so firm and vigorous a hand as that of Leo, might seem almost necessary to Christendom. The Bishop of Rome, standing aloof, and only mingling in the contests by legates, whom he

¹ It is declared in this decree, that all who had been twice married, who had married widows, or divorced women, were canonically unfit for the priesthood. Nor was it any excuse that the first wife had been married before baptism. "Cum in baptismate peccata deleantur, non uxorum numerus abrogetur."

² Epist. v. ad Episcop. Metropol. per Illyricum constitutos (Jan. 12, 444).

might disclaim at any time as exceeding their powers, could not but be heard with anxious submission by both parties, and by the Christian world at large. He would be contemplated with awful reverence, as attempting to command troubled Christendom into repose. Nestorianism had been, if not suppressed within the empire, reduced to the utmost weakness; it had been cast forth beyond the limits of the Roman world into distant and miserable exile. Nestorius himself had been the victim of the remorseless persecution.

But the theological balance was too nicely poised on this question, not speedily to descend on the opposite side. Cyril himself, by some of his strong expressions, had given manifest advantage to the Oriental Bishops.¹ Many who condemned the heresy of Nestorius, loudly impeached the orthodoxy of the Alexandrian Prelate. *The Monks.* Almost throughout the East, the monks, mindful perhaps of their Egyptian origin, had been strenuous in the cause of Cyril. In Constantinople they had overawed the government, and powerfully contributed to the discomfiture of Nestorius. But from character, education, and habits the Eastern monks were least qualified to be the arbiters in a controversy which depended on fine shades and differences of expression. Their dreamy and recluse life, their rigid ritual observances, even their austerities, instead of sharpening their intellects, led to vague conceptions; and the want of commerce with mankind disabled them from wielding the keen weapons of dialectics, or of comprehending the subtle distinctions taught in the schools of philosophy. From the temperament which drove them

¹ See p. 142.

to the cell or cloister, and which was not corrected by enlightened education, their opinions quickly became passions; those passions were inflamed by mutual encouragement, emulation, and the corporate spirit of small communities, actuated by a dominant feeling. Nor with them were these, points of abstract and speculative theology; the honor of the Redeemer, the dignity of the Virgin Mother now so rapidly rising into an object of adoration, were deeply committed in the strife. Such men were to speak with precise and guarded language on the unity of the divine and human nature in the person of Christ; on the unity which combined the two in perfect harmony, yet allowed not either to encroach on the separate distinctness, the unalterable and uninterchangeable attributes of the other.

The foremost adherent of Cyril in Constantinople had been Eutyches, a Presbyter, the Archi-^{Eutyches.} mandrite or Superior of a convent of monks without the walls of the city.¹ At his bidding the swarms of monks had thronged into the streets, defied the civil power, terrified the Emperor, and contributed, more than any other cause, to the final overthrow of Nestorius. He had grown old in the war against heresy; he had lived in continence for seventy years;² nor was it till after his departure from strict orthodoxy that men began to discover his total deficiency in learning.

A new race of Metropolitans had arisen in the more important sees of the East. That of Antioch was filled

¹ Eutyches is three times mentioned as a powerful ally of Cyril in the memorable letter to Maximianus, cited above. Flavian. Epist. ad Leon. Brev. Hist. Eutychn. p. 759. Liberatus in Breviar.

² Ad Leon. Epist. sub fin. He complains in another place that Flavianus had not respected his gray hairs.

Prelates of
the Eastern
Metropolitan
sees.

by Domnus, that of Alexandria by Dioscorus; Flavianus ruled the Church of Constantinople. All these prelates inherited the orthodox aversion to Nestorianism. Dioscorus, though he persecuted the relatives of Cyril, despoiled them of their property, and degraded them from their offices, with the violence, the turbulence, and the intolerance of his predecessor, adhered to his anti-Nestorian opinions. A great effort had been made to crush the lingering influence of those Prelates who had resisted Cyril. The aged Theodoret of Cyrus, who had accepted the peace of Antioch, but had not consented either to the condemnation or to the complete absolution of Cyril; Ibas of Edessa, who had defended the suspected writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia; Irenæus of Tyre, who, as a civilian, when Count of the Empire, had been held a partisan of the Nestorian party, and though he had been twice married, had been promoted to that see: these, with some others, were degraded from their rank, and sent into exile.

In all these movements, Eutyches and his monks had joined—always their clamors; where tumults in the streets of Constantinople or elsewhere were necessary to advance their cause, succors less becoming their secluded, peaceful, and unworldly character. On a sudden, Eutyches, from the all-honored and boastful champion of orthodoxy, to his own surprise (for in justice to him he seems to have had no very distinct notions of his own heterodoxy),¹ is arraigned, condemned, and finally branded to posterity as the head of a new and odious heresy.

¹ Leo writes of him with sovereign contempt: "Qui ne ipsius quidem symboli initia comprehendit." This old man has not learned what are the first lessons of the Christians. Ad Flavian.

In a Synod held at Constantinople, under the Bishop Flavianus, Eusebius, Bishop of Doryleum, ^{Eutyches} solemnly charged Eutyches with denying the ^{accused.} two natures in Christ. Thrice was Eutyches summoned before this tribunal, thrice he resisted or eluded the formal citation. He declared himself bound by a vow not to quit his monastery; a vow which, as his adversaries reminded him, he had not very religiously respected during the tumults against Nestorius: he pleaded bad health; he promised to come forward on a future day. At length he condescended to appear, but environed by a rout of turbulent monks, and with an Imperial officer, Florianus, who demanded to take his place in the Synod. The affair now proceeded with more decent gravity. The charge was made by Eusebius, who had practised in the schools as a Master of Rhetoric.¹ Eutyches in vain struggled to extricate himself from the grasp of the rigid logician. He took refuge in vague and ambiguous expressions, he equivocated, he contradicted himself; his merciless antagonist pressed him in his dialectic toils, and at length extorted the heretical confession: the two natures which were distinct before the Incarnation, in the Christ were blended and confounded in one. The Synod heard the confession with horror, amazement, and regret; the awful sentence of excommunication was ^{Excommu-} passed; the implacable assertor of orthodoxy ^{nicated.} against Nestorius found himself cast forth as a convicted and proscribed author of heresy.

But this grave ecclesiastical proceeding has another side. The secret history of the times, preserved by a later but trustworthy authority, if it does not A.D. 441.

¹ Evagrius.

resolve the whole into a wretched court intrigue, connects it too closely with the rise and fall of conflicting female influence, and the power of an Eunuch minister.¹ The sage and virtuous Pulcheria had long ruled with undisputed sway the feeble mind of her Imperial brother, Theodosius II. Chrysaphius the Eunuch had risen to the chief administration of public affairs. He was scheming to balance, or entirely to overthrow the authority of Pulcheria by the influence of the Empress, the beautiful Eudocia. Chrysaphius was the godson of Eutyches. He had hoped to raise the monk to the see of Constantinople. The elevation of Flavianus crossed these designs. But Chrysaphius did not despair of his end; he still hoped to expel Flavianus from the throne, and replace him by his own spiritual father. Either to estrange the mind of the Emperor from Flavianus, or to gratify his own rapacity, he demanded the customary present to the Emperor on the Prelate's inauguration. Flavianus tendered three loaves of white bread. The minister indignantly rejected this poor offering, and demanded a considerable weight of gold. Such offering Flavianus could only furnish by a sacrilegious invasion of the treasures, or profanation of the sacred vessels of the Church. This quarrel was hardly appeased when Chrysaphius endeavored, with more dangerous friendship, to implicate Flavianus in his own intrigues against Pulcheria. Flavianus not merely eluded the snare, but the Eunuch suspected the Bishop of betraying his secret designs. Eusebius, the antagonist of Eutyches, was of the party of Pulcheria before his advancement to the see of Doryleum; he had held a

¹ Theophanes, Chronog. p. 153. Edit. Bonn.

civil office, probably in the household of the Emperor's sister. He had been an early and an ardent adversary of Nestorius; he now stood forward as the accuser of the no less heretical Eutyches.

But Eutyches was too powerful in the support of his faithful monks, and in the favor of the ^{Eutyches} minister, to submit either to the Bishop of ^{appeals.} Constantinople, or to a local Synod. He appealed to Christendom—from the Metropolitan of Constantinople to the Metropolitans of Jerusalem, Thessalonica, Alexandria, and Rome. He accused the Bishops at Constantinople of forging or of altering the Acts of their Synod. He demanded a General Council to examine his opinions. The Emperor, under the influence of Chrysaphius, acceded to the request; the Council was summoned to meet at Ephesus, under the presidency of Dioscorus of Alexandria. Letters were despatched to the West by both parties, by Eutyches not only to the Bishop of Rome, but to the Bishop of Ravenna,¹ and no doubt to others. The support of Leo was too important not to be sought with earnest solicitude. But Eutyches addressed him as a suppliant, imploring his protection against injustice and persecution; Flavianus as an equal, who condescended to inform his brother Bishop of the measures which he had taken against an heretical subject of his diocese, and requested him to communicate the decree of the Constantinopolitan Synod to his brethren in the West. The consentient voice of Leo might restore peace to Christendom.

¹ The answer of the Bishop of Ravenna is extant in the works of S. Leo. Epist. xxv. The close, in which Chrysologus defers most humbly to Rome, seems to me suspicious.

But Leo was too wise to be deluded by the servility of Eutyches, or offended by the stately courtesy of Flavianus.¹ He waited to form his decision with cautious dignity.

At Ephesus met that assembly which has been branded by the odious name of the "Robber Synod." But it is difficult to discover in what respect, either in the legality of its convocation, or the number and dignity of the assembled prelates, consists its inferiority to more received and honored Councils. Two Imperial Commissioners, Elpidius and Eulogius, attended to maintain order in the Council, and peace in the city. Dioscorus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, by the Imperial command assumed the presidency.² The Bishops who formed the Synod of Constantinople were excluded as parties in the transaction, but Flavianus took his place, with the Metropolitans of Antioch and Jerusalem, and no less than three hundred and sixty bishops and ecclesiastics. Three ecclesiastics, Julian, a Bishop, Renatus, a Presbyter, and Hilarius, a Deacon,

¹ Quesnel and Pagi on one side, Baronius and the Ballerinis on the other, contest the relative priority of two letters addressed by Flavianus to Leo. The question in debate is whether Flavianus initiated an appeal to Rome. But neither of them contains any recognition of Leo's authority. In the first, according to Ballerini, he sends the account of the proceedings. *Ὡστε καὶ τὴν σὴν ὁσιώτητα γνοῦσαν τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν, πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπὸ τὴν σὴν θεοσέβειαν τελούσι θεοφιλεστάτοις ἐπισκόποις ἔδειξεν ποιῆσαι τὴν αὐτοῦ δυσσέβειαν.* — p. 757. The second letter, as printed by the Ballerinis, is in the same tone: *δίκαιον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο, ὡς ἡγοῦμαι, διδαχθῆναι ὑμῖς, ὡς ὅτι κ. τ. λ.*

² Dioscorus wanted the severe and unimpeached austerity of Cyril. He was said to have had a mistress named Irene. He is the subject of the well-known epigram which illustrates Alexandrian wit and boldness —

*"Εἰρήνη πάντεσσιν," Ἐπίσκοπος εἶπεν ἐπελιδῶν,
Πῶς δύναται πάντεσσ', ἦν μόνος ἔνδον ἔχει;*

were to represent the Bishop of Rome.¹ The Abbot Barsumas (this was an innovation) took his seat in the Council, as a kind of representative of the monks.

Though commenced with seeming regularity, the proceedings of the assembly soon degenerated into disgraceful turbulence, violence, and personal conflict. But it is impossible to deny that in this respect the Robber Synod only too faithfully followed, if it exceeded, the legitimate and Œcumenic Council of Ephesus. Its acts were marked with the same indecent precipitation; questions were carried by factious acclamations within, and the Council was overawed by riotous mobs without. But that which was pardonable and even righteous zeal in the cause of Cyril, was sacrilegious tumult in that of Eutyches: the monks, who had been welcomed and encouraged as holy champions of the faith when they issued from their cells to affright the Emperor into the condemnation of Nestorius, when they thronged around Eutyches, became a mutinous and ignorant rabble.²

The Egyptian faction (for Dioscorus, though tyrannical to the kindred and adherents of Cyril, embraced his opinions with the utmost ardor) looked to this Council, not so much for the vindication of Eutyches, as for the total suppression of Nestorianism, and, no doubt, the abasement of Flavianus, and in the person of Flavianus, of the aspiring see of Constantinople. But in their blind heat they involved themselves with the creed of Eutyches. The Council commenced with the usual formalities. The proposition to read the let-

¹ They were attended by Dulcitus, a notary. S. Leo. and Synod Ephes. One Bishop, Renatus, had died on the road. Hilarius seems to have taken the lead among Leo's legates.

² Compare Walch, p. 215.

ters of Leo to Flavianus, which condemned the doctrine of Eutyches, was refused with the utmost contempt.¹ Then were rehearsed the acts of the Synod of Constantinople. On the first mention of the two natures in Christ an angry dispute arose. But when the question put to Eutyches by Eusebius of Doryleum was read, whether he acknowledged the two natures after the incarnation, the assembly broke out with one voice, "Away with Eusebius! banish Eusebius! let him be burned alive! As he cuts asunder the two natures in Christ, so be he cut asunder!" The President put the question, "Is the doctrine that there are two natures after the incarnation to be tolerated?" The sacred Council replied, "Anathema on him who so says!" "I have your voices," said Dioscorus, "I must have your hands! He that cannot cry, let him lift up his hands!" With an unanimous suffrage the whole assembly proclaimed, "Accursed be he who says there are two!" The Council proceeded to absolve Eutyches from all suspicion of heterodoxy, and to reinstate him in all his ecclesiastical honors; to depose Flavianus and Eusebius, and to deprive them of all their dignities. Flavianus alone pronounced his appeal; Hilarius, the Roman deacon, alone refused his assent.² The unanimity of the assembly is unquestionable, but it is asserted, and on strong grounds, that it was an unanimity enforced by the dread of the imperial soldiery and

¹ "Quem Alexandrinus antistes, qui totum solus ibi potentia suæ vindicavit, audire contempsit," ἀκούσαι κατέπτυσεν in the Greek.—S. Leon. Epist. 1. ad Constantinop. Leo's letter exists in indifferent Greek, and worse Latin, dated 449, Jan. 13.

² We hear nothing of the other legate of Leo, the Bishop Julian: the Presbyter Renatus was dead.

the savage monks, who environed and even broke in, and violated the sanctity of the Council.¹ Dioscorus pursued his triumph. The deposition of Ibas of Edessa, Theodoret of Cyrus, Irenæus of Tyre, and of others who were suspected of Nestorianism, or at least refused to subscribe the anathemas of Cyril, was confirmed. Domnus of Antioch was involved in their fate. Hilarius the deacon fled to Rome; but not so fortunate was Flavianus. After suffering personal insults, it is said even blows, from the furious Dioscorus himself, instigated by the monk Barsumas, who shouted aloud, "Strike him, strike him dead!" he expired after a few days, either of his wounds, ^{Death of Flavianus.} of exhaustion, or mental suffering. Thus was this the first, but not the last, Christian Council which was defiled with blood.²

Alexandria had succeeded in dictating its doctrine to the whole of Christendom; the Patriarch of Alexandria had triumphed over both his rivals, had deposed the Metropolitan of Antioch, and the more dreaded Bishop of Eastern Rome. Nor was this all. An Imperial edict avouched the orthodoxy and confirmed the acts of the second Council of Ephesus. It involved Flavianus and Eusebius in the charge of Nestorianism; it proscribed Nestorianism in all its forms, branding it by the ill-omened name of Simonianism: it forbade the consecration of any bishop favorable to Nestorius or Flavianus, and deposed them, if unwarily consecrated: it condemned all worship or religious meetings of the Nestorians (and all who were not Euty-

¹ See the evidence of Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea.

² Leo, writing from the report of Hilarius, the Deacon, "Magnum facinus Alexandrino Episcopo auctore vel executore commissum est." — Epist. ad Anat.

chians were in danger of being declared Nestorians), under the penalty of confiscation and exile ; and interdicted the reading of all Nestorian books, which are ranked with the anti-Christian writings of Porphyry ; that is, the works of Nestorius and of Theodoret, and according to one copy of the law, those of Diodorus and Theodore of Mopsuestia also, under the same penalties.

But the law might command, it could not enforce peace. Eastern Christendom was severed into two conflicting parties. Egypt, Palestine, and Thrace adhered to Dioscorus, while the rest of Asiatic Christendom, Pontus and Asia Minor, still clung to the cause of Flavianus.¹ Strengthened by the unanimous consent of the West, which entered so reluctantly into these fine metaphysical subtleties, Leo, the Bishop of Rome, refused all recognition of the Ephesian Council. Dioscorus, in the heat of his passion and the pride of success, broke off (an unheard of and unprecedented boldness) all communion with Rome.

A sudden and total revolution at once took place. The change was wrought, — not by the commanding voice of ecclesiastical authority, — not by the argumentative eloquence of any great writer, who by his surpassing abilities awed the world into peace, — not by the reaction of pure Christian charity, drawing together the conflicting parties by evangelic love. It was a new dynasty on the throne of Constantinople.

The feeble Theodosius dies ; the masculine Pulcheria — the champion and the pride of orthodoxy — the friend of Flavianus and of Leo, ascends the throne, and gives her hand, with a share in the empire, to a brave soldier named Marcianus.

¹ Liberat. Brev. c. xii.

The hopes of one party, and the apprehensions of the other, were realized with the utmost rapidity. The first act of the Government, which Anatolius, the new bishop, who, though nominated by the Egyptian party, was a moderate prudent man, either acquiesced in or promoted, was the quiet removal of Eutyches from the city. This measure was confirmed by a synod at Constantinople.

A more full and authoritative Council could alone repeal the acts of the "Robber Synod" of Ephesus. The only opposition to the summons of such Council at Chalcedon arose from Leo. The Roman Pontiff had urged on the Western Emperor (it is said, on his knees) the necessity for a general Council; but Leo desired a Council in Italy, where no one could dispute the presidency of the Roman prelate. Prescient, it might seem, of the decree at Chalcedon, which raised the Patriarch of Constantinople to an equality with the Bishop of Rome, he dreaded the convocation of a Council in the precincts and under the immediate influence of the Byzantine court.

At Chalcedon, the Asiatic suburb of Constantinople, met that assembly, which has been admitted to rank as the fourth, by some as the last, of the great Œcumenic Councils. Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople, was present, with Maximus of Antioch, and Juvenalis of Jerusalem. Leo appointed as his representatives two bishops and a presbyter.¹ Above five hundred bishops² made their appear-

¹ Paschasinus, Bishop of Lilybæum, Lucentius, Bishop of Esculanum (Ascoli), Boniface, Presbyter of the Church of Rome.

² This is the number in the Breviarium: Marcellinus raises the number to six hundred and thirty. Between four and five hundred signatures are appended to the acts.

Council of
Chalcedon.
Oct. 8,
A.D. 451.

ance. Dioscorus of Alexandria was there, but sat not in the order of his rank, and was not allowed the right of suffrage. Theodoret of Cyrus claimed his seat, but did not obtain it without violent resistance from the Egyptian faction, who denounced him as a Nestorian: his own party retorted charges against the Egyptians, as persecutors of Flavianus, and as Manicheans. The Imperial Commissioners reprov'd with firmness, and repress'd with dignity, but with much difficulty, these rabble-like proceedings.¹

The first act of the Council, after the decrees of the Synod at Ephesus had been read, was to annul the articles of deposition against Flavianus and Eusebius. Many of the bishops expressed their penitence at their concurrence in these acts: some saying that they were compelled by force to subscribe — others to subscribe a blank paper. The Council proceeded to frame a resolution, deposing Dioscorus and five other bishops, as having iniquitously exercised undue influence in the Oct. 10. Council of Ephesus; but the right of approbation of this decree was reserved to the Emperor. During the whole of this first session, Dioscorus had confronted his adversaries with the utmost intrepidity, readiness, and self-command. He cried aloud, "They are condemning not me alone, but Athanasius and Cyril. They forbid us to assert the two natures after the incarnation." The night drew on; Dioscorus demanded an adjournment; the Senate refused; the acts were read over by torch-light. The bishops of Illyria proclaimed their abandonment of the cause of Dioscorus. The night was disturbed by wild cries of accla-

¹ It is said in the Breviar. Hist. Entych. that the Emperor and Senate were present. The Senate appears in the acts.

mation to the Emperor and the Senate, appeals to God, anathema to Dioscorus — “Christ has deposed Dioscorus — Christ has deposed the murderer — God has avenged his martyrs!” The Council at the next session proceeded to the definition of the true faith. The Creeds of Nicea and of Constantinople, the two Epistles of Cyril, and above all the Epistle of Leo to Flavianus, were recognized as containing the orthodox Christian doctrine. The letter of Leo excited acclamations of unbounded joy. “This is the belief of the Fathers, — of the Apostles!” “So believe we all!” “Accursed be he that admits not that Peter has spoken by the mouth of Leo!” “Leo has taught what is righteous and true; and so taught Cyril!” “Eternal be the memory of Cyril!” “Why was not this read at Ephesus? It was suppressed by Dioscorus!” With this there was again a strange mingled outcry of the Bishops, confessing their sin and imploring forgiveness, and of the adversaries of Dioscorus, chiefly the clergy of Constantinople, clamoring, “Away with the Egyptian, the Egyptian into exile!”

The Imperial Commissioners, who, with some few of the Bishops, were anxious that affairs should proceed with more dignified calmness, hardly restrained the impulse of the Council, who were eager to proceed by acclamation, and at once, to the condemnation of Dioscorus; they accused him of being a Jew. It would, perhaps, have been better for that prelate, if they had been permitted to follow their impulse; for charges now began to multiply and to darken against the falling Patriarch — charges of disloyalty, of tyranny, of rapacity, of incontinence. Condemnation of Dioscorus. Thrice was he summoned to appear (he had not been

permitted to resume his seat, or had withdrawn during the stormy course of the proceedings), thrice he disobeyed, or attempted to elude the summons. The solemn sentence was then pronounced by one of the Western Bishops, the representatives of Leo. It stated that Dioscorus, sometime Bishop of Alexandria, had been found guilty of divers ecclesiastical offences. To pass over many, he had admitted Eutyches, a man under excommunication by lawful authority, into communion; he had haughtily repelled all remonstrances; he had refused to read the Epistle of Leo at the Council of Ephesus; he had even aggravated his guilt by daring to place the Bishop of Rome himself under in-
 Oct. 13. terdict. Leo, therefore, by their voice, and with the authority of the Council, in the name of the Apostle Peter, the Rock and Foundation of the Church, deposes Dioscorus from his episcopal dignity, and excludes him from all Christian rights and privileges. The unanimous Council subscribes the judgment.¹

The decree was temperate and dignified; it contained no unfair or exaggerated accusations; though it might dwell with undue weight on the insulting conduct towards Leo, it condescended to no fierce and abusive appellations. Nor was the grave majesty of the assembly disturbed by a desperate rally of the monks, headed by Barsumas. This man, as
 Barsumas
 the monk. not unjustly suspected of being implicated in

¹ It is remarkable that the decree took no notice of the various imputations of heresy against Dioscorus, none of the accusations of murder said to have been perpetrated by him in Alexandria. Compare especially the libel of Ischyriion the Deacon, who offers to substantiate his charges by witnesses. Either Dioscorus was one of the most wicked of men, or Ischyriion the most audacious of calumniators. — Labbe, p. 398–400.

the death of Flavianus, the assembly refused to admit to the honors of a seat. Repelled on all sides, and awed by the Imperial power, the monks appealed to Christ from Cæsar, shook their garments in contempt of the Council, and as a protest against the injustice done to Dioscorus; and then sullenly retired to their solitudes to brood over and propagate in secret their Monophysite doctrines. Some of their traditions assert, in characteristic language, that Barsumas, thus ignominiously expelled by the Council and by the Emperor, pronounced his curse against Pulcheria. She died a few days afterwards, and Barsumas, while he took rank among his followers as a prophet and man of God, became from that time an object of cruel and unrelenting persecution by his enemies.

It is remarkable that the formulary of faith adopted finally by the Council of Chalcedon was brought forward by the Imperial Commissioners. After much altercation and delay, it received at length the sanction of the Council. After this the Civil Government (the Emperor Marcian) issued two laws, addressed to all orders, to the clergy, to the military, and to the commonalty; one prohibited the future agitation of these questions, as tending to tumult: it denounced as the penalty for offences against the statute, degradation to the ecclesiastic, to the soldier ignominious expulsion from the army, to the common man exile from the Imperial city.¹ The second decree confirmed all the proceedings at Chalcedon, enforced on the public mind the deferential conclusion, that no private man could hope to arrive at a sounder understanding of these

¹ A strong canon of the Council of Chalcedon against simony implies that the benefices in the East, as in the West, were highly lucrative.

mysteries than had been painfully attained by so many holy bishops, and only after much prayer and profound investigation. The punishment of dissent was left indefinite and at the will of the civil rulers.

But before the final dissolution of the Council at Chalcedon, among thirty canons on ecclesiastical subjects, appeared one of singular importance to Christendom. It asserted the supremacy of the Roman See, not in right of its descent from St. Peter, but solely as the Bishopric of the Imperial City. It assigned, therefore, to the Bishop of the New Rome, as equal in civil dignity, a coequal and coördinate ecclesiastical authority.¹ This canon, it is averred, was passed by a few bishops, who lingered behind the rest of the Council; it claims only the subscription of one hundred and fifty prelates, and those chiefly of the diocese of Constantinople. It is not indeed likely that the Alexandrian Church, though depressed by the ignominious degradation of its head, still less that the more ancient Churches of Antioch and Jerusalem should thus tamely acquiesce in the assumption of superiority (unless it were a measure enforced by the Imperial power) by the modern and un-Apostolic Church of Byzantium.² Leo from this period denounces the arrogance

¹ Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρονῷ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ρώμης, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες ἐικότως ἀποδεδώκασιν τὰ πρεσβεῖα. — Can. xxviii. p. 769.

² Leo, in his three epistles on the subject, seems to espouse the cause of Antioch and Alexandria, as insulted by their degradation from the second and third rank; rivalry with Rome on their part is a pretension of which he will not condescend to entertain a suspicion. "Tanquam opportunè se tempus hoc tibi obtulerit, quo *secundi* honoris privilegium sedes Alexandrina perdiderit, et Antiochena Ecclesia proprietatem *tertiæ* dignitatis amiserit, at his locis juri tuo subditis, Metropolitanis Episcopi proprio honore priventur." — Epist. liii.: ad Anatol. Const. Episc. The Bishop of Rome rebukes the ambition of his brother prelate in the words of St. Paul, "Be not high-minded, but fear!!"

and presumption of Anatolius, the Bishop of Constantinople; and this canon of the Œcumenic Council has been refused all validity in the West.

Throughout this long and melancholy ecclesiastical civil war, the Bishop of Rome could not but continue to rise in estimation and reverence, and in their inseparable result, authority. While the East had thus been distracted in every province, the West had enjoyed almost profound religious peace. The circumstances of the time contributed to this state of things; the preoccupation of the whole Western empire by the terrors of the most formidable invasion which had ever menaced society; the general disinclination to those fine theologic distinctions, which rose out of the Grecian schools of philosophy; and, perhaps, the desolation by the savage Vandals of the African Churches, which were most likely to plunge hotly into such disputes, and to drag with them the rest of Latin Christendom. During the whole feud the predecessors of Leo, and Leo himself, had calmly and firmly adhered to those doctrines which were finally received as orthodox. They had acted by common consent as heads and representatives of Western Christendom, and had fully justified the unquestioning confidence of the West by their congeniality with the universal sentiment. Nor had their dignity suffered in the eyes of men by the humiliating scenes to which the great prelates of the East, the Metropolitans of Antioch, of Constantinople, and Alexandria, had been continually exposed; arraignment as heretics, as criminals, before successive Councils, deposition, expulsion from their sees, excommunication, exile, even death. The feeble interdict issued by Dioscorus against Leo might have been

shaken off with silent contempt, if it had not rather suited him to treat it with indignation. Still more the Bishop of Rome had stood uncontaminated, in dignified seclusion from the wretched intrigues and bribery, the venal favor of unpopular ministers, and the trembling dependence on Imperial caprice. Every year became more and more manifest the advantage derived by the Bishop of Rome from the abandonment of Rome as the Imperial residence. The Metropolitan of Constantinople might claim by an ecclesiastical canon, equality with the Roman Pontiff; but the one was growing up into an independent Potentate, while the other, living under the darkening shadow of Imperial pomp and power, could not but shrink into a helpless instrument of the Imperial will. The fate of the Bishop of Constantinople, his rank and his authority in the Church, even his orthodoxy, depended virtually on the decree of the Emperor. Appearing in all the controversies of the East only in the persons of his delegates, the Bishop of Rome had preserved his majesty uninsulted and unhumbled by the degrading invectives, altercations, even personal contumelies, which had violated the sanctity of the great Eastern prelates. Even if they had not provoked; if they had borne with the most saintly patience the outrages of the popular or monkish rabble at Ephesus or Constantinople, in the general mind the holy character could not but be lowered by these debasing scenes.

Leo seemed fully to comprehend the importance and the dignity of his position. He took the most zealous interest in the whole controversy, but his activity was grave, earnest, and serious. His language to the Eastern Emperors, and especially to the Princess Pulcheria, may sound too adulatory to modern ears. The divinity

of the earthly sovereign was acknowledged in terms too nearly approaching that reserved for the great divine Sovereign. This, however, must be judged with some regard to the sentiments and expressions of the age; and his deference was in language rather than in thought. Leo addresses these earthly masters with an independence of opinion, more as their equal, almost more as their master, than would have been ventured by any other subject at that time in either empire.

In the West, meantime, Leo might seem, under the sole impulse of generous self-devotion and reliance on the majesty of religion, to assume the noblest function of the civil power, the preservation of the Empire, of Italy, of Rome itself, of Christianity, from the most tremendous enemy which had ever threatened their freedom and peace. While the Emperor Valentinian III. took refuge in Rome, and rumors spread abroad of his meditated flight, abdication, abandonment of his throne, Leo almost alone stood fearless. An embassy, of which the Bishop of Rome was no doubt considered by the general reverence of his own age, as well as by posterity, as the head and chief, arrested the terrible Attila on the frontiers of Italy, and dispersed the host of savage and but half-human Huns. Leo, to grateful Rome, might appear as the peaceful Camillus, as the unarmed Marius, repelling invaders far more fearful than the Gauls or the Cimbrians.

The terror of Europe at the invasion of the Huns naturally and justifiably surpassed that of all former barbaric invasions. The Goths and other German tribes were familiar to the sight of the Romans; some of them had long been settled within the frontier of the empire; they were already for the most part Christian, and, to

a certain extent, Romanized in their manners and habits. The Mongol race, with their hideous, misshapen, and, as they are described, scarcely human figures, their wild habits, their strange language, their unknown origin, their numbers, exaggerated no doubt by fear, and swollen by the aggregation of all the savage tribes who were compelled or eagerly crowded to join the predatory warfare, but which seemed absolutely inexhaustible; their almost unresisted career of victory, devastation, and carnage, from the remotest East till they were met by Aëtius on the field of Châlons: at the present time the vast monarchy founded by Attila, which overshadowed the whole Northern frontier of the Empire, and to which the Gothic and other Teutonic kings rendered a compulsory allegiance; their successful inroads on the Eastern Empire, even to the gates of Constantinople; the haughty and contemptuous tone in which they conducted their negotiations, had almost appalled the Roman mind into the apathy of despair. Religion, instead of rousing to a noble resistance against this heathen race, which threatened to overrun the whole of Christendom, by acquiescing in Attila's proud appellation, the Scourge of God, seemed to justify a dastardly prostration before the acknowledged emissary of the divine wrath. The spell, it is true, of Attila's irresistible power had been broken; he had suffered a great defeat, and Gaul was, for a time at least, wrested from his dominion by the valor and generalship of Aëtius. But when, infuriated, as it might seem, more than discouraged by his discomfiture, the yet formidable Hun suddenly descended upon Italy, the whole peninsula lay defenceless before him. Aëtius, as is most probable, was unable, as his enemies afterwards de-

clared, was traitorously unwilling, to throw himself between the barbarians and Rome. The last struggles of Roman pride, which had rejected the demand of Attila for the hand of the Princess Honoria (his self-offered bride, whose strange adventures illustrate the degradation of the Imperial family), and which had been delayed by the obstinate resistance of Aquileia to the whole army of Attila, were crushed by the fall and utter extermination of that city, and the total subjugation of Italy as far as the banks of the Po.¹ Valentinian, the Emperor, fled from Ravenna to Rome. To some no doubt he might appear to seek succor at the feet of the Roman Pontiff; but the abandonment of Italy was rumored to be his last desperate determination.

At this fearful crisis, the insatiable and victorious Hun seemed suddenly and unaccountably to ^{Invasion of} pause in his career of triumph. He stood ^{Attila.} rebuked and subdued before a peaceful embassy, of which, with the greater part of the world, the Bishop of Rome, as he held the most conspicuous station, so he received almost all the honor. The names of the rich Consular Avienus, of the Prefect of Italy, Trigettius, who ventured with Leo to confront the barbarian conqueror, were speedily forgotten; and Leo stands forth the sole preserver of Italy. On the shores of the Benacus the ambassadors encountered the fearful Attila. Overawed (as the belief was eagerly propagated, and as eagerly accepted) by the personal dignity, the venerable character, and by the religious majesty of Leo, Attila consented to receive the large dowry of the Princess Honoria, and to retire from Italy. The

¹ Compare Gibbon, c. xxxv. Observe the characteristic words of Jordanes: "Dum ad aulae decus virginitatem suam cogeretur custodire."

death of Attila in the following year, by the bursting of a blood-vessel, on the night during which he had wedded a new wife, may have been brooding, as it were, in his constitution, and somewhat subdued his fiercer energy of ambition. His army, in all probability, was weakened by its conquests, and by the uncongenial climate and unaccustomed luxuries of Italy. But religious awe may still have been the dominant feeling which enthralled the mind of Attila. The Hun, with the usual superstitiousness of the polytheist, may have trembled before the God of the stranger, whom nevertheless he did not worship. The best historian of the period relates that the fate of Alaric, who had survived so short a time the conquest of Rome, was known to Attila, and seemed to have made a profound impression upon him.¹ The daunt-

A. D. 452.

less confidence and the venerable aspect of Leo would confirm this apprehension of encountering, as it were, in his sanctuary the God now adored by the Romans. Legend, indeed, has attributed the submission of Attila to a visible apparition of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, who menaced the trembling heathen with a speedy divine judgment if he repelled the proposals of their successor. But this materializing view, though it may have heightened the beauty of Raffaele's painting of Leo's meeting with Attila, by the introduction of preterhuman forms, lowers the moral grandeur of the whole transaction. The simple faith in his God, which gave the Roman Pontiff courage to confront Attila, and threw that commanding majesty over his words and actions which wrought upon the mind of the barbarian, is far more Christianly sublime than this unnecessarily imagined miracle.

¹ Priscus, quoted by Jornandes, c. 42.

The incorrigible Romans alone, in their inextinguishable pagan superstition, or their ineradicable pagan passion for the amphitheatre, attributed the deliverance of the city not to the intercession of Leo (like the rest of the world), or to the mercy of God, but to the influence of the stars. They crowded (to his indignation) to the Circensian games, rather than to the tombs of the martyrs.¹ Leo might save Rome from the sword of the heathen barbarian, he could not save it from the vices of the Christian sovereign, which were precipitating the Western Empire to its fall, and brought down on Rome a second capture, more destructive than that of the Goth, by the Vandal Genseric. Valentinian III. had taken refuge at Rome; but he found Rome not only more secure, but in its society, its luxury, and its dissoluteness, a more congenial scene for his license than the confined and secluded Ravenna. He returned to it to indulge more freely in his promiscuous amours. At length the violation of the wife of a Senator, Petronius Maximus, of the highest rank and great wealth, caused his assassination. In Valentinian closed the Western line of descendants from the

¹ "Pudet dicere, sed oportet non tacere: plus impenditur dæmoniis quam apostolis, et majorem obtinent insana spectacula frequentiam, quam beata martyria." — S. Leon. Serm. lxxxiv. I am inclined to concur with Baronius (*Annal. sub ann.*) rather than with the later editors of S. Leo's works, Quesnel and the Balerinis, in assigning the short sermon on the Octave of St. Peter to the deliverance from Attila, not to the evacuation of the city by Genseric. Ballerini's view seems impossible. The death of the Emperor Maximus (see below) took place on the 12th of June, three days after Genseric entered the city; the sack of the city lasted fourteen days, till St. Peter's Day, the 29th; yet Ballerini would suppose that on the octave of that day the Romans were so far recovered from their consternation, danger, and ruin, as to celebrate the Circensian games at great expense, and to attend them in multitudes, which provoked the holy indignation of the bishop. The deliverance, which they ascribed to the stars, rather than to the mercy of God, can hardly have been the abandonment of the plundered and desolate city, with hundreds of the inhabitants carried away into captivity.

great Theodosius. The vengeance of Maximus was not content with the sceptre of the murdered Valentinian; he compelled Eudoxia, the Empress, during the first months of her widowhood, to receive him as her husband; and in the carelessness or the insolence of his triumph, betrayed his own complicity, which was before doubtful, in the assassination of Valentinian. Eudoxia determined on revenge; from her Imperial kindred in the East she could expect no succor; the Vandal fleets covered the Mediterranean; Genseric, not satiated with the conquest of Africa, had already subdued Sicily. At the secret summons of the Empress he landed with a powerful force, at the mouth of the Tiber. The defenceless Romans hastened to sacrifice the cause of their calamities; they joined the followers of Eudoxia in a general insurrection, in which the miserable Maximus perished; his body was hewn in pieces and then cast into the Tiber.¹

But the ambition and the rapacity of Genseric were not appeased by this victim; he advanced towards Rome, where no measures of defence had been taken; none perhaps could have been organized in a city without a ruler, and without a standing force. Leo was again the only safeguard of the city; but the Bishop of Rome was still a man of Christian peace. Unarmed, at the head of his clergy, he issued forth to meet the invader; and though the Arian Vandal, within sight of his prey, and actually master of Rome, still the centre of riches and luxury, Rome open to his own rapacity, and that of his soldiers—was less submissive than the heathen Hun; yet even he con-

A. D. 455. sented to some restraint on the cruelty and

¹ Procop. Hist. Vandal. On the character and history of Maximus, read Letter of Sidon. Apollinar. 11, 13.

license which attend the sack of a captured city. The lives of those who offered no resistance were to be spared; the buildings to be guarded against conflagration, the captives protected from torture. But that was all (and it was much at such a crisis) which the authority of the Pontiff could obtain. The Roman Leo with the rest of his countrymen must witness, what may seem to have aggravated the calamity in the estimation of the world, the late revenge of Carthage, the plunder of Rome by the conquering Africans.¹ In the pillage, which lasted for fourteen days, if the edifices were spared, the treasuries of the churches were forced to surrender all which they had accumulated from the pious munificence of the public, during the forty-five years which had elapsed since the sack by Alaric.² It has been observed as a singular event that Genseric, a barbarian from the shores of the Baltic, compelled Rome to surrender, and transported to the shores of Africa the spoils of two religions. From the Temple of Peace in Rome he carried off the plunder of the Jewish Holy of Holies, the gold table and the seven-branched candlestick, which had been deposited as trophies by the Emperor Titus. Roman paganism suffered loss no less insulting than that she had inflicted on Jerusalem. The statues of

¹ See the spirited lines of Sidonius, —

Heu facinus! in bella iterum *quartosque* labores
 Perfida Elisææ crudescunt classica Byrsæ.
 Nutritis quod fata malùm! Conscenderat arces
 Evandri Massyla phalanx, montesque Quirini
 Marmarici pressere pedes, rursusque revexit
 Quæ captiva dedit quondam stipendia Barche.

Sid. Apoll. Panegyric. — 444.

² Leo from the wreck saved three large silver vessels, of 100 pounds each, which he caused to be cast into communion plate for the other destitute churches. Baronius, from this, and other equally insufficient reasons, infers that the three great churches of St. Peter, St. Paul, and the Lateran (?) escaped.

the gods and heroes of ancient Rome had been still permitted to adorn the Capitoline Temple. These, with the roof of gilt bronze, became the prey of the African Vandals, and were consigned as trophies to Carthage. Rome thus ceased altogether to be a pagan city; and Genseric accomplished what, by the dispersion of the old pagan families, had been more than begun by Alaric. The last bond was broken between Christian Rome and the religion of ancient Rome. The ship which bore the gods of Rome to Carthage foundered at sea. The amount of plunder from the Imperial palace and those of the still wealthy nobility, from the temples and the churches, is vaguely stated at many thousand talents. The Vandal avarice stooped to the meaner metals; the copper and the brass were swept away with remorseless rapacity. The Roman aristocracy, which had been scattered to so great an extent by the conquest of Alaric, were now in numbers carried away into captivity; families were broken up, wives separated from husbands, children from parents. Even the Empress Eudoxia and her daughters, the sole survivors of the Western line of Theodosius, were transported as honorable bond-slaves to Carthage; one of the daughters, Eudocia, Genseric married to his son; the mother and the other daughter, who was already married he released at the request of the Byzantine Emperor Leo, and sent them to Constantinople. But with every successive decimation which thus fell on the Roman nobility, the relative importance of the clergy must have increased, as did that of the Pontiff, from the absence of the Emperor from the capital. Rome, after the departure of Genseric's fleet, laden with the spoils and crowded with captives, selected for their rank, their accomplishments, the females no doubt for

their beauty or for their easy submission to the will of the conquerer, was left without government, almost without social organization, except that of the Church. The first Emperor who aspired to the succession of Maximus was Avitus in Gaul.

The calamity which could not be averted by the commanding authority of the Bishop of Rome, was mitigated by the active and judicious charity of the Bishop of Carthage. Deo Gratias, by the manner in which he devoted himself to the service of the wretched captives dragged away from Rome, has extorted the sincere admiration of an historian in general too blind to the true beauty of the Christian religion.¹ The Bishop of Carthage had no scruple in sacrificing that which had been offered to give splendor to the worship of God, to the more holy object of alleviating human misery. In order to reunite those who had been severed by the cruelty or the covetousness of the conquerors — the husbands from the wives, the parents from their children — he sold all the gold and silver vessels belonging to the churches of his diocese. Diseases and sicknesses followed this sudden and violent change of life. To mitigate these sufferings he converted two large churches into hospitals, furnished them with beds and mattresses, and with a daily allowance of food and medicine. The good bishop himself by night and day accompanied the physicians, visiting every bed, and adding the comforts of tender and affectionate sympathy and of gentle Christian advice, to the substantial gifts of food and the proper remedies.² The aged man wore himself out in these cares. He may have been obnoxious on other accounts to the

¹ Gibbon.

² Gibbon well describes this.

Arian rulers, and may have escaped the persecutions with which Genseric and the Vandals afterwards afflicted the African Churches by his timely death;¹ but the judgment must be strangely infected with theological hatred which would suppose that his life was endangered by the jealousy of the Arians at these acts of true Christian mercy.²

The sudden but brief and transitory effort of the Roman Empire, under Majorian, to arrest its hastening extinction, to resume something of its ancient energy, to mitigate the calamities, and avert the impending disorganization by wise legislation,³ by the remission of burdensome taxation, by the restoration of the municipal government in the cities—this last and exhausting paroxysm of strength continued till the close of the Pontificate of Leo. But it was too late; wisdom and virtue, at certain periods, are as fatal to those at the head of affairs, as improvidence and vice. He that would stem a torrent at its fall is swept away. Majorian perished through a lawless conspiracy, as though he had been the worst of tyrants. The last of the Roman Emperors who showed anything of the Roman in his character, and the Pontiff who, in a truly Roman spirit, chiefly founded her spiritual empire, were coincident in the period of their death.⁴ Majorian died in the year 461, leaving the

¹ Victor. Vit. de Persecut. Vandal.

² This is the charitable conclusion of Baronius: "Quo livore Ariani succensi, dolis eum quam plurimis voluerunt sæpius enecare. Quod, credo, prævidens Dominus passerem suum de manibus accipitium voluit liberare."—Annal. sub ann. 453.

³ Compare the laws of Majorian at the end of the Codex Theodosianus.

⁴ Leo was still occupied by the disputes in the East, which followed the condemnation of Eutychianism by the Council of Chalcedon, but this subject will be continuously treated in the following Book.

affairs of Rome and the still subject provinces in irrecoverable anarchy. One or two obscure names fill up the barren annals, till the Western Empire expired in the person of Augustulus. Leo died in the same year, leaving a regular succession of Pontiffs, who gradually rose to increasing temporal influence, which, nevertheless, was entirely subordinate to the barbarian kings of Italy, the Herulian and the Ostro-Gothic line, till, after the reconquest of Italy by the Eastern Emperor, and the gradual abandonment of Justinian's conquests by his feebler successors, the Popes became great temporal potentates.

Latin Christianity, at the close of the fourth, and during the first decennial period of the fifth century, had produced three of her great fathers—the founders of her doctrinal and disciplinarian system—Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine; Jerome, if not the father, the faithful and zealous guardian of her young monasticism, Ambrose of her sacerdotal authority, Augustine of her theology.

Before the middle of the fifth century, the two great founders of the Popedom, Innocent I. and Leo I., (singularly enough, each contemporary with one of the sieges and sacks of Imperial Rome by Teutonic barbarians,) had laid deep the groundwork for the Western spiritual monarchy of Rome. That monarchy must await the close of the sixth century to behold her fourth Father, the author, if we may so speak, of her popular religion, and the third great founder of the Papal authority, not only over the minds, but over the hearts of men.—Gregory the Great.

| EMPERORS OF THE EAST. | | WESTERN EMPERORS. | | KINGS OF FRANKS. | | VISIGOTHIC KINGS IN SPAIN. | | VANDAL KINGS IN AFRICA. | | |
|--------------------------------------|------|---|------|---|------|-------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|
| A.D. | A.D. | A.D. | A.D. | A.D. | A.D. | A.D. | A.D. | A.D. | A.D. | |
| 457. Leo I. | 474 | | | | | | | 429. Genserik. | 476 | |
| | | 461. Severus. | 464 | | | | | | | |
| | | 464. Vacant. | 466 | | | | 466. Euric. | 494 | | |
| | | 467. Anthemius. | 471 | | | | | | | |
| 474. Leo II. Zeno. Basiliscus. | 491 | 472. Olybrius. Glycerius. Nepos. Augustulus. | 476 | | | | | | 476. Huneric. | 484 |
| | | KINGS OF ITALY. | | 481. Clovis. Kingdom divided. | 510 | | | | | |
| | | 476. Odoacer the Herulian. | 493 | | | | 484. Alaric II. | 507 | 484. Gondobald. | 495 |
| | | | | 510. Descendants of Clovis. | | | | | | |
| 491. Anastasius I. | 518 | | | KINGS OF BURGUNDY. | | | | | | |
| | | 493. Theodoric the Ostrogoth. | 526 | 451. Gunderic. | 473 | | | | 496. Thrasimond. | 522 |
| | | | | | | | 507. Gesaric. | 511 | | |
| (Vitalianus.) | 515 | | | 472. Gundebald and his brothers. | 509 | | 511. Amalaric. | 531 | | |
| 518. Justin I. | 527 | | | 509. Sigismund. | 534 | | | | 522. Hilderic. | 530 |
| | | | | 524. Gondemar. Conquered by Western Franks. | 532 | | | | | |
| 527. Justinian. | 565 | 526. Athalaric. | 534 | | | | | | 530. Glimmer. | 534 |
| | | 534. Theodatus. | 536 | | | | | | 534. Conquered by Justinian. | |
| | | 536. Vitiges. | 540 | | | | 531. Theudes. | 548 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 540. Theodebald. | | | | | 548. Theodegesild. | 549 | | |
| | | 541. Araric. Totila. | 553 | | | | 549. Agla. | 558 | | |
| | | 558. Tola. | | | | | | | | |
| 565. Justin II. | 578 | | | | | | 558. Athanagild. | 567 | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| 578. Tiberius. | 582 | | | | | | 567. Liuba. | 572 | | |
| 582. Maurice. | 602 | | | | | | 572. Leovigild. | 586 | | |
| | | | | | | | 586. Recared. | 600 | | |
| 602. Phocas. | 610 | | | | | | | | | |

BOOK III.

CHAPTER I.

MONOPHYSITISM.

LEO THE GREAT had not lived to witness the last feeble agonies of the Western Empire; he escaped the ignominious feeling which must have depressed the spirit of a Roman at the assumption of the strange title, the King of Italy, by a Barbarian: he was not called upon to render his allegiance, or to acknowledge the title of Odoacer.

The immediate successor of Leo was Hilarius, by birth a Sardinian. As deacon, Hilarius had been the representative of Leo at the Council of Ephesus. His firmness during those stormy debates displays a character unlikely to depart from the lofty pretensions of his predecessor. He reasserted in the East the unbending orthodoxy of Leo; in the West, he maintained, to the utmost extent, the authority which had been claimed over the churches of Gaul

| EASTERN EMPIRE. | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----|--------------------|-----|
| 564. Narses, Governor. 568. | | | |
| KINGS OF RAVENNA. | | KINGS OF LOMBARDS. | |
| 590. Longinus. | 564 | 568. Alboin. | 572 |
| 584. Smaragdus. | 587 | 572. Cleopha. | 574 |
| 587. Romanus. | 598 | 574. Duke rule to | 584 |
| 586. Callistus. | 603 | 584. Autharis, | 590 |
| | | King. | |
| | | 590. Agilulf. | 616 |

and Spain. Rusticus, Bishop of Narbonne, on his death-bed, nominated Hermes as successor to his see. This precedent of a bishop making his see, as it were, a subject of testamentary bequest, seemed dangerous, though in this case the lawful assent had been obtained from the clergy and the people. Hilarius, at Nov. 3, 462. the head of a synod in Rome, condemned the practice, but for the sentence of degradation substituted the lesser punishment, the deprivation of the right to confer ordination. In another dispute concerning the jurisdiction of the Metropolitans of Arles and Vienne over the Bishop of Die, the successor Feb. 24, 464. of St. Peter at least confirms, if he does not ground his whole ecclesiastical authority on the decrees of Christian Emperors. The Imperial sanction was wanting to ratify the edicts of the Apostolic See.¹ The bishops of the province of Tarragona addressed Pope Hilarius in humbler language, and were treated, therefore, in a loftier tone of dictation.

The only act of Hilarius which mingles him up with the temporal affairs of the age, is his solemn rebuke of the Emperor Anthemius, the sovereign who had been sent from Constantinople to rule the West, for presuming to introduce those maxims of toleration, to which his father-in-law, Marcian, had compelled unruly Constantinople; and even to look with favor on the few

¹ "Fratri enim nostro Leontio nihil constituti a sanctæ memoriæ decessore meo potuit abrogari, nihil voluit, quod honori ejus debetur, auferri; quia *Christianorum quoque principum lege decretum est*, ut quidquid ecclesiis earumque rectoribus, pro quiete omnium domini sacerdotum, atque ipsius observantiâ disciplinæ, in auferendis confusionibus apostolicæ sedis antistes suo pronunciasset examine, veneranter accipi, tenaciterque servari, cum suis plebibus caritas vestra cognosceret: nec unquam possent convelli, quæ et sacerdotali ecclesiasticâ præceptione fulcirentur *et regiâ.*" — Hilarii Papæ Epist. xi. Labbe, p. 1045.

surviving partisans of the ancient philosophy, if not of the ancient religion. Under the reign of Anthemius, the old heathen festival, the Lupercalia, was still celebrated in Rome. The venerable rite which still commemorated at once the genial influences of the opening year, and the birth of Rome from the she-wolf which nursed her twin founders, was but slightly disguised to the worshipping Christians.¹

It was Simplicius, the successor of Hilarius, born at Tibur, who beheld the sceptre wrested from the helpless hand of Augustulus, and heard the demand of the allegiance of Italy from Odoacer, a barbarian of uncertain race. The Papal Epistles dwell only on the polemic controversies of the day, on questions of ecclesiastical jurisdiction or ceremonial discipline; they rarely notice, even incidentally, the great changes in the civil society around them. We endeavor in vain to find any expression or intimation of the feelings excited in a Roman of the high station and influence of the Pope, at the total extinction of that sovereignty which had governed the world for centuries, and from which the Bishop of Rome acknowledged himself to hold to some extent his authority; by whose edicts Christianity had become the established religion of the world, to which the orthodox faith looked for its support by the legal proscription of heretics; which had been at least the civil lawgiver of the Church, and by whose grants she held her vast increasing estates. How far was the conscious possession of a power, which might hereafter sway opinions as widely as the republic or the empire had enforced outward submission and by force of arms

Sept. 467.
Feb. 25, 468.
Simplicius.

Close of the
Western
Empire.

¹ Compare Gibbon, ch. xxxvi.

had quelled every thought of resistance, accepted as a consolation for the departed name of sovereignty? How far did Roman pride take refuge under the pretensions of her Bishop to be the head of Christendom, from the degradation of a foreign and barbarian yoke? Christendom, from all her monuments and records, might seem to have formed a world of her own. Of the fall of Augustulus, of the rise of Odoacer, we hear not a word. Even in the midst of this extraordinary revolution the active energy of the Popes seems centred on the East. The Bishop of Rome is busy in Constantinople; opposing the intrigues of Timotheus Ailurus, the Bishop of Alexandria, and jealously watching the ambition of Acacius, the Bishop of Constantinople, a more formidable enemy than Odoacer, as threatening the religious supremacy of Rome.¹ He takes deep interest in the changes on the throne of the East, congratulates the Emperor Zeno on his restoration, but it is because Zeno is an enemy to the Euty-chian heretics, because he rises on the ruins of Basiliscus, the patron of the Monophysite faction.

For while the West, partly from her want of interest in these questions, partly from the unsettled state of public affairs, from the breaking up of Attila's kingdom, the Vandal invasion of Italy, the Visigothic conquests in Gaul and Spain, and the final extinction of the empire, reposed, as to its religious belief, under the paternal sway of Pope Leo and his successors, the distracted East, in all its great capi-
Church in
the East.
tals, was still agitated with strife, that strife perpetually breaking out into violence and bloodshed. The Council of Chalcedon had commanded, had defined the or-

¹ Simplicii Epist. p. 1078.

thodox creed in vain. Everywhere its decrees were received or rejected, according to the dominant party in each city, and the opinions of the reigning Emperor. On all the metropolitan thrones there were rival bishops, anathematizing each other, and each supported either by the civil power, by a part of the populace, or by the monks, more fierce and unruly than the unruly populace. For everywhere monks were at the head of the religious revolution which threw off the yoke of Jerusalem. the Council of Chalcedon.¹ In Jerusalem Theodosius, a monk, expelled the rightful prelate, Juvenalis; was consecrated by his party, and maintained himself by acts of violence, pillage, and murder, more like one of the lawless bandits of the country than a Christian bishop. The very scenes of the Saviour's Alexandria. mercies ran with blood shed in his name by his ferocious self-called disciples. In Alexandria the name of Dioscorus (who remained quiet till his death, at Gangra, his place of exile) was still dear to most of the monks, and to many of the people, who asserted the champion of orthodox belief and Alexandrian dignity to have been sacrificed to the Nestorian Council of Chalcedon. A prelate named Proterius had been appointed, in the triumph of that Council, to the vacant see. The bold wit of the Alexandrian populace had always delighted in affixing nicknames upon the rulers and kings of Egypt; in their strong religious animos-

¹ Leonis Epist. cix. a cxxiv.; Marciani Epist. ad calc. Conc. Chalced.; Evagrius, 11, 5. The latter writer says the difference between the two parties was between the two prepositions *εν* and *εξ*. Leo makes a remarkable admission. His words might have been misunderstood by those who "non valentes in Græcum aptè et propriè Latina transferre, cum in rebus subtilibus et difficilibus explicandis, vix sibi etiam in suâ linguâ disputator quisque sufficiat."

ity, they scrupled not to profane their holy bishops with equally irreverent appellations. Timotheus, a monk, called Ailurus the Weasel, perhaps because he was said to have slunk by night to the secret meetings of the rabble, or because he stole into the bishopric of another, was consecrated by the anti-Chalcedonian faction, as a rival metropolitan. We are impatient of these dreary and intricate feuds. That of Alexandria ended, it must not be said, for it might seem interminable, but came to a crisis, in the horrible assassination of Proterius. So little had centuries of Christianity tamed the savage populace of this great city, that the Bishop was not only murdered in the baptistery, but his body treated with shameless indignity, and other enormities perpetrated which might have appalled a cannibal.¹ Timotheus, however, is acquitted as to the guilt of participation in these monstrous crimes. But the Weasel did not assume the throne of Alexandria without a rival. Another Timotheus, called Solofaciolus, was set up (Timotheus the Weasel having been banished on the authority of the Emperor Leo), after no long interval, by the Chalcedonian party.²

At Antioch, some years later, a third monk, Peter, called from his humble birth and occupation the Fuller,³ with the apparent countenance of Zeno, the Emperor Leo's son-in-law, whom he had accompanied

¹ Καὶ οὐδὲ τῶν ἐντὸς ἀπογέεσθαι κατὰ τοὺς θήρας φειδόμενοι ἐκείνου, ὃν ἔχειν μεσίτην θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἔναγχος ἐνομίσθησαν. — Evagrius, 11, 9, quoting the letter of the Bishops and Clergy to the Emperor Leo.

² Timotheus was allowed to go to Constantinople to plead his cause; thence he was dismissed into banishment. — S. Leon. Epist. ad Gennadium et ad Leonem Imper.

³ The history of Peter the Fuller is related differently; the time of his invasion of the church of Antioch is not quite certain.

during his wars in the East, began to intrigue with the discontented party in that city. He led a procession, chiefly of monastics, through the streets, which added to the "Thrice Holy" in the hymn, "who wast crucified for us." In a short time Peter succeeded in expelling the Bishop Martyrius, who voluntarily abdicated his see.

Barsumas, the notorious leader of the monks in Constantinople, who had been driven from that city by the Council of Chalcedon, was not inactive during his exile. Throughout Syria he spread the charge of Nestorianism against the Council, and exasperated men's minds against the prelates of that party. On one religious subject alone the conflicting East maintained its perfect unity, in the reverence, it may be said the worship, of the Hermit on the Pillar. Simeon Stylites had been observed by his faithful disciple to have remained motionless for three days in the same attitude of prayer. Not once had he stretched out his arms in the form of the cross; not once had he bowed his forehead till it touched his feet (a holy exploit, which his wondering admirers had seen him perform twelve hundred and forty-four times, and then lost their reckoning). The watchful disciple climbed the pillar; a rich odor saluted his nostrils; the saint was dead. The news reached Antioch. Ardaburius, general of the forces in the East, hastened to send a guard of honor, lest the neighboring cities should seize — perhaps meet in desperate warfare for — the treasure of his body. Antioch, now one in heart and soul, sent out her Patriarch, with three other bishops, to lead the funeral procession. The body was borne on mules for three hundred stadia; a deaf and dumb man touched the

bier, he burst out into a cry of gratulation. The whole city, with torches and hymns, followed the body. The Emperor Leo implored Antioch to yield to him the inestimable deposit. The Emperor implored in vain. Antioch, so long as she possessed the remains of Simeon, might defy all her enemies. In the same year, when Antioch thus honored the funeral rites of him whom she esteemed the greatest of mankind, Rome was lamenting in deep and manly sorrow her Pontiff, Leo. Contrast Simeon Stylites with one Emperor crouching at the foot of his pillar, and receiving his dull, incoherent words as an oracle, then with another, a man of higher character, supplicating for the possession of his remains, and Pope Leo on his throne in Rome, and in the camp of Attila. Such were then Greek and Latin Christianity. Nor was the lineage of the Holy Simeon broken or contested. The sees of Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, the throne of the East, might be the cause of long and bloody conflict. The hermit Daniel mounted his pillar at Anapulus, near the mouth of the Euxine; in that cold and stormy climate, his body, instead of being burned up with heat, was rigid with frost. But he became at once the legitimate, acknowledged successor of Simeon, the Prophet, the oracle of Constantinople. Once he condescended to appear in the streets of Constantinople; his presence decided the fate of the Empire.¹

The religious affairs in the East were indissolubly

¹ On Simeon. Antonii vit. S. S. Theodoret Lect., Evagr. i. 13; on Daniel vit. Dan. Theodoret. This kind of asceticism was the admiration of the East to a later period. Eustathius of Thessalonica addressed a Stylites in the xiith century, admonishing the Saint against pride, yet at the same time asserting this to be the utmost height of religion. Eustath. Opuscula, Edit. Tafel, p. 182.

blended with the political revolutions, to which the religious factions added their weight, and unquestionably did not mitigate the animosity. These revolutions were frequent and violent. Leo the Thracian, the successor of Marcian, throughout his long reign, adhered firmly to the Council of Chalcedon. Towards the close of his reign the treacherous murder of Aspar the Patrician, and his son Ardaburius, to whom Leo had owed his throne; the violation of the Imperial word, solemnly given in order to lure Aspar from the sanctuary to which he had fled (the inviolability of the right of sanctuary Leo had just established by a statute); the same contempt of the laws of hospitality (the murder took place at a banquet in the Imperial palace, to which he had invited Aspar and his son), all this execrable perfidy was vindicated to a large part of his subjects, because Aspar was an Arian.¹ The Eastern world was in danger of falling under the sway of the Cæsar Ardaburius, who was either an open Arian, or but a recent and suspicious convert. This was in itself enough to convict him and his partisans of treasonable designs, and to justify any measures which might avert the danger from the Emperor Leo. Empire. During the whole reign of Leo, Eutychianism had been repressed by the known orthodoxy of the Emperor.² Timotheus the Weasel had been permitted, as has been said, through the weak and suspicious favor of Anatolius, the Bishop

Revolutions
in Constanti-
nople. From
A.D. 457 to
474.

Death of
Marcian.

¹ Niceph. xv. 27.

² A law of Leo betrays the fears of the government of these monkish factions: "Qui in monasteriis agunt, ne potestatem habeant a monasteriis exeundi." The force of law was necessary to compel these disciples of Paul and Antony to be what they had taken vows to be.

of Constantinople, to visit the court, but he had been repelled and sent into exile by the severe Emperor. But with the exception of the first disturbances excited at Antioch by Peter the Fuller, the reign of Leo the Thracian was one of comparative religious peace. Eutychianism hid its head in the sullen silence of the monasteries. With the contested Empire on the death of Leo, the religious contests broke out in new fury. Zeno, who had married Leo's daughter, Ariadne, was driven from the throne by Basiliscus, the brother of Verina, the widow of Leo. With Basiliscus, the anti-Chalcedonian party rose to power. An Imperial encyclic letter branded with an anathema the whole proceedings at Chalcedon, and the letter of Pope Leo, as tainted with Nestorianism. Everywhere the Eutychian bishops seized upon the sees, and expelled the rightful prelates. Peter the Fuller, who had for a time been excluded, reascended the throne of Antioch. Paul resumed that of Ephesus. Anastasius of Jerusalem rendered his allegiance. Timotheus the Weasel came from his exile to Constantinople, and ruled the Emperor Basiliscus with unrivalled sway.¹ Acacius, the Bishop of Constantinople, was a man of great ability. He beheld the unwelcome presence, the increasing influence of the rival Patriarch of Alexandria, with jealous suspicion, and refused to admit him to the communion of the Church. Fierce struggles for power distracted Constantinople.² On one side were

Zeno expelled
by Basiliscus.
A.D. 476.

¹ See the triumphant reception of Timotheus in Constantinople, Evagr. iii. 4.

² The language of the Pope Simplicius shows the manner in which the hostile parties wrote of each other: "Comperi Timotheum parricidam, qui Ægyptiæ pridem vastator Ecclesiæ, in morem Cain . . . ejectus a facie

the Eutychian monks ; on the other, the Bishop Acacius and a large part of the populace and of the monks of Constantinople, for fierce bands of monks now appeared on either side. But his most powerful supporter was the Hermit Daniel, who descended from the pillar, where he had received the suppliant visits of the former Emperor, to take part in these tumults, that pillar which more sober Christians might almost have mounted in order to rise above the turbid atmosphere of strife. With this potent ally the Bishop of Constantinople (probably indeed supported by the strong faction of the expelled Zeno) waged an equal war against the Emperor. Ere long the strange spectacle was presented of a Roman Emperor flying before a naked hermit, who had lost the use of his legs by standing for sixteen years on his column. Basiliscus too late revoked his encyclic letter. He fell, and Zeno

resumed the power. The tide turned against the Monophysite or anti-Chalcedonian party. But the rest, though some bishops hastened to make their peace with the Emperor and with Acacius, contended obstinately against the stream. Stephanus, the Bishop of Antioch, was murdered in the church by the partisans of Peter the Fuller. Timotheus the Weasel, spared from all extreme chastisement on account of his age, died ; but in his place arose another monk, Peter, called Mongus, or the Stammerer, and laid claim to the see of Alexandria. Timotheus Solofaciolus, however, under the Imperial authority, re-

Zeno emperor, A.D. 477. *Dei, hoc est Ecclesiæ dignitate seclusus."* . . . He then describes his resumption of the Alexandrian See: "*Quo procul dubio Cain ipso longè detestabilior approbatur; ille siquidem a perpetrato semel facinore damnatus abstinuit, hic profecit ad crimina majora post pœnam.*"—Simplic. Epist. Labbe, 1070.

sumed the Patriarchate, and endeavored to reconcile the heretics by Christian gentleness.¹ The Emperor Zeno beheld with commiseration and dismay his distracted empire; he determined, if possible, to assuage the animosities, and to reconcile the hostile factions. After a vain attempt to obtain the opinions of the chief ecclesiastical dignitaries, without assembling a new Council, a measure which experience had shown to exasperate rather than appease the strife, Zeno issued his famous Henoticon, or Edict of ^{A. D. 482.} Union. This edict was composed, it was ^{Henoticon of Zeno.} believed, if not by Acacius, Bishop of Constantinople, under his direction and with his sanction. It aimed not at the reconcilment of the conflicting opinions, but hoped, by avoiding all expressions offensive to either party, to allow them to meet together in Christian amity; as if such terms had not become to both parties an essential part, perhaps the whole, of their Christianity.

The immediate effects of the Henoticon in the East might seem to encourage the fond hope of success. The feud between the rival Churches of Constantinople and Alexandria was for a time appeased. Acacius and Peter the Stammerer recognized their mutual claims to Christian communion. Calendion, the Chalcedonian Bishop of Antioch, had been banished to the African Oasis. Peter the Fuller had resumed the throne. Peter acceded to the Henoticon; and these three Patriarchal churches commended the Imperial scheme of union to the Eastern world.²

¹ Liberatus says that the heretics used to cry out as he passed, "Though we do not communicate with you, yet we love you." — Breviar. Baronius is indignant at this "nimia indulgentia" of the bishop (sub ann. 478).

² Evagrius, iii. 26.

It was but a transient lull of peace. The Henoticon, without reconciling the two original conflicting parties, only gave rise to a third: in Three parties. Alexandria the two factions severed into three. One half of the Eutychian or anti-Chalcedonian party adhered to Peter the Stammerer; the other indignantly repudiated what they called the base concession of Peter; they were named the Acephali, without a head, as setting up no third prelate. The strong Chalcedonian party had nominated as successor John Talajas. to the mild Timotheus Solofaciolus, a man of a different character. John Talajas, while at Constantinople, had been compelled by the provident, but vain precaution, no doubt, of Acacius, to pledge himself not to aspire to the see of Alexandria.¹ The object of Acacius was to unite the Alexandrian Church under Peter the Stammerer, beneath the broad comprehension of the Henoticon. No sooner was Timotheus dead, and John Talajas safe at Alexandria, than he accepted the succession of Timotheus. On the union between Acacius and Peter the Stammerer, John Talajas fled to Rome; he was welcomed as a second Athanasius.

For now a question had arisen, which involved the Question of Roman supremacy. Bishops of Rome, not merely as dignified arbiters on a high and profound metaphysical question of the faith, but, vital to their power and dignity, plunged them into the strife as ardent and implacable combatants. The Roman Pontiffs had already, at least from the time of Innocent I., asserted their inalienable supremacy on purely religious grounds, as successors of St. Peter. If, as in the recent act of

¹ Evagrius, on the authority of Zacharias.

Hilarius, they had appealed to the laws of the empire, as confirmatory of that supremacy, it was to enforce more ready and implicit obedience. But with the world at large the ecclesiastical supremacy of Rome rested solely on her civil supremacy. The Pope was head of Christendom as Bishop of the first city in the world. Already Constantinople had put forth claims to coequal ecclesiastical, as being now of coequal temporal dignity. This claim had been ratified by the great Œcumenic Council of Chalcedon,—that Council which had established the inflexible line of orthodoxy between the divergent heresies of Nestorius and Eutyches. This was but the supplementary act, it was asserted, of a small and factious minority, who had lingered behind the rest; but, it appeared upon the records, it boasted the authority of the unanimous Council.¹ The ambition of Acacius, now, under Zeno, sole and undisputed Bishop of Constantinople, was equal to his ability. He seemed watching the gradual fall of the Western Empire, the degradation of Rome from the capital of the world, which would leave Constantinople no longer the new, the second, rather the only Rome upon earth. The West, in the person of Anthemius, had received an emperor appointed by Constantinople; the Western Empire at one moment seemed disposed to become a province of the East. Acacius had already obtained from the Emperor (we must reascend in the course of our history to connect the East with the West), Leo the Thracian, who had ruled between Marcian and Zeno, a decree confirming to the utmost all the privileges of a Patriarchate claimed by Constantinople. In that edict Constantinople as-

¹ Compare Baronius sub ann. 472.

sumed the significant and threatening title of "Mother of all Christians and of the orthodox Religion." The Pope Simplicius had protested against this usurpation, but his protest is lost. The aspiring views of Acacius were interrupted for a short time by his fall under the Emperor Basiliscus; but his triumph (an unwonted triumph of a Bishop of Constantinople over an Emperor), his unbounded favor with Zeno, might warrant the loftiest expectations. As the acknowledged and victorious champion of orthodoxy, Acacius could now take the high position of a mediator. In the Henoticon Zeno the Emperor spoke his language, and in that edict appeared a manifest desire to assuage the discords of the East, and to combine the Churches in one harmonious confederacy. On the murder of Stephanus of Antioch, Acacius had consecrated his successor; a step against which the Pope Simplicius, A. D. 479. Re-who was watching all his actions, sent a monstration of Simplicius. strong remonstrance. Before the publication of the Henoticon, the Western Empire had departed from Rome; but though her political supremacy, even her political independence was lost, she would not tamely abandon her spiritual dignity. For Rome, in the utmost assertion of her power against the Bishop of Constantinople, might depend on the support of above half the East; of all who were discontented with the Henoticon; and who, in the absorbing ardor of the strife, would not care on what terms they obtained the alliance of the Bishop of Rome, so that alliance enabled them to triumph over their adversaries. The dissatisfaction with the Henoticon comprehended totally opposite factions, Factions in the East. —the followers of Nestorius and of Euty-

ches, who were impartially condemned on all sides ;— and the ecclesiastics, who considered it an act of presumption in the Emperor to assume the right of legislating in spiritual matters, a right complacently admitted when ratifying or compulsorily enforcing ecclesiastical decrees, and usually adopted without scruple on other occasions by the party with which the Court happened to side. But the strength of the malcontents was the high Chalcedonian or orthodox party, who condemned the Henoticon as tainted with Eutychianism, and denounced Acacius as holding communion with Eutychian Prelates, and therefore himself justly suspected of leaning to that heresy. In Constantinople the more formidable of the monks were of this party ; the Bishops of Rome addressed more than once the clergy and the archimandrites of that city, as though assured of their sympathy against the Bishop and the Emperor. John Talajas, the exiled Bishop of Alexandria, filled Rome with his clamors. The Pope Simplicius addressed a remonstrance to Acacius, to which Acacius, who to former letters of the Bishop of Rome had condescended no answer, coldly replied that he knew nothing of such a Bishop of Alexandria ; that he was in communion with the rightful Bishop, Peter Mongus, who, like a loyal subject, had subscribed the Emperor's Edict of Union.¹

At this juncture died Pope Simplicius. On the vacancy of the see occurred a singular scene. The clergy were assembled in St. Peter's. In the midst of them stood up Basilus, the Patrician and Prefect of Rome, acting as Vicerent of Odoacer, the barbarian King. He ap-

March,
A.D. 483.
Death of
Simplicius

¹ Liberat. Breviar.

peared by the command of his master, and by the admonition of the deceased Simplicius, to take care that the peace of the city was not disturbed by any sedition or tumult during the election. That election could not take place without the sanction of his Sovereign. He proceeded, as the Protector of the Church from loss and injury by Churchmen, to proclaim the following edict: "That no one, under the penalty of anathema, should alienate any farm, buildings, or ornaments of the Churches; that such alienation by any Bishop present or future was null and void." So important did this precedent appear, so dangerous in the hands of those schismatics who would even in those days limit the sacerdotal power, that nearly twenty years after, a fortunate occasion was seized by the Pope Symmachus to annul this decree. In a synod of Bishops at Rome, the edict was rehearsed, interrupted by protests of the Bishops at this presumptuous interference of the laity with affairs of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.¹ The authenticity of the decree was not called in question; it was declared invalid, as being contrary to the usages of the Fathers, enacted on lay authority, and as not ratified by the signature of any Bishop at Rome. The same Council, however, acknowledged its wisdom by re-enacting its ordinance against the alienation of Church property.

Felix, by birth a Roman, succeeded to the vacant
Felix III.
Pope.
A.D. 483. see. He inherited the views and passions,
 as well as the throne of Simplicius and his
 strife with the East. His first act was an indignant
 rejection of the Henoticon, as an insult to the Council

¹ Synodus Romana. Labbe, sub ann. 502.

of Chalcedon; as an audacious act of the Emperor Zeno, who dared to dictate articles of faith; as a seed-plot of impiety.¹ He anathematized all the Bishops who had subscribed this edict. At the head of a Roman synod, Felix addressed a strong admonitory letter to Acacius of Constantinople, and another, in a more persuasive tone, to the Emperor Zeno. These letters were sent into the East by two Bishops, Misenus and Vitalis, as Legates of Pope Felix. To Peter the Fuller was directed another letter, arraigning him as involved in every heresy which had ever afflicted the Church, or with something worse than the worst.² Whether he awaited any reply from the re-
Excommuni-
cates Peter
the Fuller.
fractory Bishop or not seems doubtful; but he proceeded to fulminate a sentence of deposition and excommunication against Peter in his own name, and to assume that this sentence would be ratified by Acacius of Constantinople.

The Legate Bishops, Misenus and Vitalis, were

¹ Theodorus Lector.

² The introduction by Peter the Fuller of "who wast crucified for us," after the angelic hymn, the Holy, Holy, Holy, struck the ears of the orthodox with horror. Felix relates with all the earnestness of faith, and with all the authority of his position, the miraculous origin of this hymn in its simple form. During an earthquake at Constantinople, while the whole people were praying in the open air, an infant was visibly rapt to heaven, in the sight of the whole assembly and of the Bishop Proclus; and after staying there an hour, descended back to the earth, and informed the people that he had heard the whole host of angels singing those words. It was not merely that the words, added at Antioch, left it doubtful which of the Persons of the Trinity was crucified for us; the term was equally impious as regarded any one of those consubstantial, uncreated, invisible, impassible Beings. Καθὸ τοίνυν ὁ μονογενῆς υἱὸς ἐστι τοῦ πατρὸς ὁμοούσιος, καὶ εἰς τῆς ἁδιαρέτου τριάδος, ἄκτιστος καὶ ἀθέατος, ἐμμενήκει ἁπαθῆς καὶ ἄθάνατος. Τὸ οὖν ἄκτιστον καὶ ἄθάνατον τῇ κτίσει μὴ σύνταπτε, καὶ τοῦ τῆς πολυθείας λόγον μὴ κράτννε, διὰ τὸ λέγειν τεθνάναι τὸν ἕνα τῆς τριάδος.
 - Epist. Felic. III. ad Petr. Full., Labbe, 1058.

attacked at Abydus, and their papers seized. At Constantinople they were compelled, bribed, or betrayed into communion with Peter the Stammerer; at least they were present, and without protest, at the divine service when the name of Peter was read in the diptychs as lawful Bishop of Alexandria. On their return they were branded as traitors by Felix at the head of a synod at Rome, and degraded from their episcopal office. Felix proceeded (his tardiness had been sharply rebuked by the monks of Constantinople, especially the sleepless monks,¹ whose archimandrite Cyril and his whole brotherhood were the implacable enemies of Acacius) to issue the sentence of excommunication against the Bishop of Constantinople. The sentence was pronounced, not on account of heresy, but of obstinate communion with heretics—with Peter of Alexandria, who had been condemned by Pope Simplicius for his violent conduct to the Papal Legates, and his contemptuous refusal to admit the third ambassador, Felix the Defensor, to his presence. Acacius was declared to be deprived, not merely of his episcopal, but of his priestly honors, separated from the communion of the faithful; and this anathema, an unusual form, was declared irrevocable by any power.² But how was this process to be served on the Bishop of Constantinople? Acacius was strong in the favor of the Emperor Zeno. It is remarkable that, while he

Excommunicates Acacius of Constantinople.

¹ Ἀκοίμητοι.

² "Nunquamque anathematis vinculis eruendus."—Epist. Felic. ad Acacius. Felix, in a subsequent letter to Zeno, maintains this implacable doctrine: "Unde divino iudicio nullatenus potuit, etiam cum id mallems, absolvi."—Epist. xi. Writing to Fravitta, his successor, he intimates that no doubt Acacius has gone, like Judas, to hell.

thus precipitately proceeds to the last extremity against his rival Bishop, the Emperor is still sacred against the condemnation of the Bishop of Rome. Zeno had issued the Henoticon. Zeno had, by so doing, usurped the power of dictating religious articles to the clergy. Zeno, if he had not ordered, sanctioned all this re-establishment of the Bishops who had not acceded to the Council of Chalcedon; but to Zeno the language of the Pontiff is respectful, and bordering on adulation. The monks, the allies of Felix, were ready to encounter any peril. One of the sleepless fastened the fatal parchment to the dress of Acacius, as he was about to officiate in the Church. Acacius quietly proceeded in the holy ceremony. Suddenly he paused; with calm, clear voice, he ordered the name of Felix, Bishop of Rome, to be struck out of the roll of bishops in communion with the East. The ban of Rome was encountered by the ban of Constantinople.¹

Aug. 1, A.D.
484.
Acacius ex-
communi-
cates Felix.

The schism divided the Churches of the East and West for nearly forty years, down to the Pontificate of Hormisdas and the empire of Justinian, under whose sway Italy became subject to the Byzantine sovereign. Overtures of reconciliation were made, but Felix at least adhered inflexibly to his demand, that the name of Acacius should be erased from the diptychs. The great Eastern Patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, utterly disregarding the anathema of Rome, continued in communion with Acacius and his successors. Acacius, notwithstanding the incitements to spiritual rebellion addressed

¹ Julius, the messenger of Felix, quailed before the danger, or was bribed by Byzantine gold.

by the Bishop of Rome to his clergy and to the turbulent monks, maintained his throne till his death ¹

Acacius (I trace rapidly the history of Eastern Christianity until the reunion with the West) was succeeded by Fravitta or Flavitta, who occupied the throne but for four months.²

A. D. 489.
Fravitta
Bishop of
Constanti-
nople.

Euphemius. The election then fell on Euphemius.

The Bishops of Constantinople might defy the spiritual thunders of Rome, but though Acacius had once triumphed over an usurping Emperor, in daring to conflict with the established Imperial authority, they but betrayed their own weakness. During the reign of the Emperor Anastasius, two Bishops of Constantinople, having justly or unjustly incurred the Imperial displeasure, were degraded from their sees. The Emperor Anastasius has been handed down to posterity with the praise of profound piety, and the imputation of Eutychianism, Arianism, and even Manicheism. Anastasius ascended the throne, though Euphemius had exerted all his authority to prevent his elevation, through his marriage with the Empress Ariadne. It is said that an old quarrel, while Anastasius was yet in a humbler station, rankled in both their hearts. The Bishop had threatened to shave the head of the domestic of the palace, and expose him as a spectacle to the people. The mother of Anastasius and his mother's brother had been Arians, and Euphemius took care that dark suspicions of Anastasius on this vital point should be disseminated in the empire. But Anastasius, in the conscientious conviction of his own orthodoxy,

¹ Felicis Epist. x. xi.: ad Clerum et Plebem Constantin. et ad Monachos Constantin. et Bithyniæ.

² Felix addressed a letter to Fravitta adjuring him to abandon the cause of Acacius and Peter, and unite with Rome.

and that virtue which had called forth the popular acclamation, "Reign as you have lived," dared to enforce despotic toleration. The East was now divided into four religious parties. 1. Those who, with the Roman Pontiff and the monks of Constantinople, held inflexibly to the Council of Chalcedon, and demanded the distinct recognition of its doctrines. These were not content with the anathema against Nestorius, Eutyches, and Dioscorus: they insisted on including under the malediction Acacius and Peter the Stammerer.¹ 2. Those who, holding the tenets of Chalcedon, had yet subscribed the Henoticon, and for the sake of peace would not compel the acceptance of the Chalcedonian decrees. Among these were Euphemius of Constantinople before the accession of Anastasius, and at first his successor Macedonius, and the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem; all the four great Prelates had subscribed the Henoticon. 3. Those who subscribed the Henoticon, and abhorred the decrees of Chalcedon; these were chiefly the Patriarch of Alexandria, with the Bishops of Egypt and Libya. 4. The Acephali, the Eutychian party, who held the Council of Chalcedon to be a Nestorian conclave, and cherished the memory of Dioscorus and of Eutyches. Anastasius issued his mandate, that no bishop should compel a reluctant people to adhere to the Council of Chalcedon; no bishop should compel a people which adhered to the Council of Chalcedon to abandon its principles. Many who infringed on this law of Imperial charity were deposed with impartial severity. Euphemius had extorted from the Emperor Anastasius, as a kind of price for his accession, a written assevera-

¹ Evagrius, iii. 31.

tion of allegiance to the Council of Chalcedon, and an oath that he would maintain inviolate those articles which he had been with difficulty compelled to surrender. Euphemius, it might seem, as a rebuke against the comprehensive measures of the Emperor, held a synod, in which the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon were confirmed; but though this might be among the secret causes, it was not the crime for which Anastasius demanded the degradation of Euphemius.¹

The Isaurian rebellion disturbed the earlier period of the reign of Anastasius; it lasted for five years. The Bishop Euphemius tampered in treasonable proceedings; he was accused of traitorous correspondence, A. D. 495. or at least of betraying the secrets of the state to these formidable rebels. The Emperor summoned a Council; Euphemius was deposed, sent into exile, and died in obscurity: he has left a doubtful fame. The Latin writers hesitate whether he was a martyr or a heretic.²

Macedonius was promoted to the vacant See.³ Macedonius, Bishop of Constanti-
nople. nius, a man of gentle but too flexible disposition, began his prelacy by an act of unusual courtesy to his fallen predecessor. He performed the act of degradation with forbearance. Before he *saluted* him in the Baptistery, he took off the episcopal habiliment, and appeared in the dress of a Priest; he supplied the exile with money, borrowed money, for his immediate use. Macedonius subscribed the Henoticon, and still the four great Patriarchates were held in Christian fellowship by that bond of union. At the command of the Emperor, Macedo-

¹ Evagrius, Theophanes, p. 117. Victor, xvi. xvii.

² Walch, p. 974.

³ Theophanes.

nus undertook the hopeless task of reconciling the four great Monasteries, among them that of the Akoi-metoi, and the female convent then presided over by Matrona, with the communion of the Church under the Henoticon. The inflexible monks would give up no letter of the Council of Chalcedon — they declared themselves prepared rather to suffer exile.¹ Matrona, a woman of the austerest life, endured with patience, which wrought strongly on men's minds, acts of violence used by a Deacon to compel her to submission. The mild Macedonius, instead of converting them, was himself overawed by their rigor into a strong partisan of the Council of Chalcedon; he inclined to make overtures to the Bishop of Rome, Gelasius I.; but Anastasius prohibited such proceedings; he had declared himself resolved against all innovations.

The Eastern wars occupied for some years the mind of Anastasius. In the mean time the compressed fires of religious discord were struggling to burst forth and convulse the realm. Macedonius had hardened into a stern, almost a fanatic partisan of the Council of Chalcedon. John Nicetas had ascended the throne of Alexandria: he subscribed the Henoticon, but declared that it was an insufficient exposition of the true doctrine, as not explicitly condemning the Council of Chalcedon. Flavianus filled the See of Antioch — Elias that of Jerusalem. Elias was disposed to reject the Council of Chalcedon; Flavianus was inclined to rest on the neutral ground of the Henoticon. But the Monophysite party in Syria, which seemed greatly reduced in numbers, and content to seclude itself within the peaceful monasteries, sud-

Confusion at
Antioch

¹ Theophanes, Chronog., ed Bekker, i. 219.

denly having found a bold and reckless leader, burst out in fierce insurrection. Xenaias,¹ or Philoxenus, Bishop of Hierapolis, began to agitate the whole region by accusing Flavianus as a Nestorian. Flavianus, to exculpate himself, issued his anathema against Nestorius and his opinions. Xenaias imperiously demanded the anathema, not of Nestorius alone, but of Ibas, Theodoret of Cyrus, and a host of other bishops, who from time to time had been charged with Nestorianism. Flavianus resisted. But the followers of Eutyches and Dioscorus sprung up on all sides. Eleusinius, a bishop of Cappadocia, and Nicias of the Syrian Laodicea, joined their ranks. Flavianus consented to involve all whom they chose thus to denounce in one sweeping malediction. Xenaias, flushed with his victory, still refused to absolve the timid bishop from the hated name of Nestorian. He required his explicit condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon, and of all who asserted the two natures in Christ. Flavianus still struggled in the toils of these inexorable polemics, who were resolved to convict him, subscribe what he might, as a secret Nestorian. Swarms of monks crowded from the district of Cynegica, and filling the streets of Antioch, insisted on the direct condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon and the letter of Pope Leo.² The people of Antioch rose in defence of their bishop, slew some of the monks, and drove the rest into the Orontes, where many lost their lives. Another party of monks from Cœlesyria, where Flavianus himself had dwelt in the convent of Talmognon, hastened to form a guard for his person.

¹ Xenaias, interpreted by the hostile monks of Jerusalem, "The stranger to Catholic doctrine."

² Evagrius, iii. 31, 32.

The Emperor Anastasius in the mean time on his return from the East found Macedonius, instead of a mild assertor of the Henoticon, at the head of one, and that the most dangerous and violent of the religious factions. Rumors were industriously spread abroad, that the Emperor's secret Manicheism had been confirmed in the East. A Persian painter had been employed in one of the palaces, and had covered the walls, not with the orthodox human forms worshipped by the Church, but with the mysterious and symbolic figures of the Manichean heresy. Anastasius, insulted by the fanatic populace, was escorted to the Council and to the churches by the Prefect at the head of a strong guard. Anastasius was driven by degrees (an Emperor of his commanding character should not have been driven) to favor the opposing party. John, Patriarch of Alexandria, sent to offer, it is said, two hundred pounds of gold, as a tribute, a subsidy, or a bribe, to induce the Emperor to abrogate the Council of Chalcedon. John, however, publicly maintained the neutrality of the Henoticon, neither receiving nor repudiating the Council. His legates were received with honor. Anastasius compelled the Bishop Macedonius to admit them to communion. Xenaias, the persecutor of Flavianus, was likewise received with honor. Worse than all, two hundred Eastern monks, headed by Severus, were permitted to land in Constantinople; they here found an honorable reception. Other monks of the opposite faction swarmed from Palestine. The two black-cowled armies watched each other for some months, working in secret on their respective partisans.¹ At length they

¹ Each party of course throws the blame of the insurrection on the other.

A.D. 511. came to a rupture ; and in their strife, which he either dared not, or did not care to control, the throne, the liberty, the life itself of the Emperor were in peril. The Monophysite monks in the church of the Archangel within the palace broke out after the "Thrice Holy," with the burden added at Antioch by Peter the Fuller, "who wast crucified for us." The orthodox monks, backed by the rabble of Constantinople, endeavored to expel them from the church ; they were not content with hurling curses against each other, sticks and stones began their work. There was a wild, fierce fray ; the divine presence of the Emperor lost its awe ; he could not maintain the peace. The Bishop Macedonius either took the lead, or was

Tumults in Constantinople. compelled to lead the tumult. Men, women, children, poured out from all quarters ; the monks, with their Archimandrites, at the head of the raging multitude, echoed back their religious war-cry : "It is the day of martyrdom. Let us not desert our spiritual Father. Down with the tyrant ! the Manichean ! he is unworthy of the throne." The gates of the palace were barred against the furious mob ; the imperial galleys were manned, ready for flight to the Asiatic shore. The Emperor was reduced to the humiliation of receiving the Bishop Macedonius, whom he had prohibited from approaching his presence, as his equal, almost as his master. As Macedonius passed along, the populace hailed him as their beloved father ; even the military applauded. Macedonius rebuked the Emperor for his hostility to the Church.

The later writers, who are all of the orthodox party, ascribe it to the Syrian monks. Evagrius (iii. c. 44) quotes a letter of Severus, written before he was Bishop of Antioch, charging the whole disturbance on Macedonius and the clergy of Constantinople.

Anastasius condescended to dissemble; peace was restored with difficulty. Macedonius seems to have been of feeble character, unfit to conduct this internecine strife between the Patriarchate and the Empire for supreme authority. Enemies would not be wanting, even had the strife not been for religion, to the enemy of the Emperor; and all acts of enmity to the Patriarch, whether sanctioned or not by the Emperor, would be laid to his charge. An accusation of loathsome incontinence was brought forward against the Bishop; he calmly refuted it by proving its impossibility. His life was attempted; he pardoned the assassin. But this Christian gentleness softened into infirmity. One day he weakly subscribed a Creed, in which he recognized only the Councils of Nicea and Constantinople; his silence about those of Ephesus and Chalcedon implied his rejection of their authority. His monkish masters broke out in furious invectives. The Patriarch stooped to appear before them in the monastery of Saint Dalmatius; and not merely expressed his adhesion to the Council of Chalcedon, he uttered his anathema against all recusants of its decrees. The Emperor had been silently watching his opportunity. The Bishop was seized by night; without tumult, without resistance, he was conveyed to the Asiatic shore, thence into banishment at Euchaita, his predecessor's place of exile. A well-chosen synod of bishops declared the deposition of Macedonius:¹ Timotheus was elected Bishop of Constantinople. Timotheus

A. D. 511.
Deposition
and exile of
Macedonius.

¹ Evagrius intimates that Macedonius was persuaded to a voluntary abdication. According to Theophanes, (Edd. Bekker, i. 240,) Anastasius endeavored to gain possession of the original registers of the Council of Chalcedon, to destroy or to corrupt them. Macedonius sealed them up and put them in a place of safety.

signed the Henoticon; he went further, he laid his curse on the Council of Chalcedon. Timotheus was acknowledged by Flavianus of Antioch, by John of Alexandria, and by Elias of Jerusalem. But this concession secured not the throne of Flavianus. The Monophysite monk Severus, who had stirred up the populace of Alexandria and of Constantinople to religious riot, and had won the favor of Anastasius as acquiescing in the Henoticon, now appeared in Antioch as the rival of Flavianus. Flavianus was deposed, Severus was bishop. He would now no longer keep on the mask; he condemned in the strongest terms the Council of Chalcedon. The monkish party, which had been persecuted by, and in turn persecuted Flavianus, and to which he had in vain made such ignoble concessions, was dominant in Antioch: Severus ruled supreme. At Jerusalem the orthodox were the strongest; and Elias, who would not go all lengths with them, was likewise compelled to abdicate his see. Throughout Asiatic Christendom it was the same wild struggle. Bishops deposed quietly; or, where resistance was made, the two factions fighting in the streets, in the churches: cities, even the holiest places, ran with Christian blood.

In Constantinople it was not the throne of the Bishop, but that of the Emperor which trembled to its base. Anastasius, who had so nobly and successfully wielded the arms of the Empire against the Persians, found his power in Constantinople, in his Asiatic provinces, in his European dominions, crumbling beneath him. His foes were not on the frontier, they were at the gates of Constantinople, in Constantinople, in his palace. He was now eighty

Constantinople again in insurrection.

years old. The martial courage which he had displayed in his Eastern campaigns might seem decayed; his aged hand could no longer hold with the same equable firmness the balance of religious neutrality; it may have trembled towards the Monophysite party; he may have brought something of the irritability and obstinacy of age into the contest. The year A.D. 512. after the exile of Macedonius, Constantinople, at the instigation of the clergy and the monks, broke out again in religious insurrection. The blue and green factions of the Circus—such is the language of the times—gave place to these more maddening conflicts. The hymn of the Angels in Heaven was the battle-cry on earth, the signal for human bloodshed. Many palaces of the nobles were set on fire; the officers of the crown insulted; pillage, conflagration, violence, raged through the city. A peasant who had turned monk was torn from the palace of the favorite Syrian minister of Anastasius, Marinus (he was accused of having introduced the profane burden to the angelic hymn); his head was struck off, carried about on a pole, with shouts, “Behold the enemy of the Trinity.”¹ The hoary Emperor appeared in the Circus, and commanded the heralds to announce to the people that he was prepared to abdicate the Empire, if they could agree in the choice of his successor. The piteous spectacle soothed the fury of the people; they entreated Anastasius to resume the diadem. But the blood of two of his ministers was demanded as a sacrifice to appease their vengeance.²

¹ Evagrius, iii. 44.

² The Pope Gelasius writes to the Emperor, “You fear the people of Constantinople, who are attached to the name of Acacius; the people of Constantinople have preferred Catholic truth to the cause of their bishops

But it is not insurrection in Constantinople alone, the empire is in revolt on the question of the two natures in Christ. The first great religious war, alas for many centuries not the last! imperils the tottering throne of Anastasius. The Thracian Vitalianus is in open rebellion; obtains a great victory over the Imperial general Hypatius; wastes Thrace, depopulates the whole country—the whole realm—up to the gates of Constantinople. He is before the city at the head of 60,000 men. His banner, his war-cry, is that of religious orthodoxy; he proclaims himself the champion, not of an oppressed people, of a nobility indignant at the tyranny of their sovereign, but of the Council of Chalcedon. Cries are heard within the city (not obscurely traced to the clergy and the monks) proclaiming Vitalianus Emperor; and the army of this first religious war in Christendom is composed chiefly of Huns and Barbarians, a great part of them still heathens. But Vitalianus had allies in the West: from some obscure quarrel, or from jealousy of the Emperor of the East, he boasts the alliance of Theodoric, the Arian Ostrogoth; as the champion of orthodoxy he boasts too the countenance of Hormisdas, Bishop of Rome.¹

Macedonius (then supposed to be unsound) and Nestorins. You have suppressed their tumults in the games, you will control them if they break out in religious insurrection." A singular testimony to the two great rival causes which roused the mob of Constantinople to mutiny.

¹ The accounts of these transactions, and their dates, are confused, almost irreconcilable. According to Evagrins (iii. 43), Vitalianus was defeated in a naval battle, and fled in a single ship: according to Theophanes and others, he dictated terms of peace, the restoration of the bishops, and the Council of Heraclea. These terms Anastasius perfidiously violated, declaring that an emperor was justified, more than justified, in swearing to treaties, and breaking his oath to preserve his power,—ὁ δὲ παράνομος ἀναυδῶς ἔλεγεν νόμον εἶναι κελεύοντα βασιλέα κατ' ἀνάγκην ἐπιτοκεῖν καὶ ψεύδου

The grey hairs of Anastasius were again brought down to shame and sorrow ; he must stoop to an ignominious peace. If we are to credit the ^{Humiliation of Anastasius.} monastic historians, the end aimed at and attained by this insurrection, which had desolated provinces and caused the death of thousands of human beings, was a treaty which promised the reëstablishment of Macedonius and Flavianus on the archiepiscopal thrones of Constantinople and Antioch ; and the summoning a Council at Heraclea, in which Hormisdas, Bishop of Rome, was to appear by his legates, and no doubt hoped to dictate the decrees of the assembly.

The few last inglorious years of the reign of Anastasius, its dark close, his miserable death, his ^{A.D. 514-518.} damnation, according to his relentless foes, must be reserved for the period when the Bishop of Rome (Hormisdas) appears in a commanding character in the arena of Constantinople : and if he does not terminate, prepares the termination of the schism of above forty years between Eastern and Western Christianity.

We turn away with willingness from the dismal and wearisome period, in which, in the East, all ^{State of the East.} that is noble and generous in religious conviction disappears and gives place to dark intrigues and ignorant fury. Men suffer all the degradation and misery, incur all the sin of persecution almost without the lofty motive of honest zeal. It is a time of fierce and busy polemics, without a great writer. The Henoticon is a work of some skill, of some adroitness, in attempting to reconcile, in eluding, evading, theolog-

θα. ταῦτα ὁ παρανομώτατος μανιχαϊόφρων. — p. 243. I think, with Gibbon, following Tillemont and older authorities, that there is no doubt of the two insurrections in Constantinople.

ical difficulties; it is subtle to escape subtleties. But there was no vigorous and manly, even if intolerant writer, like Cyril of Alexandria, whom we contemplate with far different estimation in his acts and in his writings.

But that which is the characteristic sign of the The influence of the monks. times, as a social and political, as well as a religious phenomenon, is the complete dominion assumed by the monks in the East over the public mind, and the depravation of monasticism from its primal principles. Those who had forsaken the world aspire to rule the world. The minds which are to be absolutely estranged from earth mingle in its most furious tumults. Instead of total seclusion from the habits and pursuits of men, the Cœnobites sweep the streets of the great cities in armed bodies, displaying an irregular valor which sometimes puts to shame the languid patriotism of the Imperial soldiery. Even the Eremites, instead of shrouding themselves in the remotest wilderness, and burying themselves in the darkest and most inaccessible caverns, mount their pillars in some conspicuous place, even in some place of public resort. While they seem to despise the earth below, and to enjoy the undisturbed serenity of heaven, they are not unconscious that they are the oracles as well as the objects of amazement to the admiring multitudes around; that Emperors come to consult them as seers and prophets, as well as infallible interpreters of divine truth. They even descend into the cities to become spiritual demagogues. The monks, in fact, exercise the most complete tyranny, not merely over the laity, but over bishops and patriarchs, whose rule, though nominally subject to it, they throw off when-

ever it suits their purposes. Those who might seem the least qualified, from their vague and abstract devotion, to decide questions which depended on niceties of language, on the finest rhetorical distinctions, are the dictators of the world. Monks in Alexandria, monks in Antioch, monks in Jerusalem, monks in Constantinople, decide peremptorily on orthodoxy and heterodoxy. The bishops themselves cower before them. Macedonius in Constantinople, Flavianus in Antioch, Elias in Jerusalem, condemn themselves, and abdicate or are driven from their sees. Persecution is universal; persecution by every means of violence and cruelty; the only question is in whose hands is the power to persecute. In Antioch, Xenaias (Philoxenus, a famous name) justifies his insurrection by the persecutions which he has endured; Flavianus bitterly and justly complains of the persecutions of Xenaias. Bloodshed, murder, treachery, assassination, even during the public worship of God, — these are the frightful means by which each party strives to maintain its opinions, and to defeat its adversary. Ecclesiastical and civil authority are alike paralyzed by combinations of fanatics ready to suffer or to inflict death, utterly unapproachable by reason. If they had not mingled in the fray, peace might perhaps have been restored with no serious detriment to orthodox doctrine. If in the time of Zeno there had been no monks, no Akoi-metoi, in Constantinople; if these fanatics had not been in treasonable correspondence with strangers, and supported by the Bishop of Rome — temperate and orthodox bishops like Macedonius and Flavianus might have allayed the storm. The evil lay partly in the mode of life; the seclusion, which fostered both igno-

rance and presumption, and magnified insignificant matters to questions of spiritual life and death ; and the strong corporate spirit, which gave a consciousness of strength which bound them together as one man in whatever cause they might espouse. The Emperor might depose a busy and refractory bishop, what could be done with a fraternity of a thousand men? They had already the principle of organization, union, and mutual confidence, and arms in their hands. They became legions. It is at the head of such an army that Severus, a stranger, makes himself formidable in Constantinople. A more powerful adverse army heads the mob of Constantinople and reduces the Emperor Anastasius to beg his crown, if not his life. Relying on these internal allies in the heart of his enemy's camp, Vitalianus besieges Constantinople, and dictates a capitulation, embodying their demands and those of their acknowledged head, the Bishop of Rome. Alexandria is at the mercy of such hosts, who pour in from the surrounding monasteries on all sides. Even during the last years of Anastasius, at the election of the bishop, another Dioscorus, the chief Imperial officer, is slain in the streets. Hosts of monks encounter in Syria, meet in the field of battle, consider that zeal divine with which they strive, not to instruct and enlighten, but to compel each other to subscribe the same confession, each slaying and dying in unshaken assurance that eternal salvation depended on the proper sense of the words "in" and "out of;" the acceptance or rejection of the Council of Chalcedon, including its dire anathemas.¹ To monasticism may unques-

¹ I have incorporated with my own observations many sentences from a passage in a writer of the old German school, Walch, who, having investi-

tionably be attributed the obstinate continuance, perhaps the fury, of the Monophysite war. We shall hereafter encounter monasticism in the West in another character, as compensating, at least in a great degree, for its usurpation of the dignity of a higher and holier Christianity, by becoming the guardian of what was valuable, the books and arts of the old world; as the missionary of what was holy and Christian in the new civilization; as the chief maintainer, if not the restorer of agriculture in Italy; as the cultivator of the forests and morasses of the north; as the apostle of the heathens which dwelt beyond the pale of the Roman empire.

We are again in the West, reascending and passing in review Latin Christianity and its primates during the same, by no means a brilliant ^{Return to the West.} period: their sometimes enforced or uncongenial, but still ever ready intervention in the affairs of the East, from the time when Pope Felix and Acacius issue their hostile interdicts, and Constantinople A.D. 484-519. and Rome are at open war, more or less violent, during five and thirty years.

Between the pontificate of Felix III. and the rupture with Constantinople (it might seem the implacable estrangement of the East and ^{Gelasius I. March 1, 492.} West) to the accession of Hormisdas, intervened three Popes, Gelasius I., Anastasius I., Symmachus.

Gelasius, a Roman, seemed, as a Roman, to assume the plenitude of Roman dignity. From the first, he adhered to all the lofty pretensions of his predecessor,

gated the whole of these transactions with unrivalled industry and candor, and with the almost apathetic impartiality of his school, seems suddenly to break out into something approaching to eloquence. Walch, *Ketzer-Geschichte*, vol. vii.

and in his frequent and elaborate writings vindicated all the acts of Felix. He inexorably demanded, as the preliminary to any peaceful treaty, that the name of Acacius should be expunged from the diptychs. No power could now retrieve or rescue Acacius from his inevitable doom — Acacius, who had not only disregarded the excommunication of the Bishop of Rome, but presumed to emulate his power of pronouncing damnation. Constantinople must absolutely abandon the champion of her coequality, if not her superiority. Acacius, all his followers, all who respect his memory, must share his irrevocable proscription.¹ The Roman Gelasius endeavors to awaken a kindred pride in the Emperor Anastasius, now the sole representative of Roman sovereignty ;² for Italy is under the dominion of the Goth. Gelasius might even seem to cherish some secret hope of the deliverance of Rome from its barbaric lord, by the intervention of the yet Roman East. But at the same time Gelasius asserts boldly, for the first time, in these strong and discriminating terms, the supremacy of the clergy in all religious matters. “There are two powers which rule the world,

¹ The letter of Gelasius to Euphemius of Constantinople is a model of that haughty humility which became the ordinary language of the Roman bishops. Euphemius had written, that by condescension and the best disposition Gelasius could restore concord (“*annectis condescendibilem me et optimâ dispositione revocare posse concordiam*”). — “Do you call it condescension to admit among true bishops the names of heretics and excommunicated persons, and of those who communicate with them and their successors? Is not this, instead of descending like our Lord from heaven to redeem, to plunge ourselves into hell?” “*Hoc non est condescendere ad subveniendum, sed evidenter in inferum demergi.*” He summons Euphemius to meet him before the tribunal of Christ, in the presence of the apostles, and decide whether his austereness and asperity is not truly apostolic. — Epist. 1.

² “*Te sicut Romæ natus, Romanum principem, amo, colo, suscipio.*” — Ad Anastas., A.D. 493.

the Imperial and the Pontifical. You are the sovereign of the human race, but you bow your neck to those who preside over things divine.¹ The priesthood is the greater of the two powers; it has to render an account in the last day for the acts of kings."²

Pope Anastasius II., the successor of Gelasius, spoke a milder, more conciliatory, even more suppliant language. He dared to doubt the damnation of a bishop excommunicated by the see of Rome: — "Felix and Acacius are now both before a higher tribunal; leave them to that unerring judgment."³ He would have the name of Acacius passed over in

Pope Anastasius,
Nov. 24, 496.

¹ Gelasius refers to the authoritative example of Melchisedek, a type interpreted with curious variation during the Papal history. "In the oldest times Melchisedek was priest and king. The devil, in imitation of this holy example, induced the emperor to assume the supreme pontificate. But after Christianity had revealed the truth to the world, the union of the two powers ceased to be lawful. Neither did the emperor usurp the pontifical, nor the pontiff the imperial power. Christ, mindful of human frailty, has separated forever the two offices, leaving the emperors dependent on the pontiffs for their everlasting salvation, the pontiffs dependent on the emperors for the administration of all temporal affairs. So the ministers of God do not entangle themselves in secular business; secular men do not intrude into things divine." Pass over eight or nine centuries, and hear Innocent IV.; we give the pregnant Latin: "Dominus enim Jhesus Christus . . . secundum ordinem Melchisedek, verus rex et verus sacerdos existens, quemadmodum patenter ostendit, nunc utendo pro hominibus honorificentiam regiam majestatis, nunc exequendo pro illis dignitatem pontificii apud Patrem, in apostolicam sede non solum pontificatum, sed et regalem constituit monarchatum, beato Petro ejusque successoribus terreni simul et cœlestis imperii concessos habemus." — Apud Hoefler. Albert von Beham, p. 88. Stuttgart, 1847.

² "Quando etiam pro ipsis regibus domino in divino reddituri sunt examine rationem." — Ad Anastas., Mansi, vii.

³ "Namque et predecessor noster Papa Felix, et etiam Acacius illic proculdubio sunt: ubi unusquisque sub tanto iudice non potest perdere sui meriti qualitatem." — Anastas. Epist. A.D. 496. This letter was sent to Constantinople by two bishops, Cresconius of Todi and Germanus of Capua, with private instructions, not recorded in history.

silence, quietly dropped, rather than publicly expunged from the diptychs. This degenerate successor of St. Peter is not admitted to the rank of a saint. The Pontifical book (its authority on this point is indignantly repudiated) accuses Anastasius of having communicated with a deacon of Thessalonica, who had kept up communion with Acacius; and of having Nov. 19, 498. entertained secret designs of restoring the name of Acacius in the services of the Church.¹ His death, according to Baronius, his sudden death by the manifest hand of God, destroyed altogether these hopes of peace. But how deep and lasting was the tradition of detestation against this meek renegade to papal authority, may be supposed by its survival for at least nine centuries. Dante beholds in hell the unhappy Anastasius, condemned forever for his leniency to the heresy of Constantinople.²

On the death of Pope Anastasius, the contested election for the pontificate between Symmachus, a convert from paganism,³ and Laurentius, was exasperated by these divergences of opinion on the schism with the East. Festus, the legate of Anastasius, the deceased Pope, at Constantinople, the bearer, as it was

¹ "Revocare Acacium" — so I translate the words — as Acacius had long been dead. — Lib. Pontif., Vit. Anastas.

² "E quivi per l' orribile soperchio
Del puzzo, che 'l profondo abisso gitta
Ci raccostammo dietro ad un coperchio
D' un grand' avello, ov' io vidi una scritta,
Che diceva: Anastagio Papa guardo,
Lo qual trasse Fotino della via dritta."

Fotinus is said to have been the Deacon of Thessalonica.

³ "Catholica fides, quam in sede beati Petri, veniens ex paganitate, suscepi." — Epist. ad Anastas. The date of this is uncertain. Was he a son or descendant of the famous Symmachus? The latter is more probable.

supposed, of conciliatory terms obtained by the concessions of the Pope, on his return to Rome, threw himself as a violent partisan into the cause of Laurentius. The Emperor Anastasius himself, either in private letters to his adherents in Rome or in some public document, accused the successful Symmachus, who, by the decision of King Theodoric, had obtained the throne,¹ as a Manichean; and as having audaciously conspired with the Senate of Rome (a singular Council for the Pope) to excommunicate the Emperor. The sovereign of the East inflexibly withheld the customary letters of gratulation on the accession of Symmachus. The apologetic invective of Symmachus to the Emperor is in the tone of fearless hostility. He retorts against the Eutychian the odious charge of Manicheism. He denies the excommunication of the Emperor Anastasius; Acacius only was excommunicated. Yet he leaves him to the inevitable conclusion that all who were in communion with the excommunicate must share their doom.² Anastasius is arraigned as departing from his boasted neutrality only against the Catholics. The unyielding, almost turbulent resistance of the Roman party in Constantinople is justified by the aggressions assumed to be entirely on the part of the tyrannical Emperor. Peace between two such opponents was not likely to make much prog-

A.D. 498-514.

ress. Throughout the pontificate of Symmachus, the Roman faction in the East kept up that fierce and tumultuous, or more secret and brooding opposition, which lasted till the death of Anastasius. Symmachus may have heard the first tidings of the orthodox revolt

¹ See on, under the reign of Theodoric, the elevation, struggle, and final establishment of Symmachus.

² Between 499-512. Baronius places it 503.

of Vitalianus; his successor Hormisdas reaped the fruits of the humiliation of Anastasius, followed in due time by the reconciliation of the Greek and Latin Churches.¹

¹ See on, under the reign of Theodoric.

CHAPTER II.

CONVERSION OF THE TEUTONIC RACES.

CHRISTIANITY within the Roman Empire might seem endangered in its vital existence by these ungenial inward dissensions. Its lofty assertions that it came down from heaven as a religion of peace—of peace to the individual heart of man, as reconciling it with God, and instilling the serene hope of another life—of peace which should incorporate mankind in one harmonious brotherhood, the type and preëstablishment of the sorrowless and strifeless state of beatitude—might appear utterly belied by the claims of conflicting doctrines on the belief, all declared to be essential to salvation, and the animosities and bloody quarrels which desolated Christian cities. Anathema instead of benediction had almost become the general language of the Church. Religious wars, at least rare in the pagan state of society, seemed now a new and perpetual source of human misery—a cause and a sign of the weakness and decay, and so of the inevitable dissolution, of the Roman Empire.

But Christianity had sunk into depths of the human heart, unmoved by these tumults, which so fiercely agitated the surface of the Christian world. Far below, less observed, less visible in its mode of operation, though manifest in its effects, was that profound con-

viction of the truth of the Gospel, that infelt sense of its blessings, which enabled it to pursue its course of conversion throughout the world, to bring the Roman mind more completely under subjection, and one by one to subdue the barbarian tribes which began to overspread and mingle with the Greek and Latin population of the Empire. For Christianity had that within it, which overawed, captivated, enthralled the innate or at least universal religiousness of mankind; that which was sufficiently simple to arrest by its grandeur the ruder barbarian, while, by its deeper mysteries, it led on the philosophic and reflective mind through unending regions of contemplation. It had its one Creator and Ruler of the universe, one God, one Redeemer, one Spirit, under which the ancient polytheism subsided into a subordinate hierarchy of intermediate beings, which kept the imagination in play, and left undisturbed almost all the hereditary superstitions of each race. It satisfied that yearning after the invisible, which seems inseparable from our nature, the fears and hopes which more or less vaguely have shadowed out some future being, the fears of retribution appeased by the promises of pardon, the hope of beatitude by its presentiments of peace. It had its exquisite goodness, which appealed to the indelible moral sense of mankind, to the best affections of his being; it had that equality as to religious privileges, duties, and advantages, to which it drew up all ranks and classes, and both sexes (slaves and females being alike with others under the divine care), and the abolition, so far, of the ordinary castes and divisions of men; with the substitution of the one distinction, the clergy and the laity, and perhaps also that of the

ordinary Christian and the monk, who aspired to what was asserted and believed to be a higher Christianity. All this was, in various degrees, at once the manifest sign of its divinity, and the secret of its gradual subjugation of nations at such different stages of civilization. It prepared or found ready the belief in those miraculous powers, which it still constantly declared itself to possess; and made belief not merely prompt to accept, but creative of, wonder, and of perpetual preterhuman interference. Some special causes will appear, which seemed peculiarly to propitiate certain races towards Christianity, while their distinctive character reacted on their own Christianity, and through them perhaps on that of the world.

We are not at present advanced beyond the period when Christianity was in general content (this indeed gave it full occupation) to await the settle-
ment of the Northern tribes, if not within the Conversion of Germans within the Empire. pale, at least upon the frontiers of the Empire: it had not yet been emboldened to seek them out in their own native forests or morasses. But it was a surprising spectacle to behold the Teutonic nations melting gradually into the general mass of Christian worshippers. In every other respect they are still distinct races. The conquering Ostrogoth or Visigoth, the Vandal, the Burgundian, the Frank, stand apart from the subjugated Roman population, as an armed or territorial aristocracy. They maintain, in great part at least, their laws, their language, their habits, their character; in religion alone they are blended into one society, constitute one church, worship at the same altar, and render allegiance to the same hierarchy. This is the single bond of their common humanity;

and so long as the superior Roman civilization enabled the Latins to retain exclusively the ecclesiastical functions, they might appear to have retreated from the civil power, which required more strenuous and robust hands to wield it, to this no less extensive and important influence of opinion; and thus held in suspense the trembling balance of authority. They were no longer the sovereigns and patricians, but they were still the pontiffs and priests in the new order of society.

There might appear in the Teutonic religious character a depth, seriousness, and tendency to the mysterious, congenial to Christianity, which would prepare them to receive the Gospel. The Grecian polytheist was often driven into Christianity by the utter void in his religion, and by the incongruity of its poetic anthropomorphism with the progress of his discursive reason, as well as by his weariness with his unsatisfactory and exhausted philosophy: the Roman was commanded by its high moral tone and vigor of character. But each had to abandon temples, rites, diversions, literature, which had the strongest hold on his habits and character, and so utterly incongruous with the primitive Gospel, that until Christianity made some steps towards the old religion by the splendor of its ceremonial, and the incipient paganizing, not of its creed, but of its popular belief, there were powerful countervailing tendencies to keep him back from the new faith. And when the Greek entered into the Church, he was not content without exercising the quickness of his intelligence, and the versatilities of his language on his creed, without analyzing, discussing, defining everything. Or by intruding that higher part of his philosophy, which best

Teutonic
character.

assimilated with Christianity, he either philosophized Christianity, or for a time, as under the Neo-Platonists and Julian, set up a partially Christianized philosophy as a new and rival religion. The inveterate corruption of Roman manners confined that vigorous Christian morality, its strongest commendation to the Roman mind, at first within the chosen few who were not utterly abased by licentiousness or by servility: and even with them in large part it was obedience to civil authority, respect for established law, perhaps in many a kind of sympathy with the lofty and independent sacerdotal dignity, the sole representative of old Roman freedom, which contributed to Christianize the Latin world.

How much more suited were some parts of the Teutonic character to harmonize at first with Christianity, and to keep the proselytes in submission to the authority of its instructors in these sublime truths; at the same time to invigorate the Church by the infusion of its own strength and independence of thought and action, as well as to barbarize it with that ferocity which causes, is increased by, and maintains, the foreign conquests of ruder over more polished races! Already the German had the conception of an illimitable Deity, towards whom he looked with solemn and reverential awe. Tacitus might seem to speak the language of a Christian Father, almost of a Jewish prophet. Their gods could not be confined within walls, and it was degradation to these vast unseen powers to represent them under the human form. Reverential awe alone could contemplate that mysterious being which they called divinity.¹ These deities, or this one Supreme, were

Teutonic
religion.

¹ "Cæterum non cōhibere parietibus Deos, neque in ullam humani oris

shrouded in the untrodden, impenetrable forest. Such seems to have been the sublime conception above, if not anterior to, what may be called the mythology of Teutonic religion. This mythology was the same, only in its elemental form, throughout the German tribes, with that which, having passed through more than one race of poets, grew into the Eddas of Scandinavia. Vestiges of this close relationship are traced in the language, in the mythic conceptions, and in the superstitions of all the Teutonic tribes. Certain religious forms and words are common to all the races of Teutonic descent.¹ In every dialect appear kindred or derivative terms for the deity, for sacrifice, for temples, and for the priesthood. This mythic religion was in some points a nature-worship, though there might have existed, as has been said, something more ancient, and superior to the worship of the visible and impersonated powers or energies of the material world. The Romans discovered, not without wonder, that the supreme deity of the actual German worship was not invested in the attributes of their Jove, but rather of Mercury.² There is no doubt that Woden was the divinity to whom they assigned this name, a name which, in its various forms, (it became at length Odin,) is common to the Goths, Lombards, Saxons, Frisians, and other tribes. In its primitive conception, if any of these conceptions were clear and distinct, Woden appears to have been the all-mighty, all-permeating Spirit — the Mind, the primal mover of things, the all-Wise, the

speciem adsimilare ex magnitudine cœlestium arbitrantur, Deorumque nominibus appellat secretum illud quod solâ reverentiâ vident. — Tac. Germ. ix.

¹ Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, Einleitung, pp. 9-11 (2d edit.). The whole large volume is a minute and laborious commentary on this axiom.

² "*Deum maximè Mercurium colunt.*" — Tac. Germ. ix.

God of speech and of knowledge.¹ But with a warlike people, the supreme deity could not but be a god of battle, the giver of victory. He possessed therefore the attributes of Mars blended with those of Mercury.² The conduct or the reception of departed spirits, which belonged to the pagan Mercury, may have been one function which led to his identification with the Teutonic Woden. Already, no doubt, their world of the dead was a rude Valhalla.

In the earlier belief, the Thunderer, with the sun, the heavenly bodies, and the earth, the great objects of nature-worship, held only the second place. The Herthus of Tacitus was doubtless Hertha, the mother earth, or impersonated nature, of which he describes the worship in language singularly coincident with that of the Berecynthian goddess of Phrygia.³

¹ "Wodan sanè quem adjectâ literâ Gwodan dixerunt, ipse est qui apud Romanos Mercurius dicitur, et ab universis Germaniæ gentibus ut Deus adoratur." — Paul. Diacon. i. 9. See also Jonas Bobbiens. Vit. Bonifac. (Dies Mercurii became Wodan's day, — Wednesday.) Compare Grimm, p. 116, Grimm, pp. 108, &c., and the whole article Wuotan, which he closes with the following observation: "Aber noch zu einen andern Betrachtung darf die hohe stelle führen, welche die Germanen ihrem Wuotan anweisen. Der Monotheismus ist etwas so nothwendiges und wesentliches, das fast alle Heiden in ihrer Götter bunten Gewimmel, bewusset oder unbewusset, darauf ausgehn, einen obersten Gott anzuerkennen, der schon die Eigenschaften aller übrigen in sich trägt, so dass diese nur als seine Einflüsse, verjüngenden und erfrischungen, zu betrachten sind. Daraus erklärt sich wie einzelne Eigenheiten bald einem bald diesem einzelnen Gott dargelegt werden, und warum die höchste Macht, nach Verschiedenheit der Völker auf den einen oder den andern derselben fällt."

² Paulus Diacon., loc. cit. He is called Sigvödr (Siegfather) in the Edda. — Grimm, p. 122.

³ After recounting the tribes who worship this goddess, he proceeds: "In commune Herthum, id est, Terram matrem colunt, camque intervenire rebus hominum, inveni populis arbitrantur. Est in insulâ Oceani castum nemus, dicatum in eo vehiculum, veste contectum, attingere uni sacerdoti concessum. Is adesse penetrati Deam intelligit, vectamque bobus feminis multa cum veneratione prosequitur. Læti tunc dies, festa loca, quæcunque adventu hospitioque dignatur. Non arma sumunt, clausum omne ferrum,

There were other religious usages — most absolutely repugnant to Christianity, and demanding, as it were, her mild intervention, — so universal as to imply a closer relationship than that of unconnected races, which resemble each other from being in the same state of civilization. From the borders of the Roman Empire to the shores of the Baltic, from the age of Tacitus to that of the Northern Chroniclers, human sacrifices appeased the gods, or rewarded them for the victories which they had bestowed upon their worshippers. The supreme god, Woden, the Mercury of Tacitus, was propitiated by human victims. The tribunes and principal centurions in the army of Varus were slain on these horrid altars.¹ The Goths sacrificed their captives to the god of war.² The Greek historian of the age of Justinian imputes

pax et quies tunc tantum nota, tunc tantum amata, donec idem sacerdos satiata conversatione mortalium Deam templo reddit; mox vehiculum et vestes, et, si credere velis, numen ipsum secreto lacu haurit. Servi ministrant, quos statim idem lacus haurit. Arcanus hinc terror, sanctaque ignorantia, quid sit illud quod tantum perituri vident. — Tacit. Germ. xl. Contrast and compare these secret and awful rites (and their "truce of God") with Lucretius, —

Quo nunc insigni per magnas prædita terras
 Horrificè fertur divinæ Matris imago . . .
 Ergo cum primum magnas invecta per urbes
 Magnificat tacita mortales muta salute :
 Ære atque argento sternunt iter omne viarum,
 Largificâ stipe donantes, ninguitque rosarum
 Floribus, umbrantes Matrem comitumque catervas.

ii. 597 *et seq.*

(Also Ovid. Fasti, iv. 337.) Grimm, in another part of his book, illustrates all this by a circumstance related during the persecution of the Christian Goths by Athanaric (Sozom. H. E. vi. 37.) An image on a wagon was led in procession round the tents of the people; all who refused to worship and make their offerings to this Gothic deity were burned alive in their tents.

¹ Tac. Germ. ix. and xxxix. Ann. i. 61. The Hermanduri and Catti are particularly mentioned as slaying human victims.

² Jornandes, 86.

the same ferocious usage to the Thuletes (the Scandinavians), and to the Heruli; ¹ Sidonius Apollinarius to the Saxons. ² The Frisian law denounces not merely the penalty of death, but describes as an immolation to the gods the punishment of one who violates a temple. At a later period St. Boniface charges some of his Christian converts with the sale of captives to the pagans for the purpose of sacrifice. ³ At the great temple at Upsala every kind of animal was suspended in sacrifice: seventy-two dogs and men, mingled together, were counted on one occasion. ⁴ The northern poetry contains many vestiges of these human immolations. The Northmen are said by Dithmar of Merseburg to have sacrificed every year, about Christmas, ninety-nine men in a sacred place in Sea-land. This execrable custom was suppressed by the Emperor Henry I. the Fowler. ⁵ A.D. 926.

Among animals the horse was the chosen victim of all the Teutonic tribes. It was offered in the age of Tacitus in the German forests, which Animal sacrifices. had been just penetrated by the Roman arms, and, according to the Sagas, by the yet unconverted Danes and Swedes.

Throughout the wide regions occupied by the Teutons the sacred grove was the sanctuary of the deity. The Romans could not tread Holy groves

¹ Procop. de Bell. Gothic. ii. 14, ii. 15.

² Epist. viii. 5.

³ "Quod quidem ex fidelibus ad immolandum paganis sua venundent mancipia." — Epist. xxv.

⁴ "Ita etiam canes, qui pendent cum hominibus, quorum corpora mixta suspensa, narravit mihi quidam Christianorum se septuaginta duo vidisse."

⁵ Müller, *Saga Bibliothek*. ii. 560, v. 93. See also, in Mr. Thorpe's *Mythology of Scandinavia*, a copious list of references on the sanctity of groves, vol. i. p. 255 (note); on temples, p. 259; on human sacrifices, p. 264.

without awe these dark dwelling-places of the gods of their enemies ; they were astonished at the absence of all images, and perhaps did not clearly distinguish the shapeless symbols which were set up in some places, from the aged trunks, which were also the objects of worship. The reverence for these hallowed places, the adoration of certain trees, survived the introduction of Christianity. The early missionaries and the local councils are full of denunciations against this inveterate heathen practice. We shall behold St. Boniface and others, as their crowning triumph, daring to hew down stately trees, the objects of the veneration of ages, and the barbarians standing around, awaiting the event in sullen suspense, and leaving their gods, as it were, on this last trial. If they were gods, would they endure this contumelious sacrilege ?

The belief in the immortality of the soul, and in another life, though not perhaps so distinct, or connected with the transmigration of the soul, as in Gaul, yet seems to have been universal, dominant ; as far as warlike contempt of death, an active and influential faith. But it was to most men vague, dreary, dismal, — the Nifleheim, the home of clouds and darkness, was the common lot ; the Valhalla that alone of the noble, and of select and distinguished warriors.

The priesthood were held in the same reverence throughout Germany. It was not an organized and **Priesthood.** powerful hierarchy, or a separate caste, like that of the Druids in Gaul and Britain ;¹ but the

¹ Cæsar says of the Germans, " Neque Druides habent qui rebus divinis præsent, neque sacrificiis student." — B. G. vi. 21. This, though not strictly true, is true in the sense in which Cæsar wrote, as contrasted with the hierarchy of Gaul. — " Ungleich beträchtlicher war in Zahl und ausbildung das celtische Priesterthum." — Grimm.

priests officiated in and presided over the sacred ceremonies of sacrifice and worship, and administered justice. In the early German wars, when Rome was, as it were, invading the sanctuaries of the Teutonic deities, the priesthood appear as a kind of officers of the god of war, enforcing discipline, branding cowardice, and inflicting punishment, which the free German spirit would endure only from those who bore a divine commission.¹ In all affairs of public concern — the priest ; in private affairs — the head of the family, interpreted the lots by which the gods rendered their oracles.² The priest or the king might alone harness the sacred horses ; the allusions to the priesthood in the late writers on the various conquering tribes, are not very frequent, but sufficient to show that they had that veneration inseparable from the character of persons who performed sacrifices, consulted the gods, and by auspices, or other modes of divination, predicted victory or disaster.³ Prophetic women characterize the Teutonic faith in all its numerous branches. The Velleda of Tacitus, who ruled like a Queen, and was worshipped almost as a goddess, is the ancestress of the Normas of the poetic Sagas.⁴ In the East the gift of prophecy

¹ "Cæterum neque animadvertere, neque vincire, nec verberare quidem, nisi sacerdotibus permissum; non quasi in pœnam, nec ducis jussu, sed velut Deo imperante, quem adesse bellantibus credunt." — Tacit. Germ. vii.

² Tac. Germ. x. and xi. A priest of the Catti was led in the triumph of Germanicus. — Strabo.

³ Even Grimm's industry is baffled by the question of the power of the priesthood in Germany: "Aus der folgenden zeit uud bis zur einführung des Christenthums, haben wir fast gar keine kunde weiter wie es sich in innern Deutschland mit dem priestern verhielt: ihr dasein folgt aus den der tempel und opfer." — p. 61. Among the Anglo-Saxons the priests might not bear arms, or ride, except on a mare. — Bede, Hist. Ecc. ii. 13.

⁴ Tac. Germ. viii. Hist. iv. 61. "Ea virgo, nationis Bructeræ, latè imperitabat. Vetere apud Germanos more, quo plerasque fœminarum fatidicas, et augescente superstitione, arbitrantur Deas." Compare iv. 65, v. 24, Grimm, Art. Weise Frauen.

is sometimes, but rarely, vouchsafed to females; in Greece it was equally shared by both sexes; the seer or prophet is the exception in the Northern mythology. This reverence for women, especially for sacred virgins, no doubt prepared them to receive one article of the new religious faith, which had already begun to grow towards its later all-absorbing importance; while it harmonized with the general tendency of Christian doctrine to elevate the female sex.

Such was the general character of the Teutonic religion, disposed to the dark, the awful, the mysterious, with a profound belief in prophetic revelations, and a priesthood accustomed to act in a judicial, as well as in a religious capacity. And with such religious conceptions, and habits of thought and feeling, the Northern tribes, first on the frontiers, afterwards within the frontiers, and gradually in the heart of the Roman Empire, came into the presence of Christianity — of Christianity now organized under a powerful priesthood, a hierarchy of bishops, priests, and inferior clergy: laying claim to divine inspiration; and though that divine inspiration was gathered and centred, as it were, into a sacred book — in a wider and more vague and indistinct sense, it remained with the rulers of the Church. The Teutonic conqueror, already expatriated by the thirst for conquest or the aggression of more martial tribes, by his migration had broken off all local associations of sanctity; he had left far behind him his hallowed grove,¹ and his reeking altar;² even the awe of his primeval forests must have

Teutons
encounter
Christianity.

¹ The Lombards even in Italy found stately trees to worship. See Muratori, Dissert. 59, especially a curious quotation about a holy tree in the dukedom of Benevento. The Gallic Councils (Arles, 452; Tours, 597; Nantes, 658) prohibit the worship of trees, the latter of certain stones.

² Luitprand. Leg. l. vi. 30.

gradually worn away as he advanced into the southern sunshine, and took possession of the regular towns or the cultivated farms of his Roman subjects.

The human sacrifices not merely belonged of ancient usage to these gloomy sanctuaries: but even before they had learned the Christian tenet, that all sacrifice had ceased with the one great sacrifice on the cross, the milder manners, which they could not but insensibly, if slowly, acquire by intercourse with more polished nations, would render such dire offerings more and more unfrequent: they would be reserved for signal occasions, till at length they would fall into total desuetude.

In one respect, in which the genius of Christianity might have been expected to clash with his own religious notions, Christianity had already advanced many steps to meet the Teuton. The Christian God, and even the gentle Saviour of mankind, had become a God of battle. Christ a God of battle. The cross, the symbol of Christian redemption, glittered on the standards of the legions; and every victory, and every new conquest, might encourage the hope that this God, the God of the southern people, did not behold them with disfavor, was deserting his own votaries, and would gladly receive and reward the allegiance of more manly and valiant worshippers. Notwithstanding the proud consciousness of their own superior prowess as warriors, the Teutonic conquerors could not enter into the dominions of Rome, cross the Roman bridges, march along the Roman roads, encamp before the walled cities, with their towers, temples, basilicas, forums, aqueducts, baths, and churches now aspiring to grandeur, if not magnificence, without awe at the superior

intellectual power of those whom they had subdued.

Respect for the clergy. It was natural to connect this intellectual superiority with the religion; and while everything else, the civil power, the ordinary course of affairs, as well as the army, bowed before them, the religion alone stood up, resolute, unyielding, almost undisturbed. The Christian bishops and clergy (like the aged senators of old, as they are described in the noble passage of Livy, awaiting their doom in the Capitol, and appalling for a time the ruthless Gaul by the venerable majesty of their dress and demeanor) might seem to awe their conquerors into respect; and though at times, when the paroxysm of wonder was broken, as in the former instance, the conquerors might insult or even massacre the objects of their adoration, still in general the sacred character would work on the superstitious mind of the barbarian. The Teuton had already the habit of contemplating the priest as the representative of divinity. According to the general feeling of polytheism, acknowledging the gods of other tribes or nations, as well as his own, to possess divine power, he arrayed the priesthood of the stranger in the same fearfulness; the mysterious sanctity which dwelt with the Christian's God hallowed the Christian bishop.

Nor, though individual priests might and did accompany the migratory tribes, does there appear No Teutonic priesthood. any of that strong sacerdotal spirit which belongs to an organized hierarchy, by which its influence is chiefly maintained and established, which is pledged to and supported by mutual emulation, and by fear of the reproach of treason to the common cause, or of base abandonment of the wealth, the power, and the credit of the fraternity. With these elements then of

faith within his heart, the German was migrating into the territory as it were of a new God, and was encountered everywhere by the priest of that God. That priest was usually full of zeal, and, with all to whom his language was intelligible, of eloquence; confessedly in all intellectual qualities a superior being, and asserting himself to be divinely commissioned to impart the truth; seizing every opportunity of vicissitude, of distress, of sickness, of affliction, to enforce the power and goodness of his God; himself perhaps in perfect faith turning every one of those countless incidents, which to a barbarian mind was capable of a supernatural tinge, into a manifest miracle; opening a new and more distinct and terrible hell and a heaven of light and gladness, and declaring himself to possess the keys of both.

At no time, under no circumstances, would Christianity appear more sincere, more devout, more commanding, or more amiable. As ^{Effect on} _{Christians.} has always been observed during a plague, an earthquake, or any other great public calamity, men become either more recklessly godless, or more profoundly religious; so during the centuries of danger, disaster and degradation, which were those of barbarian invasion and conquest, the fire must, as it were, have been trying the spirits of men. Those who had no vital or rooted religion would fall off, as some of them would assert, from a God who showed them no protection. These while free would waste away the few remaining years or days of their wealth, or at all events of their freedom, in licentiousness and luxury; if slaves, they would sink to all the vices, as well as the degradation of slavery. The truly religious, on the other hand,

would clasp more nearly to their heart the one remaining principle of consolation and of dignity. They would fly from a world which only offered shame and misery, to the hope of a better and more happy state of being. Death was their only release, but beyond death, they were secure, they were at peace; they would take refuge, at least in faith, from the face of a tyrannical master, or what to a freeborn Roman was as galling and humiliating, a lord and proprietor, in the presence of the Redeemer. They would flee from down-trodden servitude on earth to glory and beatitude in heaven. The darker the calamity, the more entire the resignation; as wretchedness would be more rampant, so devotion would be more devout. The Provincial with his home desolated, his estate seized, his family outraged or massacred or carried away into bondage, would, if really Christian, consider himself as taking up his cross; he would be a more fervent, as it were, a desperate believer. In the letters of Sidonius Apollinaris, we find the Bishop of Clermont writing to Martenus, the Bishop of Vienne, for the form of certain litanies or rogations, which were used in that city during an earthquake and conflagration; he proposes to institute the same solemn ceremonies in apprehension of the invasion of the Goths into Provence. Salvian bitterly reproaches the Roman Gauls with their passion for theatric games, which they indulged during such days of peril and disaster only with more desperate intensity. But, even if the true Christians in those hours of trial were fewer in number, it cannot be doubted that their piety took a more vehement and impassioned character. It was the time for great Christian virtues, as well as for more profound Christian con-

solutions, virtues which in some points would be strikingly congenial to barbaric minds, as giving a sublime patience and serenity in suffering, a calm contempt of death. The Germans would admire the martyr whom in their wantonness they slew, if that martyr showed true Christian tranquillity in his agony. There was no danger which the better bishops and clergy would not encounter for their flocks; they would venture to confront unarmed the fierce warrior; all the treasures of the unplundered churches were willingly surrendered for the redemption of captives. The austerities practised by some of the clergy, and by those who had commenced the monastic life, would arrest the attention and inthral the admiration of barbarians, to whom self-command, endurance, strength of will, would appear kindred and noble qualities. In the early period, when the Germans still dwelt separate in their camps, or in the ceded settlements within the frontier, the captives would be, and as history shows, were the chief missionaries. The barbarians on the one hand would more and more feel the intellectual superiority of their bond-slaves, which would induce them to look favorably on their religion. The captives, some of them bishops, some females of high rank and influential beauty, where they were truly Christians, would be urged by many of the purest, and many less holy motives, to convert their masters. The sacred duty of disseminating the Gospel, the principle of love which would impart its blessings to all mankind; the strong conviction that they were rescuing the barbarians from eternal damnation, the doom of all but the true believers in Christ; and so in the noblest form the returning good for evil, would conspire with the pride and con-

solation of ruling their rulers; of maintaining in one sense the Roman supremacy over the minds of men. The end would sanctify all arts, dignify all humiliations; Christian zeal and worldly ambition would act together in perfect harmony.

Where the Teutonic nations had penetrated more into the midst of the Roman Empire; where they had settled down, as they did successively, in all the provinces, as lords of the soil, they would be more fully in the presence and centred influence of Christianity. Themselves without temples, without shrines, without altars, perhaps without a priesthood, they would be daily spectators of the lofty and spacious edifices, perhaps the imposing processions, the ceremonial, which had already begun to assume some grandeur, of the Christian churches. If admitted, or forcing their way within, or hearing from without the hymns and the music, the ordinary ceremonial which they would witness, and still more perhaps the more solemn mysteries which were jealously shrouded from their sight, would lay hold upon their unpreoccupied religiousness, and offer them as almost ready captives to the persuasive teacher of these new and majestic truths. Their conversion therefore was more speedy, and comparatively more complete. They too contributed much to establish that imposing, but certainly degenerate form of warlike and sacerdotal Christianity, which had been growing up for two or three centuries. No doubt they retained and infused into the Christianity of the conquered provinces many of their old native superstitions and modes of religious thought and feeling, but far less than survived in Germany itself. There the nature-worship lingered be-

Teutons in
the midst
of the Em-
pire.

hind in the bosom of Christianity; and under the sublime Monotheism of Christianity, as the old beneficent or malignant deities of paganism, became angels or spirits of evil. Everywhere among the converted tribes, the groves, the fountains, the holy animals, preserved their sanctity. As we accompany the missionaries in their spiritual campaigns we shall encounter many curious circumstances, which will appear more striking when in their proper position, than brought together and crowded in one general view. The character of the Christianity which grew up out of these discordant elements will be best discerned in the progress of its growth.¹

About the year 300 Christianity had found its way among the Goths and some of the German tribes on the Rhine. The Visigoths first embraced the Gospel, as a nation; they were followed by the Ostrogoths; with these the Vandals and the Gepidæ were converted during the fourth century. At the close of the fifth century the Franks were converted, and at the beginning of the sixth, first the Alemanni, then the Lombards; the Bavarians in the seventh and eighth, the Frisians, Hessians, and Thuringians in the eighth; the Saxons by the sword of Charlemagne in the ninth. Our present inquiry limits itself to the conversions within the pale of the Roman Empire, and closes with that of the Franks. With the exception of the latter, the whole of these nations were the conquests of Arian Christianity, or embraced it during the early period

Successive
conversion
of Teutonic
tribes.

Arianism of
first converts.

¹ The description of the Holstenians by Helmold (i. 47) will apply more or less to most of the early German converts: "Nihil de religione nisi nomen tantum Christianitatis habetis . . . nam lucorum et fontium ceterarumque superstitionum multiplex error apud vos habetur."

of their belief. That diversity of religious creed which perplexed the more mature Christian, especially the disputatious Greek and imaginative Asiatic, touched not these simple believers. The Arian Goth had submissively received the lessons of his first teacher, and with some tribes the difference was so little felt, that he did not persecute on account of it. Nations changed their belief with but slight reluctance. The Burgundians in Gaul were first Catholic, then Arian under the Visigothic rule, Catholic again with the Franks. The Suevians in Spain were first Catholic, then fell off into Arianism: it was not till the sixth century that Spain was Catholic. For soon, indeed, religious difference became a pretext for cruelty and ambition, made the Vandal in Africa a persecutor as well as a tyrant, and became the battle-word of the Frank when he would invade the dominions of the Burgundian or the Visigoth, or when he descended into Italy to protect the orthodox Bishop of Rome against the heterodox Lombard.

But of these early Arian missionaries, the Arian *Ulphilas*. records, if they ever existed, have almost entirely perished. The Church was either ignorant of or disdained to preserve their memory. *Ulphilas* alone, the apostle of the Goths, has, as it were, forced his way into the Catholic records, in which, as in the fragments of his great work, his translation of the Scriptures into the Mæso-Gothic language, this admirable man has descended to posterity.¹ *Ulphilas* was a Goth

¹ The orthodox abbreviator of *Philostorgius* acknowledges, but carefully suppresses, the praises which *Philostorgius* had lavished on *Ulphilas*. We would almost have forgiven him the suppression of the praise, if he had imparted the more extensive information which *Philostorgius* seems to have preserved of this great event.

by birth, not by descent. His ancestors, during a predatory expedition of the Goths into Asia, under the reign of Gallienus, had been swept away with many other captives, some belonging to the clergy, from a village in Cappadocia, to the Gothic settlements north of the Danube.¹ These captives, faithful to their creed, perpetuated and propagated among their masters the doctrines of Christianity. Ulphilas first appears as the Bishop of the Goths, and as their ambassador at the Court of Valens.² His religion, and his descent from a Roman provincial family, as well as high influence, might designate him for this mission to the Roman Emperor of the East.³ The Goths beyond the Danube, pressed by the more powerful and ferocious Huns, requested permission to cross the Danube, and settle in Mœsia, within the Roman frontier. Among the motives which induced the Emperor to consent, and to accept this nation of hardy but dangerous subjects, was their, at least partial, conversion to Christian-

¹ The name of Eutyches, called by St. Basil, the Blessed, has survived, as having, from the same region, Cappadocia, established a church among the Scythians, (the Sarmatians,) who had been subdued, and were mingled with the Goths. St. Cyril asserts that the Scythians had no cause to envy the empire; they had their bishops, priests, deacons, sacred virgins. — Cyril Hierosolym. Catech. xvi.

² Basil, Epist. 16, tome iii.

³ It is said that the Gothic bishop, like his predecessor Theophilus, reported to have been present at the Council of Nicea (Socrates, ii. 41), had professed that creed; that he was threatened, bribed, persuaded by Valens to accede to his Arianism, and acquiesced in it as a mere verbal dispute. *Οὐκ εἶναι δογμάτων ἔφη διαφορὰν, ἀλλὰ ματαίαν ἔρω ἐργάσασθαι τὴν διάστασιν.* — Theodoret, iv. 37. But see the very curious character and creed of Ulphilas, in the speech of his disciple Bishop Auxentius at the Council of Aquileia (A.D. 381), reported by Bishop Maximinus. This remarkable fragment was edited by Dr. Waitz from a MS. in Paris. *Über das Leben und die Lehre des Ulfila, von George Waitz.* Hanover, 1840. Also the Preface to the new and excellent Edition of the Bible of Ulfilas, by the very learned H. F. Massmann. Stuttgart, 1856.

ity. Ulphilas was called by the grateful Christian Goths, who might now pasture their herds in the rich plains of Thrace, the Moses, who had led them into the land of promise.¹ But the disciples of Ulphilas formed but a small part of the vast migration, which, partly under permission, partly by bribery of the Imperial officers, partly by stealth, and partly by force, came swarming over the river, and took possession of the unprotected Roman province. The heathen part of the population brought over their own priests and priestesses, with their altars and rites; but on those mysterious rites they maintained an impenetrable silence; they disguised their priests in the garb and manners of Christian bishops. They had even fictitious monks clothed in black, and demeaning themselves as Christian ascetics.² Thus, relates the heathen historian, who makes this curious statement, while they faithfully but secretly adhered to their own religion, the Romans were weak enough to suppose them perfect Christians. But once on the Roman side of the Danube, the more martial Goths spurned the religion which they had condescended to

Migration
of Goths
across the
Danube.

¹ Philostorg. ii. 5. Auxentius (apud Waitz, p. 20) uses the same comparison to Moses and the Red Sea (the Danube), and adds, "eo populo in solo Romanixæ ubi sine illis septem annis triginta et tribus annis veritatem prædicavit, &c."—and so makes up the forty years of Moses.

² This remarkable passage of Eunapius is one of the most important historical fragments discovered in the Palimpsest MSS. by Monsignor Mai. It was of course unknown to the older historians, including Gibbon.—Mai, p. 277. In the reprint of the Byzantines (Bonn, 1829, edit. Niebuhr), p. 82. Eunapius speaks of the false bishops having much of the fox. The hatred of Eunapius to the monks breaks out in his description of these impostors. "The mimicry of the monks was not difficult; it was enough to sweep the ground with black robes and tunics, to be good for nothing and believed in." Οὐδὲν ἐχούσης τῆς μιμήσεως πραγματώδες καὶ δύσκολον, ἀλλὰ ἐξήκει φαυὰ ἱμάτια σύρουσι καὶ χιτῶνια, πονηροῖς τε εἶναι καὶ πιστεῦσθαι.

feign with barbarian cunning.¹ Ulphilas, as a true missionary of the Prince of Peace, aspired not merely to convert his disciples to Christianity, but to peaceful habits. In his translation of the Scriptures he left out the Books of Kings, as too congenial and too stimulative to their warlike propensities.² The Goths divided into two factions, each with its great hereditary chieftain: of the one, the valiant Athanaric; of the other Fritigern, the friend of Ulphilas.

Strife among
the Goths.

The warlike and anti-Christian party appealed to their native Gods, and raised a violent persecution.³ The God of their fathers was placed on a lofty wagon, and drawn through the whole camp; all who refused their adoration were burned, with their whole families, in their tents. A multitude, especially of helpless women and children, who took refuge in their rude church, were likewise mercilessly burned with their sacred edifice.⁴ But while in their two great divisions, the Ostrogoths and Visigoths, the nation, gathering its descendants from all quarters, spread their more or less rapid conquests over Gaul, Italy, and Spain, Ulphilas formed a peaceful and populous colony of shepherds and herdsmen on the pastures below Mount Hæmus.⁵

¹ Are we to attribute Jerome's triumphant exclamations to these events? Probably not altogether. "Getarum rutilus et flavus exercitus, Ecclesiarum circumfert tentoria."—Ad Læt. "Stridorem suum in dulce crucis fregerunt melos."—Ad Heliod. "Hunni discunt Psalterium."—Ad Læt.

² Philostorgius, loc. cit.

³ These persecutions are by some placed before the migration over the Danube. I think the balance of probability favors the view in the text.

⁴ Sozomen, iv. 37. Compare the legend of St. Saba. apud Bolland, April 12—remembering that it is a legend.

⁵ "Gothi minores, populus immensus cum suo Pontifice ipsoque Primate Wulfila . . . ad pedes montis. Gens multa sedit, pauper et imbellis, nisi armento, diversi generis pecorum et pascuis, silvæque lignorum, parùm aabens tritici."—Jornandes, c. lii.

He became the Primate of a simple Christian nation. For them he formed an alphabet of twenty-four letters, and completed (all but the fierce Books of Kings) his translation of the Scriptures. Thus the first Teutonic Christians received the gift of the Bible, in their own language, from the Apostle of their race.¹

No record whatever, not even a legend remains, of the manner in which the two great branches of the Gothic race, the Visigoths in France, the Ostrogoths in Pannonia, and the Suevians in Spain, the Gepidæ, the Vandals, the mingled hosts which formed the army of Odoacer, the first king of Italy, and at length the fierce Lombards, were converted to Christianity.² They no doubt yielded — but secretly and imperceptibly — to those influences described above; the faith appears to steal from nation to nation, and wins king after king; and it is only when they become sovereigns of great independent kingdoms, conquerors like Alaric, founders of dynasties like Theodoric in Italy and the Visigothic and Suevian monarchs in France and Spain, or raise fierce persecutions, like the Vandals in Africa against the Catholics, that we recognize them as professed Christians, and Christians holding a peculiar form of faith.³

Of the Burgundians alone, and the motives of their

¹ It is difficult to discriminate between the rhetoric and the facts recorded by Jerome. If we are to take his words in their plain sense, theologic studies were far advanced among the Goths: "Quis hoc crederet ut barbara Getarum lingua Hebraicam quæreret veritatem? et dormitantibus imo contententibus Græcis, ipsa Germania Spiritus Sancti eloquia scrutaretur." — *Epist. ad Juniam et Fretilam*, tom. ii. p. 626.

² Idacius (*Chron.* 448) says the Suevians were first Catholic; if so, they were converted to Arianism by the Goths.

³ Compare a modern book of research and judgment, and on the whole, of candor, *L'Arianisme des Peuples Germaniques*, par Ch. J. Reveillot. Paris: Besançon, 1850.

conversion, remains a curious detail in one of the Byzantine ecclesiastical historians. The ^{except of} Burgundians. Burgundians occupied at that time the left bank of the Rhone, had acquired peaceful habits, and employed themselves in some kind of manufacture.¹ The terrible invasion of the Huns broke in upon their quiet industry. Despairing of the aid of man, they looked round for some protecting Deity; the God of the Romans appeared the mightiest, as worshipped by the most powerful people. They set off to a neighboring city of Gaul, requested, and after some previous fasting, received baptism from the bishop. Their confidence in their new tutelary Deity gave them courage, they discomfited with a small body of troops, about 3000, a vast body of the Huns, who lost 10,000 men. From that time the Burgundians embraced Christianity, in the words of the historian, with fiery zeal.²

But all these nations were converts to the Arian form of Christianity, except perhaps the Bur- ^{All Arians.} gundians,³ who under the Visigoths fell off to Arianism. Ulphilas himself was a semi-Arian, and acceded to the creed of Rimini. Hence the total silence of the Catholic historians, who perhaps destroyed, or disdained to preserve the fame of Arian conquests to the common Christianity.⁴ The first conversion of a Teutonic nation to the faith, of which any long and par-

¹ Socrates, Ecc. Hist. vii. 30. *Οὗτοι βίον ἀπράγμονα ζῶσαν ἀεὶ, τέκτονες γὰρ σχεδὸν πάντες εἰσιν.* Of what were they artisans? This was during the reign of Theodosius II., A.D. 403-449.

² *Τὸ ἔθνος διαπύρως ἐχριστιάνισεν,* loc. cit.

³ Orosius, vii. 22.

⁴ Salvian is absolutely charitable to the errors of the German Arians: "Hæretici ergo sunt, sed non scientes. Errant ergo, sed bono animo errant, non odio sed affectu Dei." But this is to contrast them with the vices of the orthodox. — De Gubern. Dei.

ticular account survives, was that of the Franks, and that by Catholic prelates into stern proselytes to the Catholic faith.¹

This conversion of the Franks was the most important event in its remote as well as its immediate consequences in European history. It had great influence on the formation of the Frankish monarchy. The adoption of the Catholic form of faith, by arraying on the side of the Franks all the Catholic prelates and their followers, led to their preponderance over the Visigothic and Burgundian kings, to their descent into Italy under Pepin and his son, and to their intimate connection with the Papal see; and thus paved the way for the Western Empire of Charlemagne. They were the chosen champions of Catholicism, and Catholicism amply repaid them by vindicating all their aggressions upon the neighboring kingdoms, and aiding in every way the consolidation of their formidable power. The Franks, the most barbarous of the Teutonic tribes (though in cruelty they seem to have been surpassed by the Vandals), had settled in a Christian country, already illustrious in legendary annals for the wonders of Saints, as of Martin of Tours, the foundation of monasteries, and the virtues of Bishops like Remigius, who gave his name to the great cathedral city of Rheims. The south of France was ruled by Arian sovereigns. Clovis was a pagan, then only the chief of about 4000 Frankish warriors, but full of adventurous daring and unmeasured ambition. His conversion, if it had not issued in events of such pro-

Conversion
of Franks.

¹ Gregory of Tours is the great authority for this period: he wrote for those "qui appropinquante mundi fine desperant." — In Prolog. See Loebel, Gregor von Tours; Ampère, *Hist. Lit. de la France*.

found importance to mankind, might have seemed but a trivial and fortuitous occurrence. The influence of a female conspires with the conviction that the Christians' God is the stronger God of battle; such are the impulses which seem to bring this bold yet crafty barbarian, who no doubt saw his advantage in his change of belief, to the foot of the Cross, and made him a strenuous assertor of orthodox faith. Clovis had obtained in marriage the niece of Gundebald, king of the Burgundians. The early life of this Princess was passed amid the massacre of her parents and kindred; it shows how little Christianity had allayed the ferocity of these barbarians.

Gundicar, king of the Burgundians, left four sons. The fate of the family was more like that of a polygamous Eastern prince, where the sons ^{Gundicar the Burgundian.} of different mothers, bred up without brotherly intercourse in the seraglio, own no proximity of blood. Gundebald, the elder son, first slew his brother Chilperic, tied a stone round the neck of Chilperic's wife, and cast her into the Rhone, beheaded his two sons and threw their bodies into a well. The daughters, of whom Clotilda was one, he preserved alive. Godemar, his next brother, he besieged in his castle, set it on fire, and burned him alive. Godesil, the third brother, as will be related at a subsequent period, shared the same fate. Gundebald, as yet only a double fratricide, either felt, or thought it right to appear to feel, deep remorse for his crimes. Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, saw or imagined some inclination in the repentant king to embrace Catholicism. In far different language from that spoken by Ambrose to the Emperor Theodosius, the Bishop addressed the bloody monarch, — "You weep

with inexpressible grief at the death of your brothers, your sympathizing people are afflicted by your sadness. But by the secret counsels of God, this sorrow shall turn to joy; no doubt this diminution in the number of its princes was intended for the welfare of the kingdom, those alone were allowed to survive who are needed for the administration of the kingdom." ¹

Gundebald, however, resisted these flattering arguments, and remained obstinately Arian; but Clotilda, his niece, it is unknown through what influence, was educated in orthodoxy. Clotilda took the opportunity, when the heart of her husband Clovis might be softened by the birth of her first-born son, to endeavor to wean him from his idolatry. Clovis listened with careless indifference; yet with the same indifference common in the Teutonic tribes, permitted the baptism of the infant. But the child died, and Clovis saw in his death the resentment of his offended Gods; he took but little comfort from the assurance of the submissive mother, that her son, having been baptized, was in the presence of God. Yet with the same strange versatility of feeling, he allowed his second son also to be baptized. This child too declined, and Clovis began to renew his reproaches; but the prayer of the mother was heard, and the child restored to health.²

It was not, however, in this gentler character that the Frank would own the power of the Christians' God. The Franks and the Alemanni met in battle at Tolbiac, not far from Cologne. The Franks

¹ Alcimi Aviti Epist. apud Sirmond. oper. vol. ii.

² According to Gregory of Tours, she argued with her husband against the worship of Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, and Mercury. Was it ignorance or did Gregory suppose that he was writing like a Roman?—Gregor Turon. ii.

were worsted, when Clovis bethought him of Clotilda's God. He cast off his own inefficient divinities; he prayed to Christ, and made a solemn vow, that if he were succored, he would be baptized as a Christian. The tide of battle turned; the king of the Alemanni was slain; and the Alemanni, in danger of total destruction, hailed Clovis as their sovereign.¹

Clotilda, without loss of time, sent the glad tidings to Remigius, Bishop of the city, which afterwards took his name. Clovis still hesitated, till he could consult his people. The obsequious warriors declared their readiness to be of the same religion as their king. To impress the minds of the barbarians the baptismal ceremony was performed with the utmost pomp; the church was hung with embroidered tapestry and white curtains; odors of incense like airs of Paradise were diffused around; the building blazed with countless lights. When the new Constantine knelt in the font to be cleansed from the leprosy of his heathenism, "Fierce Sicambrian," said the Bishop, "bow thy neck: burn what thou hast adored, adore what thou hast burned!" Three thousand Franks followed the example of Clovis. During one of their subsequent religious conferences, the Bishop dwelt on the barbarity of the Jews in the death of the Lord. Clovis was moved, but not to tenderness, — "Had A.D. 496. I and my faithful Franks been there, they had not dared to do it."

At that time Clovis the Frank was the only orthodox sovereign in Christendom. The Emperor

¹ "Invocavi enim Deos meos, sed, ut experior, elongati sunt ab auxilio meo, unde credo eos nullius esse potestatis præditos, qui sibi obedientibus non succurrunt. Te nunc invoco, et tibi credens desidero, tantum ut eruar ab adversariis meis." — Greg. Turon. ii. 30.

Clovis the only orthodox sovereign. Anastasius lay at least under the suspicion of favoring the Eutychian heresy. The Ostrogoth Theodoric in Italy, the Visigothic¹ and Burgundian kings in France, the Suevian in Spain, the Vandal in Africa were Arians. If unscrupulous ambition, undaunted valor and enterprise, and desolating warfare, had been legitimate means for the propagation of pure Christianity, it could not have found a better champion than Clovis. For the first time the diffusion of belief in the nature of the God-head became the avowed pretext for the invasion of a neighboring territory.² Already the famous Avitus, Bishop of Vienne, has addressed a letter to Clovis, in which he augurs from the faith of Clovis the victory of the Catholic faith; even the heterodox Byzantine emperor is to tremble on his throne; Catholic Greece to exult at the dawning of this new light in the West. The wars of Clovis with Burgundy were all but openly declared wars of religion; the orthodox clergy hardly condescended to disguise their inclination to the Franks, whom they supported with their prayers, if not with more substantial assistance.³ Before the war broke out,

¹ Euric, the greatest of the Visigothic kings, was now dead; he had left but feeble successors. Euric labored under the evil fame of a persecutor; he had attempted what Theodoric aspired to effect in Italy, but with far less success, the fusion of the two races — the Roman and Teutonic; but that of which Sidonius so bitterly complains, of so many sees vacant by the intolerance of Euric, the want of bishops and clergy to perpetuate the Catholic succession, ruined churches, and grass-grown altars, reads as too eloquent. Reveillot admits that the views of Euric were political rather than religious (p. 141).

² The rebellion of Vitalianus in the East was a few years later.

³ The barbarous Clovis must have heard, it must not be said, read, still less, considering the obscure style of the prelate, understood, the somewhat gross and lavish flattery of his faith, his humility, even his *mercy*, to which the saintly Bishop scrupled not to condescend: "Vestra fides nostra victoria est. . . . Gaudeat ergo quidem Græcia se habere principem legis nostræ.

a synod of the orthodox Bishops met, it is said, under the advice of Remigius, at Lyons. With Avitus at their head, they visited King Gundebald, and proposed a conference with the Arian bishops, whom they were prepared to prove from the Scripture to be in error.¹ The king shrewdly replied, — “If yours be the true doctrine, why do you not prevent the King of the Franks from waging an unjust war against me, and from caballing with my enemies against me?”² There is no true Christian faith where there is rapacious covetousness for the possessions of others, and thirst for blood. Let him show forth his faith by his good works.” Avitus skilfully eluded this question, and significantly replied, that he was ignorant of the motives of Clovis, “but this I know, that God overthrows the thrones of those who are disobedient to his law.”³ When after the submission of the Burgundian kingdom to the payment of tribute to the Franks, Gundebald resumed the sway, his first act was to besiege his brother Godesil, the ally of Clovis, in Vienne. Godesil fled to the Arian church, and was slain there with the Arian Bishop.⁴

Numquid fidem perfecto prædicabimus quam ante perfectionem sine prædicatore vidistis? an forte humilitatem . . . an *misericordiam* quam solutus a vobis adhuc nuper populus captivus gaudiis mundo insinuat lacrymis Deo?” The mercy of Clovis! — Avitus, Epist. xli.

¹ It is remarkable that all the distinguished and influential of the clergy appear on the Catholic side. The Arians are unknown even by name. It is true that we have only Catholic annalists. But I have little doubt that the Arian prelates were for the most part barbarians, inferior in education and in that authority which still, in peaceful functions, attached to the Roman name. It was Rome now enlisting a new clan of barbarians in her own cause, and under her own guidance, against her foreign oppressors.

² The Bishop Avitus of Vienne was in correspondence with the insurgent Vitalianus in the court of the Emperor Anastasius. So completely were now all wars and rebellions religious wars.

³ Collatio Episcop. apud D'Achery, Spicileg. iii. p. 304.

⁴ M. Reveillot has very ingeniously, perhaps too ingeniously, worked out

On this occasion Avitus tried again to work on the obstinate mind of Gundebald; his arguments confounded but did not persuade the king, who retained his errors to the end of his life.

When, however, Clovis determined to attack the kingdom of the Visigoths, the monkish historian ascribes to him this language:—“I am sore troubled that these Arians still possess so large a part of Gaul.”¹ Before he set out on his campaign the King of the Franks went to perform his devotions before the shrine of St. Martin at Tours. As he entered the church he heard the words of the Psalm which they were chanting, —“Thou hast girded me, O Lord, with strength unto the battle; thou hast subdued unto me those which rose up against me. Thou hast given me the necks of mine enemies, that I might destroy them that hate me.”² The oracular words were piously fulfilled by Clovis. The Visigothic kingdom was wasted and subdued by the remorseless sword of the Frank. These are not the only illustrations of the Christianity practised by Clovis, and related in

the religious history of the reign of King Gundebald (p. 189 et seq.). But he is somewhat tender to the Bishop, who “almost praises Gundebald for the murder of his brothers.” The passage is too characteristic to be omitted: “Flebatis quondam pietate ineffabili funera germanorum (he had murdered them), sequebatur fletum publicum universitatis afflictio, et occulto *divinitatis intuitu*, instrumenta mœstitiæ parabantur ad gaudium . . . Minuebat regni felicitas numerum regalium personarum et hoc solum servabatur mundo, quod sufficeret imperio (the good Turkish maxim). Illic repositum est quicquid prosperum fuit catholice veritati.” This is said of an Arian, but the father of an orthodox son, Sigismund, converted by Avitus. — Epist. v. p. 95.

¹ Valde molestè fero, quod hi Ariani partem Galliarum tenent. Eamus cum Dei adjutorio, et superatis eis terram redigamus in ditionem nostram. — Greg. Tur. ii. 37.

² Psalm xviii. 39. Did Clovis understand Latin? or did the orthodox clergy of Tours interpret the flattering prophecy?

perfect simplicity by his monkish historian.¹ Gregory of Tours describes without emotion one of the worst acts which darken the reign of Clovis. He suggested to the son of Sigebert, King of the Ripuarian Franks, the assassination of his father, with the promise that the murderer should be peaceably established on the throne. The murder was committed in the neighboring forest. The parricide was then slain by the command of Clovis, who in a full parliament of the nation solemnly protested that he had no share in the murder of either; and was raised by general acclamation on a shield, as King of the Ripuarian Franks. Gregory concludes with this pious observation:—“For God thus daily prostrated his enemies under his hands, and enlarged his kingdom, because he walked before him with an upright heart, and did that which was pleasing in his sight.”² Yet Gregory

BORN A. D.
539-594.

¹ Miracles accompany his bloody arms; a hind shows a ford; a light from the church of St. Hilary in Poitiers summons him to hasten his attack before the arrival of the Italian troops of Theodoric in the camp of the Visigoth. The walls of Angoulême fall of their own accord. Gregory Tur. ii. 37. According to the life of St. Remi, Clovis massacred all the Arian Goths in the city.—Ap. Bouquet, iii. p. 379. St. Cesarius, the Bishop of Arles, when that city was besieged by Clovis and the Burgundians, was suspected of assisting the invader by more than his prayers. He was imprisoned, his biographers assert, his innocence proved.—Vit. S. Cæsar. in Mabill. Ann. Benedic. sæc. i.

² Greg. Turon. ii. 42. “Prosternebat enim quotidie Deus hostes ejus sub manu ipsius et augebat regnum ejus, eò quod ambulavit rectè corde omnino, et fecerit quæ placita erant in oculis ejus.” There follows a long list of assassinations and acts of the darkest treachery. “Clovis fit périr tous les petits rois des Francs par une suite de perfidies.”—Michelet, H. de France, i. 209. The note recounts the assassinations. Throughout, the triumph of Clovis is the triumph of the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity over Arianism. “Dominus enim se verè credentibus, etsi insidiante inimico aliqua perdant, his centuplicata restituit; hæretici vero nec acquirunt, sed quod videntur habere, aufertur. Probabat hoc Godigeseli, Gundobaldi, atque Godomari interitus, qui et patriam simul et animas perdiderunt.”—Prolog. ad lib. iii.

of Tours was a prelate, himself of gentle and blameless manners, and of profound piety.

Throughout indeed this dark period of the contest between the Franks, the Visigoths, and the Burgundians for the dominion of France, as well as through the long dreary annals of the Merovingian kings, it will be necessary, as well as just, to estimate the character, influence, and beneficent workings of the clergy on the whole society. But the more suitable place for this inquiry will be when the two races, the Roman provincial and the Teutonic, are more completely mingled, though not fused together, for it was but gradually that the clergy, who never ceased to be Roman in the language of their services and of letters, ceased to be so in sentiment, and throughout northern France especially, in blood and descent. There is more even at this time of the first conversion of the Franks to Christianity, in the close alliance between the Roman clergy of Gaul with the Franks, than the contest of Catholicism with heterodoxy. The

Influence of clergy. Arian clergy of the Visigoths were probably, to a considerable extent, of Teutonic race, some of them, like Ulphilas, though provincials of the Empire by descent, of Gothic birth. Their names have utterly perished; this may partly (as has been said) be ascribed to the jealousy of the Catholic writers, the only annalists of the time. But the conversion of the Franks was wrought by the Latin clergy. The Franks were more a federation of armed adventurers than a nation migrating with their families into new lands; they were at once more barbarous and more exclusively warlike. It would probably be long before they would be tempted to lay aside their arms and

Clergy Latin.

aspire to the peaceful ecclesiastical functions. The Roman Gauls might even imagine that they beheld in the Franks deliverers from the tyranny of their actual masters,¹ the Burgundians or Visigoths. Men impatient of a galling yoke pause not to consider whether they are not forging for themselves another more heavy and oppressive. They panted after release from their present masters, perhaps after revenge for the loss of their freedom and their lands, for their degradation, their servitude; and cared not to consider whether it would not be a change from bad masters to worse. Clovis, it is true, had commenced his career by the defeat of Syagrius, the last Roman who pretended to authority in Gaul, and had thus annihilated the lingering remains of the Empire; but that would be either pardoned by the clergy or forgotten in the fond hope of some improvement in their condition under the barbarian sway. It was, of course, a deep aggravation of their degraded state that their masters were not only foreigners, barbarians, conquerors—they were Arians. The Franks, as even more barbarous, were more likely to submit in obedience to ecclesiastical dominion; and so it appears that almost throughout the reign of the Merovingian dynasty the two races held their separate functions—the Franks as kings, the Latins as churchmen. The weak prince who was deposed from his throne, or the timid one who felt himself unequal to its weight, was degraded, according to the Frankish notion, into a clerk;² he lost his

¹ Gregory of Tours ingeniously admits “quod omnes (the Catholic clergy) desiderabili amore cupiverunt eos regnare.” I. ii. 23.

² Queen Clotilda, when her two sons seized their nephews, her favorite grandsons (the children of Chlodimir), and gave her the choice of their death or tonsure, answered like a Frankish queen, “Satius mihi est, si ad regnum non veniant, mortuos eos videre quam tonsos.”—iii. 18.

national eminence and distinction, but disqualified by the tonsure from resuming his civil office, according to the sacerdotal notion, he was admitted to the blessed privilege of the priesthood; while at the same time his feeble and contemptible character was a guarantee against his becoming a dangerous rival for the higher honors of the Church. Hence, on the one hand, the unchecked growth of the sacerdotal authority, and the strong Catholicity of the clergy among the Franks, the retention of all the higher offices, at least in the Church, by the Roman Provincials, till they had become of such power, wealth, and dignity, as to rouse the ambition of the noble, and even of the royal families.¹ Until that time the two races remained distinct, each in possession of his separate, uncontested function; and each might be actuated by high and noble, as well as selfish and ambitious motives. The honest and simple German submitted himself to the comparatively civilized priest of that God whom he now worshipped—the expounder of that mysterious creed before which he had bowed down in awe—the administrator in those imposing rites to which he was slowly and, as it were, jealously admitted,—the awarder of his eternal doom. On the other hand the clergy, fully possessed with the majesty of their divine mission, would hold it as profanation to impart its sanctity to a rude barbarian. Not merely would Roman pride find

¹ In the year 566 a certain Meroveus, from whose name he may be concluded to have been a Frank, appears as Bishop of Poitiers.—Greg. Turon. ix. 40. Compare Planck, *Christliche Kirchliche Verfassung*, ii. p. 96. It is a century later that, at the trial of Prætextatus, Archbishop of Rouen, are twelve prelates, six Teutons—Ragheremod, of Paris; Landowald, Bayeux; Remahaire, Coutances; Merowig, Poitiers; Melulf, Senlis; Berthran, Bourdeaux. Compare Thierry, *Récits des Temps Mérovingiens*, the one writer who, by his happy selection and artistic skill, has made the Merovingian history readable (tome ii. p. 135).

its consolation in what thus maintained its influence and superiority, and look down in compassion on the ignorance of the Teuton — his ignorance even of the language of their sacred records, and of the service of their religion; the Romans would hold themselves the heaven-commissioned teachers of a race long destined to be their humble and obedient scholars.

We return to the general view of the conversion of the German races. The effect of this infu- Effects of conversion on Teutons. sion of Teutonic blood into the whole Roman system, and this establishment of a foreign dominant people (of kindred manners, habits and religion, though of various descent) in the separate provinces of the Empire which now were rising into independent kingdoms, upon the general Christian society, and on the Christianity of the age, demands attentive consideration. Though in each ancient province, and in each recent kingdom, according to the genius of the conquering tribe, the circumstances of the conquest and settlement, and the state of the Roman population, many strong differences might exist, there were some general results which seem to belong to the whole social revolution. In one important respect the Teutonic temperament coincided with Christianity in raising the moral tone. In all that relates to sexual intercourse, the Roman society was corrupt to its core, and the contagion had spread throughout the provinces. Christianity had probably wrought its change rather on the few higher and more distinguished individuals than on the whole mass of worshippers. Most of these few, no doubt, had broken the bonds of habits and manners by a strong and convulsive effort, not to cultivate the purer charities of life, but in the aspiration after virtue, unat-

tainable by the many. Celibacy had many lofty minds and devoted hearts at its service, but it may be doubted whether conjugal fidelity had made equal progress. Christianity had secluded a certain number from the world and its vices; but in the world itself, now outwardly Christian, it had made in this respect far less impression. Not that it was without power. The courts of the Christian Emperors, notwithstanding their crimes, weaknesses, and intrigues, had been awed, even on the throne, to greater decency of manners. Neither Rome, nor Ravenna, nor Byzantium, had witnessed, they would not have endured, a Nero or an Elagabalus. The females (believing the worst of the early life of the Empress Theodora) were more disposed on the whole to the crimes of ambition, and political or religious intrigue, than to that flagrant licentiousness of the wives and mothers of the older Cæsars. But the evil was too profoundly seated in the habits of the Roman world to submit to the control of religion — of religion embraced at first by so large a portion, from the example of others, from indifference, from force, from anything rather than strong personal conviction, and which had now been long received merely as an hereditary and traditional faith. The clergy themselves, as far as may be judged, did not stand altogether much above the general level. They had their heroes of continence, their spotless examples of personal purity; but though in general they might outwardly submit to the hard law of celibacy, by many it was openly violated, by many more secretly eluded; and, as ever has been, the denial of a legitimate union led to connections more unrestricted and injurious to public morality. Scarcely a Provincial

On moral
purity.

Council but finds itself called upon to enact more stringent, and, it should seem, still ineffective prohibitions.

Whether as a reminiscence of some older civilization, or as a peculiarity in their national character, the Teutons had always paid the highest respect to their females, a feeling which cannot exist without high notions of personal purity, by which it is generated, and in its turn tends to generate. The colder northern climate may have contributed to this result. This masculine modesty of the German character had already excited the admiration, perhaps had been highly colored by the language, of Tacitus, as a contrast to the effeminate voluptuousness of the Romans — marriages were held absolutely sacred, and producing the most perfect unity; adulteries rare, and visited with public and ignominious punishment.¹ The Christian teachers, in words not less energetic, though wanting the inimitable conciseness of the Roman analyst, endeavor to shame their Latin brethren by the severity of Teutonic morals, and to rouse them from their dissolute excesses by taunting them with their degrading inferiority to barbarians, heathens, and heretics. Salvian must be heard with some reserve in his vehement denunciation against the licentiousness of the fifth century. He is seeking to vindicate God's providential government of the world in abandoning the Roman and the Christian to the sway of the pagan and

¹ "Inesse quinetiam sanctum aliquid et providum putant."—Germ. viii. "Quamquam severa illic matrimonia, nec ullam morum partem magis laudaveris. . . . Ergo septâ pudicitia agunt, nullis spectaculorum illecebris, nullis convivorum irritationibus corruptæ Nemo . . . illic vitia ridet, nec corrumpere et corrumpi sæculum videtur. . . . Sic unum accipiunt maritum, quomodo unum corpus unamque vitam, ne ulla cogitatio ultra, ne longior cupiditas ne tanquam maritum, sed tanquam matrimonium ament."—xviii. xix.

the barbarian. "Among the chaste barbarians, we alone are unchaste: the very barbarians are shocked at our impurities. Among themselves they will not tolerate whoredom, but allow this shameful license to the Romans as an inveterate usage. We cherish, they execrate, incontinence; we shrink from, they are enamored of purity; fornication, which with them is a crime and a disgrace, with us is a glory."¹ Salvian describes the different races, who, though in other respects varying in their character, and some more conspicuous than others for these virtues, were all nevertheless far superior to the Romans. The Goths are treacherous, but continent; the Alemanni less treacherous, and also less continent; the Franks false, but hospitable; the Saxons savagely cruel, but remarkable for chastity.² The Vandals, if Salvian is to be credited, maintained their severe virtue, not only in Spain, but under the burning sun and amidst the utter depravity of African morals, and in that state of felicity, luxury, and wealth which usually unmans the mind. They not only held in abomination the more odious and unnatural vices which had so deeply infected the habits of Greece and Rome, but all unlawful connections with the female sex.³ According to the same authority, they enforced the marriage of the public pros-

¹ De Gubernat. Dei, l. vii. p. 66. He draws the same contrast between the Roman inhabitants of Spain and their Vandal conquerors.

² "Gothorum gens perfida sed pudica est, Alemanni impudica sed minus perfida, Franci mendaces sed hospitales, Saxones crudelitate efferi, sed castitate venerandi." — Ibid.

³ "Et certè ob eâ tantum continentissimi ac modestissimi judicandi erant quos non fecisset corruptiores ipsa felicitas . . . igitur in tantâ affluentia rerum atque luxuria, nullus eorum mollis effectus est . . . abominati enim sunt virorum improbitates; plus adhuc addo, abominati etiam fœminarum; horruerunt lustra ac lupanaria, horruerunt contactus concubitusque meretricum." — Ibid.

titutes, and enacted severe laws against unchastity, thus compelling the Romans to be virtuous against their will. Under the Ostrogothic kingdom, the manners in Italy might seem to revert to the dignified austerity of the old Roman republic. Theodoric indignantly reproves a certain Bardilas, who had married the wife of an officer (from his name also of Gothic blood) while the husband was absent with the army. He speaks of it as bringing disgrace on the age and on the Gothic character.¹ The Ostrogothic law is silent as to incest and the crime against nature, as if, in its lofty purity, it did not imagine the existence of such offences. This code was for the Goths alone; the Romans were still amenable to their own law.² In the laws of Theodoric the German abhorrence of adultery continued to make it a capital crime; the edict was inexorably severe against all crimes of this class: the seducer or ravisher of a free virgin was forced to marry her, and endow her with a fifth of his estate; if married, he forfeited a third of his property to his victim; if he had no property, he atoned for his crime by death: if the virgin was a slave, the criminal, being a free man, was de-

¹ "In injuriam nostrorum temporum, adulterium simulatur, matrimonii lege commissum." The husband's name was Patzena. It is amusing to hear the King of the Goths reminding unchaste women of the fidelity of turtledoves, who pine away in each other's absence, and remain in strictly continent widowhood: "Respicite impudicæ gementium turturum castissimum genus, quod si a copulâ fuerit eam intercedente divisum, perpetuâ se abstinentiæ lege constringit;" and this is a royal or imperial edict.

² Sartorius, *Essai sur l'Etat des Peuples d'Italie sous le Gouvernement des Goths* (p. 95). "Odious as homicide is, it would be more odious to punish than to commit that crime in certain cases, as in that of open adultery. See we not that rams, bulls, and goats avenge themselves against their rivals? Shall man alone be unable to preserve the honor of his bed? Examine the cause of Candax; if he only killed the adulterers who dishonored him, remit all his penalties; if he has slain innocent men, let him be punished." — Var. i. 37.

graded into a slave of the wife of the maiden's master, if he could not redeem his guilt by supplying two slaves; the rape of a free widow was subject to the capital punishment of adultery. The parents or guardians of a female who had suffered rape were bound to prosecute on pain of exile.

In some provinces, it must be acknowledged, that the vices as well as the religion of Rome assert their unshaken dominion; or rather there is a terrible interchange of the worst parts of each character. It is difficult to conceive a more dark and odious state of society than that of France under her Merovingian kings, the descendants of Clovis, as described by Gregory of Tours. In the conflict or coalition of barbarism with Roman Christianity, barbarism has introduced into Christianity all its ferocity, with none of its generosity or magnanimity; its energy shows itself in atrocity of cruelty and even of sensuality. Christianity has given to barbarism hardly more than its superstition and its hatred of heretics and unbelievers. Throughout, assassinations, parricides, and fratricides intermingle with adulteries and rapes.¹ The cruelty might seem the mere inevitable result of this violent and unnatural fusion; but the extent to which this cruelty spreads throughout the whole society almost surpasses belief. That King Chlotaire should burn alive his rebellious son with his wife and daughter is fearful enough; but we are astounded even in these times with a Bishop of Tours burning a man alive to obtain the deeds of an estate which he coveted.² Fredegonde sends two murderers to assassinate Childebert, and these assassins are clerks. She causes the

¹ See a fearful summary in Loëbel, *Gregor von Tours*, pp. 60-74.

² *iii.* 1.

Archbishop of Rouen to be murdered while he is chanting the service in the church; and in this crime a Bishop and an Archdeacon are her accomplices. She is not content with open violence, she administers poison with the subtlety of a Locusta or a modern Italian, apparently with no sensual design, but from sheer barbarity.

As to the intercourse of the sexes, wars of conquest, where the females are at the mercy of the victors, especially if female virtue is not in much respect, ^{Merovingian} would severely try the more rigid morals of ^{times.} the conqueror. The strength of the Teutonic character, when it had once burst the bonds of habitual or traditionary restraint, might seem to disdain easy and effeminate vice, and to seek a kind of wild zest in the indulgence of lust, by mingling it up with all other violent passions, rapacity, and inhumanity. Marriage was a bond contracted and broken on the lightest occasion. Some of the Merovingian kings took as many wives, either together or in succession, as suited either their passions or their politics. Christianity hardly interferes even to interdict incest. King Chlotaire demanded for the fisc the third part of the revenue of the churches; some bishops yielded; one, Injuriousus, disdainfully refused, and Chlotaire withdrew his demands. Yet Chlotaire, seemingly unrebuked, married two sisters at once. Charibert likewise married two sisters: he, however, found a Churchman, but that was Saint Germanus, bold enough to rebuke him. This rebuke the King (the historian quietly writes), as he had already many wives, bore with patience. Dagobert, son of Chlotaire, King of Austrasia, repudiated his wife Gomatrude for barrenness, married a Saxon slave Mathil-

dis, then another, *Regnatrude*; so that he had three wives at once, besides so many concubines that the chronicler is ashamed to recount them.¹ Brunehaut and Fredegonde are not less famous for their licentiousness than for their cruelty. Fredegonde is either compelled or scruples not of her own accord to take a public oath, with three bishops and four hundred nobles as her vouchers, that her son was the son of her husband Chilperic. The Eastern right of having a concubine seems to have been inveterate among the later Frankish kings: that which was permitted for the sake of perpetuating the race was continued and carried to excess by the more dissolute sovereigns for their own pleasure. Even as late as Charlemagne, the polygamy of that great monarch, more like an Oriental Sultan (except that his wives were not secluded in a harem), as well as the notorious licentiousness of the females of his court, was unchecked, and indeed unproved, by the religion of which he was at least the temporal head, of which the Spiritual Sovereign placed on his brow the crown of the Western Empire. These, however, seem to have been the royal vices of men gradually intoxicated by uncontrolled and irresponsible power, plunging fiercely into the indulgences before they had acquired any of the humanizing virtues of advanced civilization.

In such times the celibacy or even the continence of the clergy was not likely to be very severely observed. The marriage of bishops, if not general, was common.² Firmilio had a wife named Clara. There is an ac-

¹ "Nomina concubinarum eo quod plures erant, increvit huic chronicæ inseri." — Fredegar. c. 60.

² G. T. x. 10. The son of a bishop of Verdun (vi. 35). Daughter of bishop (viii. 32). Compare throughout Loëbel, Gregor von Tours.

count of some strange cruelties practised by a bishop's wife.¹

Yet clerical incontinence was not without rebuke from above. Gregory tells a strange story of the pax with the consecrated host leaping out of a deacon's hands, and flying through the air to the altar. All agreed that the clerk must be polluted. He confessed, it was said, to several acts of adultery.²

If, however, with some exceptions, more especially this great exception of the Frankish monarchs, Christianity found an unexpected ally in the higher moral tone of the Teutonic races, the religion in other respects and throughout its whole sphere of conquest suffered a serious, perhaps inevitable deterioration. With the world Christianity began rapidly to barbarize. War was the sole ennobling occupation. Even the clergy, after striving for some time to be the pacific mediators between the conquerors and the conquered; to allay here and there the horrors of war, at times by the awe of their own holiness and that of their religion; to keep the churches during the capture of a city as a safe sanctuary for the unarmed, the helpless, the women, and the children; to redeem captives from slavery; to mitigate the tyranny of the liege lord, who as a Christian, perhaps in the ardor of a new convert, was humbly submissive to their dictates; even the clergy were at length swept away by the torrent. In

¹ Of two hermits (viii. 39), one was drunken, one had a wife!

² One priest only, three women, one of whom was Gregory's mother, witnessed this miracle. Gregory was present, but the privilege was not vouchsafed to him. "Uni tantum presbytero, et tribus mulieribus, ex quibus una mater mea erat, hæc videre licitum fuit; cæteri non viderunt. Aderam fateor, et ego huic festivitati, sed hæc videre non merui." — De Glor. Martyr. vol. ii. p. 361.

the fifth century we find bishops in arms, and at the head of fighting men ; and though at first the common feeling protested against this desecration, though bearing arms was prohibited by the decrees of councils ; yet where, as in some cases, the wars in which they might engage were defensive, and for the preservation of the most sacred rights of man ; the step once taken, the sight once familiarized to this incongruous confusion of the armed warrior and the peaceful ecclesiastic, the evil would grow up with fatal rapidity. When the ecclesiastical dignities and honors, from their wealth and authority, began to tempt the barbarians, who would no longer leave them to the exclusive possession of the Romans, those barbarians would be the more disposed to assume them, if they no longer absolutely imposed inglorious inactivity or humiliating patience. While on the other hand, the barbarian invested in the priesthood would more jealously justify himself for thus, in one sense, descending from his high place as a warrior, by retaining some of the habits and character of the free German conqueror. At length, though at a much later period, the tenure of land implying military service, as the land came more and more into the hands of the clergy, the ecclesiastic would be embarrassed more and more by his double function ; till at length we arrive at the Prince Bishop, or the feudal Abbot, alternately with the helmet and the mitre on his head, the crozier and the lance in his hand ; now in the field in the front of his armed vassals, now on his throne in the church in the midst of his chanting choir.¹

¹ The first bishops who appeared in arms, and actually slew their enemies, shocked Gregory of Tours. "Salaris et Sagittarius fratres atque

All things throughout this great social revolution tended to advance and consolidate the sacerdotal power. The clergy, whether as among the Goths and other Arian nations, who had their own bishops, or among the Franks, where they were revered for their intellectual as well as their spiritual superiority, became more completely a separate and distinct corporate body, filling up their own ranks by their own election, with less and less regard even to the assent of the laity; for the barbarous laity, of another race, ceased to pretend to any share of the election of the clergy. They possessed more completely the power of ecclesiastical legislation. In the confusion and breaking up of all ancient titles to property, more would be constantly falling into their hands. The barbarians for the good of their souls would abandon more readily lands which they had just acquired by the sword, and of which they had hardly learned the value; while the Romans, in perpetual danger of being forcibly despoiled, would more easily make over to the safer custody of Churchmen, lands which under such protection they might more securely cultivate. Already in France the kings are jealous of their vast acquisitions; King Chilperic hated the clergy for this reason, and was hated by them with emulous intensity. He com-

episcopi qui non cruce cœlesti muniti, sed galeâ aut lanceâ sæculari armati, multos manibus propriis quod pejus est, interfecisse referuntur." — iv. 41 Compare v. 17. — Merovingian France still offers the most startling anomalies. While thus advancing in power, their persons are not sacred in these wild times. The Bishop of Marseilles is exposed to cruel usage. Even the strong feeling of caste has lost its influence. They are murdered and burned with as little remorse as the profane. Gregory, who stands up on some occasions for their inviolability, on others despondingly acquiesces in their fate; if not in its justice, in its being too much in the common order of things to shock public feeling. Some of them, by his own account, richly deserved their doom.

plained that all the wealth of the crown was swallowed up by the Church.¹ The Church revenged itself by consoling visions of Chilperic's damnation. The jurisdiction of the bishops, at first confined to strictly religious concerns, would gradually extend itself, perhaps from confidence in their superior justice, their intellectual superiority, the absence or the deficiency of the administrators of the Roman law, under which everywhere the Romans still lived. Where other magistrates were suppressed, or had forfeited or abandoned their functions, they would become the sole magistrates. Causes regarding property, bequests, and others of a more intricate kind, which might perplex the greater simplicity of the barbaric codes, or embarrass the straightforward justice of barbaric tribunals, would be referred to their superior wisdom. The bishops thus gradually became more independent of their college of presbyters; they grew into a separate order in the State as well as in the Church.

Nor can it be wondered that partly in self defence, partly for his own relative aggrandizement, the weaker and conquered Roman, conscious of his intellectual superiority — especially the Roman ecclesiastic — should abuse his power, and make, as it were, reprisals on the rude and ignorant barbarian conqueror.² His own religion would become more and more superstitious, for the more superstitious the more awful. Art and cunning are the natural and constant weapons of

¹ "Aiebat enim plerumque, ecce pauper remanet fiscus noster, ecce divitiæ nostræ ad ecclesias translatae: nulli penitus nisi soli episcopi regnant; perithonos noster, et translatus est ad episcopos civitatum." — vi. 46.

² The Jews were their rivals in wealth. Cantinus, the cruel Bishop of Tours, has large money dealings with the Jews. Eufrañius borrows large sums of the Jews to buy the same bishopric. — iv. 35.

enfeebled civilization against strong invading barbarism. Throughout the period the strongest superstitious terrors cross the most lawless and most cruel acts.¹ There are several curious instances in the Frankish annals in which the ecclesiastical kindred speaks more strongly to the alarmed conscience than that of blood to the heart. Those who without compunction, murder their nearest relatives, their children or their husband, have some reluctance to shed the blood of those whom they have held over the baptismal font. Brunehaut spares Borthefrid because she has been godmother to his daughter.

The ecclesiastics must have been almost more than men, certainly far beyond their time, to have resisted the temptation of what would seem innocent or beneficent fraud, to overawe or to control the ignorant barbarian.

The good Bishop Gregory of Tours is himself concerned in an affair in which the violence and religious fears of King Chilperic singularly contrast with the subtlety of the ecclesiastics. Chilperic sends a letter to St. Martin of Tours requesting the Saint to inform him whether he might force Meroveus out of the sanctuary. It will hardly be doubted that he received an answer; and that the majesty of the sanctuary suffered no loss. St. Martin of Tours was the great oracle of the Franko-Latin kingdoms:² kings flock to his shrine to make their offerings, to hear his judgments. No two cities

¹ A bishop of Rheims gives a safe conduct under oath on a chest of relics; but having first stolen away the relics, holds the oath not binding. — Fredegar. c. 97. Eichhorn quotes a similar fraud of Hatto, Archbishop of Maintz. — i. p. 514.

² Michelet writes in his flashing way, "Ce que Delphes était pour la Grèce.

in the north of France, not even the royal residences, approached the two great ecclesiastical capitals, Rheims and Tours. Lands and wealth were poured at the feet of the Church. Dagobert bestowed twenty-seven hamlets or towns on the monastery of St. Denys.¹ His son bestowed on St. Remaclus of Tongres twelve square leagues in the forest of Ardennes.² The Church of Rheims possessed vast territories, some of which it may have received from the careless and lavish bounty of Clovis himself; much more, by a pious anachronism, was made to rest on that ancient and venerable tenure.³

¹ *Gesta Dagobert.* c. 35.

² This subject is resumed when the clergy are considered as co-legislators with the Teutonic kings and people.

³ *Vit. St. Sigebert. Austras.,* c. 4. *Script. Franc.* See the curious passage in Frodoard, quoted by Michelet.

CHAPTER III.

THEODORIC THE OSTROGOTH.

THE Ostrogothic kingdom of Italy shows the earliest and not the least noble form of this new so-^{Ostrogothic}ciety, which grew out of the yet unfused ^{kingdom.} elements of the Latin and Teutonic races. To the strong opposition between the barbarian and Roman parts of the community was added the almost stronger contrast of religious difference. The Sovereign of Italy, the civil monarch of the Papal Diocese, was an Arian.

Theodoric's invasion of Italy was the migration of a people, not the inroad of an army.¹ His Goths were accompanied by their wives and children, with all the movable property which they had possessed in their settlements in Pannonia. Theodoric had extorted from the gratitude and the fears of the Eastern Emperor, if not a formal grant of the kingdom of Italy, a permission to rescue the Roman West from the dominion of Odoacer. The Herulian king, after two great battles, and a siege of three years in Ravenna, wrested from Theodoric a peace, by the terms of which the Herulian and the Gothic monarchs were to reign over Odoacer

¹ Compare, on the number of the Gothic invaders, Sartorius, *Essai sur l'Etat Civil et Physique des Peuples d'Italie sous le Gouvernement des Goths*, note, page 242.

Italy, in joint sovereignty. Such treaty could not be lasting. Odoacer, either the victim of treachery, or his own treacherous designs but anticipated by the superior craft and more subtle intelligence of Theodoric, was assassinated at a banquet.¹ The Herulians were dispossessed of the third portion of the lands which they had extorted from the Roman proprietors, and dispersed, some into Gaul, some into other parts of the Empire. The Gothic followers of Theodoric took their place, and Theodoric, the Ostrogoth, commenced a A. D. 493-526. reign of thirty-three years, in which Italy reposed in peace under his just and vigorous, and parental administration.

Throughout the conquest, and the establishment of the Gothic kingdom, the increasing power and importance of the Christian ecclesiastics forces itself upon the attention. They are ambassadors, mediators in treaties, decide the wavering loyalty or instigate the revolt of cities. Even before the expiration of the Empire, Glycerius abdicates the throne, and retires to the bishopric of Salona, not, it should seem, from any strong religious vocation, or weariness of political Bishops employed. intrigue. He is afterwards concerned in the murder of another of his short-lived successors, the Emperor Nepos, and is promoted, as the reward of his services, to the Archbishopric of Milan. Epiphanius, the Bishop of Pavia, bears to Theodoric at Milan the surrender and offer of allegiance from that great city.

¹ The most probable view of this transaction is, that the Herulian chieftains, impatient of the equal dominion of the Goths, had organized a formidable insurrection, of which Odoacer, possibly not an accomplice, was nevertheless the victim. The Byzantine writers, Procopius, Marcellinus, betray their hatred. Ennodius and Cassiodorus of course favor Theodoric Gibbon declares against him.

John, the Bishop, was employed by Odoacer to negotiate the treaty of Ravenna.¹ Before this time, whenever a difficult negotiation occurred, Epiphanius was persuaded to undertake it. He had been ambassador from Ricimer to Anthemius, from Nepos to Euric the Visigoth. Theodoric admired the dignified beauty and esteemed the saintliness of character in the Catholic Epiphanius, and perhaps intended that his praises of the bishop should be heard in Pavia, where from his virtues and charities, he enjoyed unbounded popularity: "Behold a man whose peer cannot be found throughout the West: he is the great bulwark of Pavia; — to his care I may intrust my wife and children, and devote myself entirely to war."² Epiphanius was permitted to plead the cause of the Herulians who had risen in arms in the north of Italy after the death of Odoacer. The eloquence of the Bishop arrested the inexorable vengeance or justice of Theodoric. He was employed even on a more apostolic mission — to rescue from slavery those who had been sold or had fled into slavery beyond the Alps. Gundebald the Burgundian and his chieftains melted at the persuasive words of Epiphanius, who entered Pavia at the head of 6000 bond-slaves, rescued by his influence from slavery. Epiphanius made a third journey to Ravenna, to obtain a remission of taxes in favor of his distressed people.³

The Ostrogothic kingdom was an intermediate state between the Roman Empire and the barbarian mon-

¹ Procop. l. i. c. i. p. 9, Edit. Bonn.

² Ennodii Vita Epiphan.

³ Ennodius says of Epiphanius, — "Inter dissidentes principes solus esset, qui pace frueretur amborum." — p. 1011. He even overawed the fierce Rugians, at one time masters of Pavia.

Union of the
races archies. It was the avowed object of Theodor-
oric to fuse together the Teutonic vigor with
the Roman civilization, to alloy the fierceness of the
Gothic temperament with the social culture of Italy.¹
The Romans still held many of the chief civil offices.
Liberius, Symmachus, Boethius, Cassiodorus, were the
ministers of the Gothic king. Yet the two elements
of the society had no tendency to assimilation or union,
the justice and wisdom of the king might mitigate, he
could not reconcile this discord, which could
very imper-
fect. only be finally extinguished by years of mu-
tual intercourse, by intermarriages, and above all by
perfect community of religious faith. The Gothic and
the Roman races stood apart in laws, in usages, in civil
position, as well as in character. Possessors, by the
right of conquest, of the one-third of the lands in
Italy, of which they exacted the surrender, and for
which they tacitly engaged to protect the whole from
foreign invasion,² the Goths settled as an armed aristoc-
racy among a people who seemed content to purchase

¹ "Ii semper fuerint (Gothi, sc.) in laudis medio constituti, ut et Romanorum prudentiam caperent, et virtutem gentium possiderent. . . . Consuetudo nostra feris mentibus inseratur donec truculentus animus vivere velle consuescat."—Cassiod. Var. Epist. iii. 23. In another passage he exhorts the Goths to put on the manners of the toga, and to cast off those of barbarism. "Intelligite homines non tam corporeâ vi quam ratione præferri."—Lib. iii. Epist. 17. When he invaded Gaul, Theodoric declared himself the protector of the Romans: "Delectamur jure Romano vivere quos armis vindicamus. . . . Nobis propositum est, Deo juvante, sic vivere, ut subjecti se doleant nostrum dominium tardius acquisisse."—iii. 43. But the most clear and distinct indication of his views is in the formula for the appointment of the Count of the Goths: "Unum vos amplectatur vivendi votum, quibus unum esse constat imperium." The anonym. Vales. says that the poor Roman (miser) affected to be a Goth, the rich (utilis) Goth to be a Roman.

² "Vos autem Romani magno studio Gothos diligere debetis, qui in pace numerosos vobis populos faciunt, et universam rempublicam per bella defendunt."—Cassiod. vii. 3.

their security at the price of one third of their possessions. This transfer was carried on with nothing of the violence and irregularity of plunder or confiscation, but with the utmost order and equity. It was, in truth, but a new form of the law of conquest, which Rome had enforced, first upon Italy, afterwards on the world. Nor was it an obsolete and forgotten hardship, the expulsion of a free, and flourishing, and happy peasantry from their paternal homesteads, and hereditary fields; they were only like those more partial no doubt, but more cruel ejections, when the conquering Triumvir, during the later republic, confiscated whole provinces, and apportioned them among his own soldiery.¹ The followers of Odoacer had already, ^{Division of lands.} if not to so great an extent, enforced the same surrender, and the Goth only expelled the Herulian from his newly acquired estate. Large tracts in Italy were utterly desolate and uncultivated — almost the whole under imperfect culture.² This, in the best times of the Roman aristocracy, had been the natural and recorded consequence of the vast estates accumulated by one proprietor, and cultivated by slaves or at best by poor métayers, and was now aggravated by the general ruin of that aristocracy, the difficulty of maintaining slaves, and the effects of long warfare. This revolution at least assisted in breaking up these overgrown properties, combining as it did with constant aliena-

¹ Theodoric considered that he had succeeded to the right of the Roman people in apportioning land: he prohibited the forcible entrance upon farms without authority.

² "Vides universa Italiae loca originariis viduata cultoribus." Read the whole speech of Theodoric to Epiphanius of Pavia on the desolation especially of Liguria. — Ennod. Vit. p. 1014. "Latifundia perdidere Italiam," the axiom of all the Roman economists.

tions to the Church, and afterwards to monasteries. Agriculture in Italy received a new impulse,¹ the more necessary, as it ceased to command foreign resources. The harvests of the East, and of Egypt and Libya, had long been assigned to the maintenance of the new capital; and Western Africa, desolated by the Vandals, no longer poured in her supplies. Theodoric watched with parental solicitude the progress of agriculture, and the irregular and uncertain supplies of corn to his Italian subjects, who were now thrown on their own resources. His correspondence is full of orders on this important subject. Italy began to export corn. The price, both of corn and wine, fell to a very moderate amount.²

The Gothic king claimed all the imposts formerly paid to the imperial treasury; the Curixæ were still responsible for the collection, but Theodoric inculcated moderation in the exaction of the imperial claims.³ The Goths appear to have been liable to the same taxes with the Romans.⁴ The clergy had as yet no immunities. Theodoric himself aspired to be the impartial sovereign of both races. In him met

¹ It is curious that most of these edicts prohibit *exportation*. See Cassiodorus. Var. Lib. i. 31, 34, 35 (a strange document in point of style). Lib. ii. 12, is a prohibition of the export of bacon, an important article of food; 20 gives orders to send corn from Ravenna to Liguria, which was suffering famine. The Gothic army in Gaul was supported by the province, not from Italy (iii. 41, 2), and during a famine Southern Italy and Sicily relieved Gaul (iv. 5, 7). On the other hand, Theodoric endeavored to obtain corn from Spain for the supply of Rome; but it seems the dealers had found a better market in Africa (v. 35).

² "Sexaginta modios triticorum in solidum ipsius tempore fuerunt, et vinum triginta amphoræ in solidum."—Anon. Vales. Without ascertaining the exact relative value, we may infer that these were unusually low prices.

³ Var. i. 19, iv. 19.

⁴ iv. 14.

and blended the Roman and the Goth: in peace he exchanged the Gothic military dress for the purple of the Roman Emperor.¹ He preserved the ancient titles both of the Republic and of the Empire. He appointed Consuls, Patricians, Quæstors, as well as Counts of largesses, of provinces, and some of the more servile titles of the East.² The conqueror was earnestly desirous to secure for his Italian subjects the blessings of peace: though his arms were employed in Gaul for thirty out of thirty-three years of his reign, Italy, under his dominion, escaped the ravages of war.³ The police was so strict throughout Italy, that merchants thronged from all parts. A man might leave his silver or gold as safely on his farm as in a walled city.⁴ He bequeathed peace to his successors; he encouraged all the arts of peace. The posts ^{Peace of Italy.} were arranged on a new and effective footing.⁵ The great roads, the bridges, the ruined walls, and falling buildings were restored to their ancient strength and splendor. Verona, Pavia,⁶ above all Ravenna, were adorned with new palaces, porticos, baths, amphitheatres, basilicas, and, doubtless, churches. In the latter

¹ Muratori, *Annal. d' Italia*, iv. 330.

² See the sixth book of the *Epistles*.

³ Ennodius says, in *Vit. Epiphan.* — “Cujus post triumphum spoliatum vagina gladium nullus aspexit.” — p. 1012. “Ergo præclarus et bonæ voluntatis in omnibus, qui regnavit annos xxxiii. cujus temporibus felicitas est sequuta Italiam per annos xxx. ita ut etiam pax pergentibus esset (*Pergentibus* successoribus ejus).” — Wagner's note, *Anonym. Vales.*

⁴ *Anonym. Vales.*

⁵ *Epist. i. 29, iv. 47, v. 5.*

⁶ *Anonym. Vales.* This writer, in his admiration of the golden age of Theodoric, declares that he did not repair the gates of the cities, as, being now never closed, the inhabitants entering and going out by night as well as by day, they had become of no use. “Hoc per totam Italiam augurium habebat, ut nulli civitati portas faceret.”

city Theodoric avowedly aimed at rivalling the magnificence of Rome; but Rome was not plundered or sacrificed to the new capital. The care of Theodoric was extended to the restoration of her stately but injured edifices.¹ The Cloacæ, which excited the wonder of the barbarians, and distinguished Rome from all other cities, were to be repaired entirely at the public cost.² The water from the aqueducts was no longer to be directed to private use, for the turning of mills, or irrigation of gardens, but devoted to the general benefit of the citizens.³ The prefect of the city and his lieutenant, the Count of Rome, and the public architect⁴ were especially charged to keep up the forests of stately buildings, the statues which peopled the city, the herds of equestrian images.⁵ In these terms the barbarians expressed their astonishment at the yet inexhausted treasures of art in the imperial city. The florid panegyric of Theodoric describes the aged city as renewing her youth; noble edifices were completed nearly as soon as planned. Theodoric is almost a second Romulus — as it is greater to ward off the fall, than to have commenced the foundations of a city.⁶

¹ Var. i. 21. Compare ii. 34.

² Var. iii. 30.

³ Var. iii. 31.

⁴ On the general policy of Theodoric in this respect, “Decet principem cura, quæ ad rempublicam præstat augendam, et verè dignum est regem ædificiis palatia decorare. Absit enim ut ornatui cedamus veterum, qui impares non sumus beatitudini sæculorum.” — Var. i. 6. “Decora facies imperii, testimonium præconiale regnorum.” — Var. vii. 5.

⁵ “Mirabilis sylva mænium, populus statuarum, greges equorum.” — Var. vii. 5: compare vii. 13, 16. These latter are the formularies for the appointment of the Comes Romanus, and the architect of the public works. — Ennod. apud Sirmond. p. 967.

⁶ Theodoric commands marmorarii to be sent from Ravenna to Rome: these were workers in mosaic (we hear nothing of painters or sculptors), which art the barbarians seem to have especially admired. “Qui eximiè

When Theodoric appeared in Rome, the Emperor might seem to revive in greater power and majesty than he had displayed since the days of Theodosius the Great. The largesses of corn were distributed, though to a smaller population, with a liberality which rivalled the earlier days of the Empire.¹

Though himself taking no pleasure in savage or idle amusements, the barbaric king, considering such subjects not quite beneath the care of the sovereign, perhaps not without some politic design to occupy the proud and turbulent metropolis, indulged his subjects with their ancient spectacles, in such pomp as to recall the famous names of Trajan and Valentinian.² The gladiators alone had been suppressed by the influence of Christian opinion; and even if humanity had not won this triumph, Rome had no longer barbarian captives, whom she could devote to the carnage of these mimic wars. But the arena was still open to the combats of wild beasts.³ The pantomimes, of which alone Theodoric speaks with interest, were frequent and splendid.⁴ The chariot races were attended with all the old passionate ardor, and the contending colors were espoused with fanatic zeal by the opposite factions,

divisa conjungunt et venis colludentibus illigata naturalem faciem laudabiliter mentiantur. . . . De arte veniat, quod vincat naturam, discoloria crusta marmorum gratissimâ picturarum varietate texantur." — Var. i. 6.

¹ Anonym. Vales. Compare the formulary for the appointment of the *Præfectus annonæ*.

² Anonym. Vales. The edicts are prefaced with a kind of apology. "Licet inter gloriosas reipublicæ curas . . . pars *minima* videatur, principem de spectaculis loqui, tamen pro amore reipublicæ Romanæ non pigebit has cogitationes intrare." — Var. i. 20.

³ Var. v. 42, where the *feritas spectacula* is reproved. Among Theodoric's buildings is mentioned an amphitheatre at Pavia.

⁴ He calls it a wonderful art, which is often more expressive than language. — Var. i. 20.

on which the Sovereign, though he did not condescend to take a part, looked with indulgence. He allowed the utmost license to the expression of public feeling, and strongly reprovèd the officious or haughty interference of the Senate for attempting to repress this legitimate freedom.¹

But Theodoric, in his religious character, is the chief object of our study. The Christian sovereign must find his proper place in the history of Christianity. The King of the Ostrogoths not merely held together in peace and amity the two races, the Roman and the Barbarian, but even the Orthodox and the Arian reposed throughout his reign, if not in friendly quiet, at least without any violation of the public peace.

It was fortunate, perhaps, that in a state so divided, the Sovereign was of the religion of the few. He escaped the temptation to persecute, since it would have been idle to suppose that he could persuade or compel so strong a majority to embrace his detested opinions. If the wise spirit of toleration had not led him to moderate measures, the good sense of the Sovereign would have compelled him to respect the inveterate tenets of the larger, the more intellectually powerful part of his subjects. Still, though his Byzantine education might have warned Theodoric against the danger, if the Sovereign should plunge too deeply into ecclesiastical affairs, his forbearance was neverthe-

¹ "Mores autem graves in spectaculo quis requirit? Ad circum nesciunt convenire Catones."—i. 27. It is evident that the senate and the people had taken different sides. The senators are reprovèd for introducing their armed slaves among the audience. On the other hand, the complaint of a senator of personal insult was to be carried before the prætorian præfect. There is a remarkable tone of good-humored moderation in all the edicts: compare Var. i. 27, 30 to 33.

less extraordinary, considering the all-searching, all-pervading activity of his administration; and that the religious supremacy had been so long a declared prerogative of that Imperial power, which had now passed into his hands. Imperial edicts since the days of Constantine had been solicited, respected, enforced by the hierarchs so long as they spoke the dominant doctrine; they had become part of the code of the Empire; even when adverse to the prevailing opinion, they had been always supported by one faction at least, and received with awe by the more indifferent multitudes. The doctrine that the clergy, the bishops, or the Roman Pontiff, were the sole legislators of Christianity, was so precarious and undefined, that we still cannot altogether withhold our admiration from the wisdom of Theodoric. The Arianism, indeed, of the Goths had not the fresh ardor or burning zeal of recent proselytism. It was a kind of religious accident, arising out of their first conversion, which happened to take place during the reign of an Arian Emperor, and through Arian missionaries. It had settled into a quiet hereditary faith. There was no peculiar congeniality in its tenets with the Teutonic mind, which was rather disposed to receive what it was taught with implicit faith; and, though no doubt averse to the subtleties of the Greek theology, neither comprehended, nor cared to comprehend, these controversies. It was content to adhere to the original creed,¹ or, possibly, might feel

¹ Salvian is inclined to judge the heresy of the barbarians with charity; perhaps that he might inveigh more fiercely against the vices of the Catholic Romans. "Barbari quippe homines, immo potius humanæ eruditionis expertes, qui nihil omnino sciunt, nisi quod a doctoribus suis audiunt, quod audiunt, sic sequuntur . . . hæretici ergo sunt, sed non scientes." — De Gubernat. Dei, lib. v.

some pride in differing from the abject race, over which it asserted its civil and military superiority.

The serene impartiality of Theodoric's government in religious affairs extorts the praise of the Theodoric's impartiality. most zealous Catholic.¹ He attempted nothing against the Catholic faith. Towards the close of the Gothic monarchy, the royal ambassadors to Belisarius defied their enemies to prove a case in which the Goths had persecuted the Catholics.² Theodoric treated the Pope, the Bishops, and Clergy, with grave respect: in the more distinguished, such as Epiphanius, he ever placed the highest esteem and confidence. We shall behold him showing as much reverence, and even bounty, to the Church of St. Peter, as though he had been a Catholic. The poor who were dependent on that Church were maintained by his liberality.³ The Arian clergy also shared in the tolerant sentiments of their King. Of their position, character, influence; of the churches they built or occupied; of their services, of their processions, of their ceremonies; of any aggression or intrigue on their part; of any collision, which we might have supposed inevitable with the Latin clergy, history, and history entirely written by the Catholics, is totally silent; and that silence is the best testimony, either to their unexampled moderation, as the religious teachers of the few indeed, but those few the conquerors and rulers, or to the wiser policy of the King, which could constrain even

¹ "Nihil contra religionem catholicam tentans," thus writes the anonymous historian, himself a devout Catholic. Ennodius, in praising the religion, forgets the Arianism of Theodoric.—Paneg. p. 971. Anonym. Vales.

² Procop. de bell. Gothic. ii. c. 6.

³ Procop. Hist. Arcan., p. 145, edit. Bonn.

honest religious zeal. Theodoric himself adhered firmly but calmly to his native Arianism; but, all the conversions seem to have been from the religion of the King; even his mother became a Catholic;¹ and some other distinguished persons of the court embraced a different creed without forfeiting the royal favor.² Theodoric was the protector of Church property,³ which he himself increased by large grants.⁴ This property, with some exceptions, was still liable to the common imposts. His wise finance would admit no exemptions, but in gifts he was prodigal to magnificence. The clergy were amenable to the common law of the Empire, and were summoned before the royal courts (the stern law would not be eluded) for all ordinary crimes;⁵ but all ecclesiastical offences were left to the ecclesiastical authorities.⁶ Nor, although the Herulian

¹ "Mater Theodorici, Erivileva dicta, catholica quidem erat quæ in baptismo Eusebia dicta."—Anonym. Vales.

² Note of Valesius to Anonym. at the end of Waguer's Ammianus Marcellinus, page 399. — Var. x. 34 a. 26. These cases belong to the successors of Theodoric. With Gibbon, I reject the story of his beheading a Catholic priest for turning Arian in order to gain his favor! It is most probable that the man had been guilty of some capital crime, and sought to save his life by apostacy. It was not improbably either Theodorus or Count Odoin, who had formed a conspiracy against him in Rome, and was beheaded for his treason: compare Hist. Miscel. p. 612.

³ Var. iv. 17, orders to his general Ibas in Gaul to restore certain lands to the Church of Narbonne.

⁴ "If," he writes to Count Geberic, "in our piety, we bestow lands on the church, we ought to maintain rigidly what she possesses already." — Var. iv. 20.

⁵ Januarius, Bishop of Salona, is sued for a debt, though for lights for the church; a Bishop Peter for the restitution of an inheritance; the Priest Laurence for sacrilegious violation of a tomb in search of treasure; Antony, Bishop of Pola, for the restitution of a house: compare Du Roure, Hist. de Théodoric, i. p. 358.

⁶ See the celebrated privilege accorded to the clergy of Rome by Athalaric. — Var. viii. 24. This, however, was no more than arbitration. "Exceptos a tramite justitiæ non patimur inveniri." — Cassiod. ii. 29. Yet

Odoacer had claimed and exercised the right of confirming the Papal election, did Theodoric interfere in those elections until compelled by the sanguinary tumults which distracted the city. Even then he interfered only as the anxious guardian of the public peace, and declined the arbitration between the conflicting claims, which both parties, hoping for his support, endeavored to force on the reluctant monarch.

The feuds of the Roman clergy, which broke out on the customary occasion of the election of a new Pope, and brought them to the foot of their Arian sovereign, may be traced back to a more remote source.

A. D. 498.
Contested
election for
the Popedom.

Anastasius, as has been seen, during his short pontificate, had deviated into the paths of peace and conciliation. He had endeavored by mildness, and by no important concession (he insisted not on the condemnation of Acacius), to reunite the Churches of Rome and Constantinople. This unwonted policy had apparently formed two parties in the Roman clergy, one inclined to the gentler measures of Anastasius, the other to the sterner and more inexorable tone of his predecessors. Each party elected

Dec. 22.
A. D. 499.

their Pope, the latter the Deacon Symmachus, the former the Archpresbyter Laurentius.¹ The rival Pontiffs were consecrated on the same day, one in the Lateran Church, the other in that of St. Mary. At the head of the party of Laurentius, stood Festus or Faustus Niger, the chief of the Senatorial order. He had been the ambassador of Theodoric at Constantinople, to demand the acknowledgment of

Theodoric, from respect, was unwilling to punish a priest. "Scelus quod nos pro sacerdotali honore relinquimus impunitum." — iv. 18.

¹ Anastasius died Nov. 17. — Muratori, sub ann.

the Goth as King of Italy. He had succeeded in his mission; perhaps had been prevailed upon to attempt the reconciliation of the two Churches, either by persuading the acceptance of the Henoticon by the Roman clergy, or more probably on the terms of compromise approved by Pope Anastasius. The two factions encountered with the fiercest hostility; the clergy, the senate, and the populace were divided; the streets of the Christian city ran with blood, as in the days of republican strife.¹ The conflicting claims of the prelates were brought before the throne of Theodoric. The simple justice of the Goth decided that the bishop who had the greater number of suffrages, and had been first consecrated, had the best right to the throne. Symmachus was acknowledged as Pope: he held a synod at Rome which passed two memorable decrees, one almost in the terms of the old Roman law, severely condemning all ecclesiastical ambition, all canvassing, either for obtaining subscriptions, or administration of oaths, or promises for the papacy during the lifetime of the Pope; ² the other declared the election to be in the majority of the clergy, thus virtually abrogating the law of Odoacer. Laurentius (the rival Pope was present at this synod) subscribed its de-

¹ Each party charged the other with these cruelties. The author of the *Hist. Micell.* asserts that Festus and Probinus, of the party of Laurentius, slew in the midst of Rome the greater part of the clergy and a great number of citizens: a fragment of a writer on the other side (published by the impartial Muratori) ascribes these acts of violence, slaughter, and pillage, with many other vices, to Symmachus. Compare *Annal. d' Ital.* sub ann. 493.

² It was the language of the law *de Ambitu*, applied to ecclesiastical distinctions. It is enacted "*propter frequentes ambitus quorundam, et ecclesiæ puritatem, vel populi collisionem, quæ molesta et iniqua incompetentem episcopatum desiderantium generavit aviditas.*" — Labbe, *Concil.*, p. 1313.

crees,¹ and returned to the more peaceful, perhaps to a wise man, the more enviable bishopric of Nocera.

During this interval of peace, Theodoric for the first time visited the imperial city. He was met by Pope Symmachus at the head of his clergy, by the Senate, which still numbered some few old and famous names, Anicii, Albini, Marcelli, and by the whole people, who crowded with demonstrations of the utmost joy around their barbarian sovereign. Catholic and Arian, Goth and Roman, mingled their acclamations. Theodoric performed his devotions in St. Peter's with the fervor of a Catholic. In the Senate he swore to maintain all the imperial laws, the rights and privileges of the Roman people. He celebrated the Circensian games, in commemoration of all his triumphs, with the utmost magnificence; ordered a distribution of one hundred and twenty bushels of corn annually to the poor, and set apart two hundred pounds of gold for the restoration of the imperial palace. The Bishop Fulgentius, witness of the splendor of Theodoric's reception, breaks out into these rapturous words: "If such be the magnificence of earth, what must be that of the heavenly Jerusalem!"² Theodoric remained in Rome six months, and then returned to Ravenna.

During all this period, and the three or four following years, the faction of Laurentius were watching their opportunity to renew the strife.³

Charges
against

Symmachus.

¹ Baronius sub ann. Muratori has some doubts.

² Anonym. Vales. Vita B. Fulgentii.

³ There are two accounts of these transactions, — one that of Anastasius Bibliothecarius, or the anonymous papal biographer, favorable to Symmachus; the other the anonymous Veronensis, published by Muratori. I have endeavored to harmonize them. Both agree that some years elapsed between the accession of Symmachus and this new contest.

Fearful charges began to be rumored against Symmachus, no less than adultery,¹ and the alienation of the property of the see. Faustus, his implacable adversary, with the Consul Probinus and great part of the Senate, supported these criminations. The accusation was brought before the judgment-seat of Theodoric, supported by certain Roman females of rank, who had been suborned, it was said, by the enemies of Symmachus. Symmachus was summoned to Ravenna, and confined in Rimini. But finding the prejudices in Ravenna darkening against him, he ^{Tumults in Rome.} escaped and returned to Rome. Laurentius had also secretly entered the capital. The sanguinary tumults between the two factions broke out with greater fury; priests were sacrilegiously slain, monasteries fired, and even sacred virgins treated with the utmost indignity. The Senate petitioned the King to send a ^{A.D. 503.} visitor to judge the cause of the Pontiff. A royal commission was issued to Peter, Bishop of Altino. But instead of a calm mediator between the conflicting parties, or an equitable judge, the visitor threw himself into the party of Laurentius.² The possessions of the Church were, in part at least, seized and withholden from Symmachus; he was commanded to give up the slaves of his household that they might be examined,³ it should seem, by torture according to the ancient usage.⁴

¹ Anonym. Veron. — confirmed by Ennodius, p. 1366.

² Ennod. Apologet. pro Synod., p. 987.

³ This corresponded with the two heads of accusation. The former provided against the alleged alienation of the church property, the latter referred to that of adultery.

⁴ This is a remarkable fact, in the first place, showing that slaves formed the household of the Pope, and that, by law, they were yet liable to torture. This seems clear from the words of Ennodius, "Sed, credo, replicabitis:

Theodoric, still declining the jurisdiction over these ecclesiastical offences, summoned a synod of Italian prelates to meet at Rome. The synod held two successive sessions, and throughout their proceedings may be traced their consciousness of their embarrassing position, which is increased as the reports of these proceedings have passed through later writers.¹ They were assembled under the authority of a layman, an heretical sovereign, too powerful to be disobeyed, and acting with such cautious dignity, justice, and impartiality as to command respect. They were assembled to judge the supreme Pontiff, the Metropolitan of the west, the asserted, and by most acknowledged, head of Christendom. Symmachus himself had the prudence to express his concurrence in the convocation of this synod. At the first session he set forth to attend the Council. He was attacked by the adverse party, showers of stones fell around him; many presbyters and others of his followers were severely wounded; the Pontiff himself only escaped under the protection of the Gothic guard. The final, named the Palmary, synod was held in some edifice or hall in the palace called by that name; of this assembly the accounts are some-

veritatem quam sponte prolata in illis vox habere non poterat, hanc diversis cruciatibus e latebris suis religiosus tortor exegerat, ut dum pœnis corpora solverentur, quæ gesta fuisse noverat anima non celaret." Ennodius is so obscure and figurative that he may seem to say, in the next sentence, that this proceeding was illegal, perhaps contrary to the canons. He appears to consider it most contumelious that ecclesiastics should be judged on servile evidence.

¹ The whole question of the number and dates of the synods held at this time is inextricably obscure. I chiefly follow Muratori. The *synodus palmaris* is usually considered the fourth. One, in all probability two, were held by Symmachus before this new strife. The fourth was apparently a continuation of the third, but held in a different place — unless the third was one held by Peter of Altino.

what more full and distinct. Throughout appears the manifest struggle in the ecclesiastical senate between the duty of submitting to the King, who earnestly ^{Decree of the Palmary Synod.} urges them to restore peace to Rome and to Italy, and the reluctance to assume jurisdiction over the Bishop of Rome. Some expressions intimate that already the Bishop of Rome was held to be exempt from all human authority, and could be judged by God alone. If the Pope is called in question the whole episcopacy of the Church is shaken to its foundation.¹

Symmachus, however, had the wisdom to suppress all jealousy of a Council² whose authority alone could completely clear him of these formidable accusations, and which he probably knew to be favorably impressed with his innocence. With the full authority of a synod of one hundred and twenty bishops he resumed the pontifical throne, without having compromised his dignity by thus condescending to their jurisdiction. In the wording of the sentence the Council claims at once the authority of the Holy Ghost, yet confines the justification of Pope Symmachus to immunity and freedom from censure before men;³ it leaves to the secret coun-

¹ "In sacerdotibus cæteris potest si quid forte nutaverit, reformari: at si papa urbis vocatur in dubium, episcopatus videbitur, non jam episcopus, vacillare." — Avit. ad Senat. apud Labbe, p. 1365. Avitus uses this argument to the senators of Rome, "Nec minus diligatis in ecclesiâ nostrâ sedem Petri, quam in civitate apicem mundi;" but Avitus acknowledges all priests, even the Pope, to be amenable to secular tribunals, of course for secular offences, "quia sicut subditos nos esse terrenis potestatibus jubet arbiter cœli; staturos nos ante reges et principes in *quacunq̄ accusatione* prædicens; ita non facile datur intelligi, qua vel ratione, vel lege ab inferioribus (inferior in ecclesiastical order) eminentior judicetur."

² "Judicia et iste voluit, amavit, attraxit, ingressus est; et quod posset fidei corda doloris justî aculeis excitare, venerando concilio etiam contra se si mereretur, indulsit." — Ennod., p. 981.

³ "Quantum ad homines respicit (quia totum causis obsidentibus superius designitis, constat arbitrio divino fuisse dimissum) sit immunis et

sel of God the ultimate decision which they might not presume to pronounce;¹ nevertheless, with inconsistency, which it is difficult to understand, they seem to grant permission to the Pope to offer the divine mysteries to the Christian people in all the churches of his jurisdiction.²

Content with having restored peace to the Roman Affairs of the see, Theodoric kept aloof from the religious East. dissensions which brooded in deepening darkness over the east. The Gothic king was devoting himself, dare we not say, to the more Christian office of maintaining the peace, securing the welfare, promoting the civilization, lightening the financial burdens of his people,³ in exercising for the benefit of Italy, the liber, et Christianæ plebi sine aliquâ de objectis oblatione, in omnibus ecclesiis suis, ad jus sedis suæ pertinentibus, tradat divina mysteria."—Labbe, p. 1325.

¹ Considering the horror in which the crime of adultery was held in an ecclesiastic, we can scarcely suppose, either that the severe Theodoric would not have driven him from his presence, or that an assemblage of prelates would have attempted to shield a pontiff, of precarious and disputed title, without full and conclusive evidence of his guiltlessness.

² The decisions of this synod were indeed impeached by the enemies of Symmachus, and Ennodius found it necessary to vindicate them in an apology, as he thought, eloquent, and therefore in parts altogether unintelligible, at least so as to give but obscure glimpses of the facts. He would seem, perhaps only figuratively, to retort the charge of adultery against the partisans of Laurentius.—p. 992. At the close, Ennodius personifies Rome, who has still some compunctious feelings for the inevitable damnation of all her older heroes. "Quæ Curios, Torquatos, Camillos, quos Ecclesia non regeneravit, et reliquos nisi, plurimæ prolis infœcunda mater, ad Tartarum, dum exhaustis emarcui male fœta visceribus; quia Fabios servata patria non redemit, Decius multo sudore gloria parta nil præstitit profligata est operum sine fide innocentia: criminosis junctus est, æqui observantissimus Scipio."—p. 993, apud Sirmond.

³ "Sensimus auctas illationes, vos addita tributa nescitis. Ita utcumque sub admiratione perfectum est, ut et fiscus crescebat, et privata utilitas nulla damna perferret."—Var. ii. 16. The panegyric of Ennodius must be read with that reserve which these *eloquent* adulations suggest; but, on the other hand, it must be remembered that Ennodius was a Catholic and a bishop.

virtues of wisdom, justice, and humanity. His foreign wars in Pannonia, with a horde of the Bulgarian race, in Gaul, in defence of his kindred the Visigoths against the ambitious Franks, brought fame to the king, without disturbing the repose, or interrupting the progress of improvement in Italy. Far different was the state of the East; the long religious quarrel in which the Emperor Anastasius had been engaged, had shaken its throne to the base, it needed only a successful insurrection to degrade it to still lower humiliation.

The Pope Symmachus watched no doubt with profound interest the holy war which had now broken out in the East. The polemic controversies had become the causes or pretexts of revolt and battles. The formidable Scythian Vitalianus (with whom Theodoric had some political connection on account of the hostilities in which he had been involved on the Dacian frontier with the Eastern empire) had raised the standard of rebellion and of orthodoxy against the aged Anastasius. Symmachus did not live to witness the sad latter years of the Emperor Anastasius; the revolt of Vitalianus; the hollow peace on the hard conditions of religious submission; the full acceptance of the council of Chalcedon, the restoration of the exiled Catholic Bishops, and the summoning an Œcumenic Council at Heraclea. His successor Hormisdas¹ reaped the fruits of the humiliation of the eastern Emperor, and became, though at first the vassal, at last the ^{Pope Hormisdas.} humble subject of the Arian Theodoric, the dictator of the religion of the world. Anastasius in his helpless state sought the mediation not of the civil but of the religious sovereign of Italy. He might justly fear

¹ Hormisdas, Pope from July, 514, to Aug. 6, 523.

A. D. 509. Theodoric, himself had once some years before entered into suspicious alliance with Clovis the Frank, he had meditated or threatened a descent on the coast of Italy. The Emperor addressed a letter to Hormisdas, the fame of whose mild disposition tempted him to renew a correspondence broken off by the harshness of former Popes. But Hormisdas, while he warmly approved the Emperor's disposition to peace and unity, declined this flattery at the expense of his predecessors. Yet, on the whole, the language of the Pope's reply was moderate, neither dissembling nor asserting in too haughty terms the pretensions of his See. The proposed Council of Heraclea came to nothing; a Council in the East, under present circumstances, suited the policy neither of the Pope, nor of the Emperor.¹

July 8, 515. Four ambassadors, the Bishops Ennodius and Fortunatus, the Presbyter Venantius, with Vitalis a Papal Embassy to Constantinople. deacon, set forth in the name of Pope Hormisdas to Constantinople. Their instructions are extant, a remarkable manual of ecclesiastical diplomacy in a nice and difficult affair. In the questionable and divided state of the Eastern clergy, especially of Constantinople, as to orthodoxy, the ambassadors were to receive their personal advances with decent courtesy, lest the episcopal character should be lowered in the estimation of the laity; but to avoid all intimate intercourse with men, who might at least be heretics; to receive no presents, not even provisions, only means of conveyance; to incur no obligations, and to decline all invitations to feasts, until they could all

¹ The story in Theophanes as to the perfidy of Anastasius in these proceedings, is altogether inconsistent with the whole course of events, as appears from existing documents.

meet together at the great feast of the Holy Eucharist. In Constantinople they were to go at once to the lodgings provided by the Emperor, but to avoid all intercourse with their own partisans, till they had presented their credentials to the Emperor.¹ Besides these credentials they were armed with letters to Vitalianus, letters however so cautiously worded, that they might acknowledge the possession of them, and though steadily declining to surrender them to the Emperor, might permit them to be read to Vitalianus in the presence of an imperial commissioner. Their instructions, how they were to fix the wavering Emperor, and extort concession after concession, are marked with the same subtle and dexterous policy. They were to demand, I., his unequivocal assent to the Council of Chalcedon, and to the letters of Pope Leo. If he yielded this point, they were to express their gratitude and kiss his breast, and then, II., to require him to demand the same assent from all the clergy of the East. If he should assert the general orthodoxy of the clergy, and their disposition to quiet submission, if affairs had not been thrown into confusion by certain unadvised letters of Pope Symmachus, they were to declare that those letters, now in their hands, contained only general exhortations to accept the Council of Chalcedon. They were to press this point with prayers and tears, to remind the Emperor of God, and of the day of judgment. Should the Emperor reply, "What would you have?"

¹ There was a preliminary caution that, as it was customary in Constantinople for all persons admitted to the emperor on ecclesiastical business to be presented by the bishop, they were to omit, if possible, receiving this courtesy from Timotheus, and if he should officiously thrust himself in the way, and enforce the right of presentation, to declare that they were directly accredited to the emperor alone.

I receive the Council of Chalcedon, and the letters of Leo:" they were to elude any assent to this protest, unless he would issue his imperial letters *compelling* a general union with the Church of Rome. Should the Emperor say, "Will you then receive the Bishop of Constantinople into communion?" Here was the nicest point of all, to avoid the recognition of either of the contending prelates, and so to bring the absolute nomination of the Bishop of Constantinople under the cognizance of the proposed Council, over which Council was to preside the representative of Rome. The instructions even anticipate a dangerous objection, which might occur to Anastasius, that the rival prelate, Macedonius, was a notorious heretic. This, they were to rejoin, is a question to be calmly considered when the Church is restored to unity. "What," should the Emperor say, "is my city to be without a bishop?" "The canons," they are to answer, "provide remedies for such a difficulty." But these inexorable terms were not all. Anastasius was not only to be compelled to be a persecutor. Besides the acceptance of the Council of Chalcedon, and the Leonine letters by the Emperor, and the compulsory enforcement of obedience from the clergy, were demanded from the Emperor, as to be ratified by the Council, III. The public anathema of Nestorius, Eutyches, Dioscorus, and also of their followers, (the maintainers of the Henoticon,) Timotheus Ælurus, Peter of Alexandria, Acacius, formerly Bishop of Constantinople, and Peter of Antioch. IV. The immediate recall from exile of all ecclesiastics in communion with Rome, the causes of their respective banishments to be examined by the Apostolic See. V. The judgment of those accused of persecuting the Catholics

to be in like manner submitted to the court of Rome. On the full acceptance of these terms, Hormisdas consented to honor the future Council with his personal presence, not to deliberate but to ratify his own solemn determinations.

But Anastasius was not reduced so low as to submit to these debasing conditions. The condemnation of Acacius was unpopular at Constantinople, the memory of the Bishop dear and sacred to a large party. Anastasius chose this point of resistance. He accepted on his own part the Council of Chalcedon, but why should the living be kept excommunicated from the Church on account of the dead? The terms of Hormisdas could not be enforced without much bloodshed.¹ A.D. 507. The embassy returned to Rome. Anastasius continued to temporize. An imperial embassy appeared in Rome, accredited to the Senate as well as to the Pope. It entreated the intervention of that venerable body with the glorious Theodoric to unite the afflicted Christian Church and Empire. Hormisdas treated these lay ambassadors, who presumed to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs, with supercilious contempt. The churches of Illyria, of which the opinions had as yet hung in doubt, had now given their unqualified adhesion to Hormisdas and the Council of Chalcedon. Far from retracting, he rose in his demands; he condescended indeed to send a second legation, Ennodius, Bishop of Pavia, and Peregrinus, Bishop of Misenum, to Constantinople. His answer by them was a vehement and implacable invective against the memory of Acacius.² That Bish-

¹ "Grave esse clementia nostra judicat de ecclesiâ venerabili propter mortuos vivos expelli, nec sine multâ effusione sanguinis scimus posse ea. quæ super hoc scribitis, ordinari." — *Epist. Anastas. Labbe*, p. 1432.

² *Epistola Hormisdæ apud Labbe*.

op's communion with the followers of Dioscorus and of Eutyches infected him with their most heinous guilt. All who hated those heretics, must hate Acacius. The crime of Acacius was darker than that of the original authors of the heresy. The condemnation of Acacius, the unpardonable Acacius — Acacius who had claimed equality with the Pope — was now the only obstacle to the peace between Eastern and Western Christendom, a consummation to which the West, even the remotest Gaul (so wrote Hormisdas, alluding to the Catholic Franks) looked forward with eager interest. Anastasius was now more secure upon his throne, his formidable subject, Vitalianus, had lost his power. To his honor, he would not abandon even the memory of Acacius, who had been guilty only of firmly carrying out the Emperor's scheme of toleration; he broke off all further communication with the merciless Prelate. "We may submit to insult, we may endure that our decrees be annulled, but we will not be commanded.¹ Hormisdas must await the accession of a new Emperor Justin, before the Churches of Rome and Byzantium are reunited by the sacrifice of him, who besides his communion with Eutychians, had dared to equal himself with the successor of St. Peter."

But with the age and decay of Anastasius the strength of the Chalcedonian party increased rapidly. Timotheus, the Bishop of Constantinople, gave hopes at least, that he would secure himself by timely concession. Hormisdas addressed encouraging letters to the Catholic bishops, and though Anastasius ventured to punish with severity certain monks who strove to stir up rebellion, he dared not to resent this treasonable

¹ Epist. Anastas. Labbe, p. 1460.

correspondence with his subjects. The monks in Syria, of that party, appealed from the Emperor, whom they accused of contemptuously rejecting their humble supplications for protection and redress against their rivals, charged with the massacre of their brethren in the church, to the representative of St. Peter and St. Paul.¹

The strife ended with the death, if we are to believe Baronius, the damnation of Anastasius. The death of an old man, at least of eighty-one, more likely eighty-eight years of age, was ascribed to the visible vengeance of God. There was a terrible tempest, and that tempest transported away the affrighted soul of the Emperor, or struck him dead by its lightning. His death was revealed to a saint at a great distance, who communicated the awful fact to three of his brethren, intimating at the same time that he himself was summoned to appear before the tribunal of God within ten days, to bear witness against the Emperor.² This Elias departed before the end of ten days on his charitable errand, so necessary to enlighten Omniscience as to the deeds of a mortal man. So deeply had the passion of hatred, offering itself to the heart in the garb of religious zeal, infected the Christian mind, that Cardinal Baronius, reviving the inexorable resentment which had slept for centuries, calls upon the Church to sing a hymn of rejoicing over this new Pharaoh, this Emperor, thus, for his resistance to the Pope, judged, damned, and thrust down into hell.

Justin, a rude unlettered Dacian peasant, seized the throne of Constantinople; and there was an instan-

¹ *Relatio Archimandrit. et Monach. ii. Syriæ apud Labbe, 1461*

² *Baronius, sub ann. 518, with his authorities.*

Accession of Justin.
July 9, 518. taneous religious revolution in the Byzantine court and city, and throughout the East. Justin, though ignorant, was known to be of unbending orthodoxy. Only six days after his proclamation, the July 15. Emperor, with his wife Lupicina, who had been his slave and concubine, and who took the more decorous name of Euphemia, entered the great church. The populace broke out in acclamations, "Long life to the new Constantine and the new Helena." Their clamors ceased not with these loyal expressions: "Away with the Manicheans, proclaim the Council of Chalcedon." They demanded the degradation of Severus of Antioch, immediate reconciliation with Rome, and even that the bones of the Manicheans (the Emperor Anastasius and his party) should be torn up from their sepulchres. John of Cappadocia, the Patriarch of Constantinople, a man of servile mind, though unmeasured ambition, had acquiesced without remonstrance in all the measures of Anastasius. He now ascended the pulpit, declared his adhesion to the four great Councils, especially that of Chalcedon. The populace summoned him to utter his anathema against Severus; the Prelate obeyed. The next day was celebrated a festival in honor of the Council of Chalcedon. John of Cappadocia hastily assembled a Council of forty bishops, which confirmed all the demands of the rabble; Justin ratified their decrees by an imperial edict, commanding the recall of all the exiled bishops, and the expulsion of those who had usurped their sees. A second edict disqualified all heretics from holding civil or military office. The whole East followed the example of the capital, and became orthodox with the orthodox Emperor. Hera-

clea, Nicea, Nicomedia, Gangra, Jerusalem, Ptolemais, Tyre, restored the Chalcedonian bishops. ^{Close of the} Antioch shook off the yoke of Severus. ^{schism} Thessalonica and Alexandria alone made resistance, but were awed into submission. The death of the Eunuch Amantius, who had aspired to dispose of the empire, which he could not usurp himself; by whose gold, intrusted to him for other purposes, Justin had bought the crown; had been demanded as a sacrifice by the populace, and was readily conceded by Justin, his treason being aggravated by his notorious Manicheism. Theocritus, whom he had intended to raise to the empire, shared his unpopularity and his doom. But Vitalianus, the pillar of orthodoxy, met no better fate; he was treacherously invited to Constantinople, promoted to the highest dignity, and in the seventh month of his consulate assassinated by the agents of Justinian, the Emperor's nephew, now clearing the way for his own accession to the throne. Even before these necessary precautions for the security of his reign, the zealous Emperor had opened negotiations with Rome.¹ All opposition shrunk away. Hormisdas had the satisfaction not merely of compelling, by the aid of the Emperor, the whole East to accept his theologic doctrines, but his anathemas also of the living and of the dead. At the demand of his legates, the names of Acacius, and all who communicated with him, those of the Emperors Zeno and Anastasius, were erased from the diptychs. John the Patriarch vainly struggled to save the blameless names of Euphemius and Macedonius from the same ignominy: they were included with the rest (they were severely orthodox, but

¹ The first letter of Justin was dated August 1; the second, September 7.

they had been guilty of acknowledging Acacius and his successor as legitimate patriarchs);¹ yet, nevertheless, the East has continued to reverence them as of undoubted orthodoxy. John however contrived a happy expedient to elude the direct recognition of the supremacy of Rome, by declaring that the Churches of old and new Rome were one. He assumed, by the March 23, A.D. 519. permission of Justin, the yet pregnant title of œcumenic Patriarch. So closed the schism which had lasted for thirty-five years. Latin and Greek Christianity held again one creed—East and West were at peace.

Theodoric had stood aloof, whether in contemptuous Theodoric at the height of prosperity. indifference, or, as he might suppose, intent on nobler objects, from all these intrigues, embassies, and negotiations. He left his subject, the Bishop of Rome, to assert, as he might, his ecclesiastical superiority over Constantinople; to league with the rebellious subjects of Byzantium against the eastern Emperor; to treat with Justin almost as an independent sovereign. Theodoric was now at the height of his fame and power, his kingdom of its peace and felicity. His dominion extended without rival, without opposition, from the Alps to Calabria. His sovereignty extended over the ancient provinces of Noricum and Pannonia, and some large adjacent, if not distinctly bounded territories; over the whole south of France, and even parts of Spain. But not all the victories, not all the virtues, not the wisdom, justice, and moderation of Theodoric, nor the prosperity of Italy under his rule, could secure his repose, or enable him to close his reign without strife, injustice, persecution, and blood-

¹ Compare Walch, vii. p. 109.

shed. His firm character might overawe the elements of civil dissension, the jealousy of the two races which formed his subjects, and the feeble impatience of Rome under the barbarian sway. It was religious strife which broke up the quiet of his life and reign, and perhaps, by imbittering his temper in the decline of his days, by awakening suspicions not altogether groundless, and fears not without warrant, led to the crimes which have so deeply sullied his memory, the death of Boethius and of Symmachus. Notwithstanding the natural repugnance of the Romans to a foreign sway, and the secret dissatisfaction with which the Emperor of the East must have beheld the West altogether severed from the Roman Empire, yet Theodoric the Goth might have lived and ruled, and transmitted his sceptre in peace to his posterity; but an orthodox empire would not repose in unreluctant submission under an Arian. It was the unity of the Church, upon the accession of Justin, which endangered his government. Heresy, at the head of a prosperous kingdom, and a powerful fleet and army in the West, had commanded respect, so long as Eutychianism, or the no less odious compulsory toleration of the Henoticon, sate on the throne of Constantinople. Catholicism had concentrated all its hatred on the Manicheans, as they were called, who refused the Council of Chalcedon; but no sooner were those dissensions healed, than it began to resent, to look with holy jealousy upon, and to burn with fiery zeal against the older heterodoxy; it would no longer brook the equality of the detested Arians.

The first aggression was confined to the East. Justin in a terrible edict commanded all Mani- A. D. 523

cheans to leave the empire on pain of death ; all other heretics, who were ranked with pagans and Jews, were incapacitated for all civil and military offices, excepting the Goths, and other foreign soldiers in the service of the empire.¹ The exception might seem intended to lull the jealousy of Theodoric ; yet the Arians of the East could not but see that this, hard measure as it was, was only the beginning of the persecution ; they looked to the Sovereign of Italy for protection, for the continued possession of that tacit exemption which they had long enjoyed, from the intolerant rigor in force against other heretics. It was precisely at this juncture that rumors were spread abroad of dangerous speeches—at least concerning their independence of the Gothic yoke, of the assertion of the liberties of Rome—having been ventured in the capital. Vague intelligence reached Ravenna, of an actual and widespread conspiracy which involved the whole Senate ;

Rumors of conspiracies. but of which Albinus, the most distinguished of the Roman patricians, was the head. Indignation, not without apprehension, at this sudden, and, as it appeared, simultaneous movement of hostility, seized the soul of Theodoric. The whole circumstances of his position demand careful consideration. Nothing could be more unprovoked than the religious measures of Constantinople, as far as they menaced the West, or assailed the kindred of Theodoric in the East or even those who held the same faith. His equity to his Catholic and Arian subjects was unimpeachable ; to the Pope he had always shown respectful deference ; he had taken no advantage of the contention for the Pontificate to promote his own

¹ Theophanes. Cedrenus in loc.

tenets. Even as late as this very year, he ^{A. D. 523.} had bestowed on the Church of St. Peter two ^{Of Theodoric's} magnificent chandeliers of solid silver. ^{reign 31.} But the Catholics resented, no doubt, the unshaken justice with which Theodoric had protected the Jews.¹ At Rome, at Milan, and at Genoa the Jews had been ^{The Jews.} attacked by the irrepressible hostility of the Catholics: their synagogues had been burned or destroyed, or their property unjustly seized. Theodoric compelled the restoration of the synagogues at the public expense. The Catholics had taken the pretext of the demolition of a small chapel dedicated to St. Stephen at Verona, probably for the fortification or embellishment of the city, as another indication of aggression on the part of Theodoric.² These were slight but significant signs of the growing hostility. Nor was it in the East alone that Catholicism menaced the life of Arianism. The Council of Epaona, in Burgundian Gaul, at which bishops from the territories of Theodoric had met, had passed severe canons closing the churches of the Arians.

Though Clovis was now dead, orthodoxy was still the battle-cry of the Franks; in all the Gothic kingdoms the government might dread the prayers, if not the more active interference of the Catholic clergy on the side of their enemies.

It was in connection with the bad feeling, which caused and was no doubt aggravated by the demolition of the chapel in Verona, that Theodoric took the strong measure of totally disarming the Roman popu-

¹ Hist. of the Jews, v. iii. p. 115.

² Gibbon supposes that Theodoric may have been anathematized from the pulpit of that chapel.

lation. He prohibited them from bearing any offensive weapons ; the only instrument permitted was a small knife, for the common purposes of life.

No less doubtful and menacing was the aspect of civil affairs. The heir of Theodoric was a State of Theodoric's family. child. His gallant son-in-law Eutharis, the hopeful successor to his valor, his wisdom, as well as his religious opinions, was now dead. Notwithstanding all her virtues and her accomplishments, Amalasintha, his only daughter, as a female could hardly cope with the difficulties of the times, sole guardian of a boy-king. Theodoric knew that the Emperor of the East in his pride, still considered the barbarian king as his vassal, as originally holding Italy by his grant, and so, no doubt, claimed the power of revoking that grant. The Goths might be safe from hostile aggression, so long as the aged Justin, who was sixty-eight years old, at his accession, occupied the throne : but he could not be ignorant of the character, the unmeasured and unscrupulous ambition, the unbending orthodoxy of Justinian. Theodoric's prophetic sagacity might well anticipate the events which in a few years would not merely endanger, but extinguish the Italian kingdom of the Goths.

It was at this juncture, when the Emperor of the East might be at least suspected of designs, if he had not committed overt acts, in order to recover and reunite the severed empire ; when he might seem to be enlisting all the religious and all the Roman sympathies of Theodoric's subjects in a kind of initiatory treason, in a deep, if yet silent and inactive dissatisfaction, that these dark rumors began to spread of secret intelligence between the senate of Rome and the East.

Men, it is asserted by Boethius himself, of infamous character, yet who had held, and who afterwards held high offices of trust and honor, accused Albinus, the chief of the Senate, of disloyal correspondence with Constantinople.

Albinus was the friend of Boethius. Boethius the senator, the patrician, the descendant and Boethius. head of the noble Anician family, who connected himself with the old republic by the name of Manlius; the philosopher, the theologian, the consummate master of all the arts and sciences known at that period—had been raised to the highest civil honors; not only had he himself received the ensigns of the Consulate, but the father had seen his two sons in the same year raised to that honor, which still maintained its traditionary grandeur in the Roman mind. On the day of their inauguration, Boethius, too, pronounced a panegyric on his munificent Gothic sovereign, and displayed his own magnificence by distributing a noble largess to the people at the games. In his public capacity Boethius had declared himself the protector of the Romans against the oppressions of Theodoric's ministers. He had repressed the extortions of Cunegast, the more violent tyranny of Treguella, the chamberlain of Theodoric's household—(these names betray their Gothic origin). By a dangerous exercise of his authority he had rescued many unfortunate persons from the rapacity of the barbarians; he had saved the fortunes of many other provincials from private exaction, and from unjust and inordinate taxation. He had opposed the Prætorian Præfect in certain measures, by which a famine in Campania would have been greatly aggravated; on this act he had received the public approba

tion of the King. He had plucked Paullinus, a man of senatorial rank, from the very jaws of those hounds of the palace, who had already in hope devoured his confiscated estate. Such, according to Boethius himself, were his merits towards his own countrymen, the causes of the hostility towards him among the Gothic courtiers of Theodoric. And even under the rigid equity of Theodoric, such abuses might be almost inevitable in that form of society. Boethius hastened to Verona to confront the accuser Cyprianus, the great referendary, when he heard the accusation of treason against Albinus,¹ and in the face of the Emperor declared, "If Albinus is criminal, I and the whole Senate are equally guilty." The generous boldness of Boethius awoke no admiration or sympathy in the heart of Theodoric. Instead of saving his friend, Boethius was involved in his ruin. Three persons, one of whom Basilius (according to Boethius) had been dismissed ignominiously from the royal service, and whom poverty drove to any crime; two others, Opilio and Gaudentius, who had been exiled, had taken refuge in the sanctuary of a church, and had been threatened, if they should not leave Ravenna in a certain number of days, with branding in the forehead, were admitted as witnesses against Boethius. He was accused of more than hoping for the freedom of Rome. His signature, forged as he declared, was shown at the foot of an address, inviting the Emperor of the East to reconquer Italy.² Boethius was refused permission to examine

Charges
against
Albinus.

¹ Gibbon says that Albinus was only accused of *hoping* the liberty of Rome. The Anonym. Vales. declares the charge to have been of treasonable correspondence with the East.

² The specific charges against Boethius were, that he had endeavored to maintain inviolate the authority of the senate; that he had prevented an

the informers. He admits the latent, but glorious treason of his heart. "Had there been any hopes of liberty, I should have freely indulged them. Had I known of a conspiracy against the King, I should have answered in the words of a noble Roman to the frantic Caligula, you would not have known it from me." The King, now, in the words of Boethius, eager to involve the whole Senate in one common ruin,¹ condemned Boethius to imprisonment. He was incarcerated in Calvenzano, a castle between Milan and Pavia.²

In the mean time the religious affairs of the East became more threatening to the kinsmen, and to those who held the same religious creed with Theodoric. The correspondence between the monarchs had produced no effect. Theodoric had written in these words to Justin: — "To pretend to a dominion over the conscience, is to usurp the prerogative of God; by the nature of things the power of sovereigns is confined to political government; they have no right of punishment but over those who disturb the public peace;³ the most dangerous heresy is that of a sovereign who separates himself from part of his subjects, because they believe not according to his belief." Golden words! but mistimed above twelve hundred years.

informer from forwarding certain documents inculcating the senate to the king; that he had been privy and assenting to an address from the senate to the Emperor of the East.

¹ *Avidus communis exitii.*

² The narrative of these events is perplexed by making, as many writers (following the Anonym. Vales.) have done, the death of Boethius immediately consequent upon his imprisonment. But he had time during that imprisonment to write the *De Consolat. Philosophiæ.*

³ *Cassiod. ii. 6, iii. 28.*

Justin coolly answered, that he pretended to no authority over men's consciences, but it was his prerogative to intrust the public offices to those in whom he had confidence; and public order demanding uniformity of worship, he had full right to command the churches to be open to those alone who should conform to the religion of the state. The Arians of the East were thus stripped of all offices of honor or emolument, were not only expelled from the Catholic churches, but their own were closed against them, and they were exposed to all the insults, vexations, and persecutions of their adversaries, who were not likely to enjoy their triumph with moderation, or to repress their conscientiously intolerant zeal. Great numbers who held but loosely to their faith, conformed to the state religion; the more sincere appealed in the strongest terms to the protection of Theodoric. The King of Italy at first maintained something of his usual calm moderation; he declined all retaliation, to which he had been incessantly urged, on the orthodox of the West. He determined on an embassy to Constantinople to enforce upon the Eastern Emperor the wisdom of mutual toleration, the ambassador whom he selected for this mission of peace was the Pope himself, not the vigorous Hormisdas, but John the Ist. who had quietly succeeded to the See of Rome on the death of that Prelate.¹ This extraordinary measure shows either an overweening reliance in Theodoric on his own power, or a confidence magnanimous, but equally unaccountable, a confidence bordering on simplicity, that for his own uninterrupted exercise of justice, humanity, and moderation he had a

Theodoric
sends Pope
John to Con-
stantinople.

¹ John, Pope, August 13, A.D. 523.

right to expect the return of fidelity and gratitude. Could he fondly suppose that the loyalty of the Pope would be proof against the blandishments of the Eastern court, that the Bishop of Rome would be zealous in a cause so directly at issue with his own principles? The Pope summoned to Ravenna, was instructed to demand of Justin the reopening of their churches to the Arians, perfect toleration, and the restoration to their former faith of those who on compulsion had conformed to the Catholic religion.¹ To the Pope's remonstrances and attempts to limit his mediatorial office, to points less unsuited to his character, Theodoric angrily replied, by commanding the envoys instantly to embark on the vessels which were ready for the voyage.² The Pope, attended by five other bishops and four senators, set forth on a mission of which it was the ostensible object to obtain indulgence for heretics, heretics under the ban of his Church, heretics looked upon with the most profound detestation.

Hitherto the Pope had remained in his unmoved and stately dignity within his own city. Excepting in the case of the exiled Liberius, he had hardly ventured further than the court of Ravenna, or on such a service as that of Leo to the camp of Attila. The Pope had not even attended any of the great Councils. Aware, as it might almost seem, that much of the awe which attached to his office, arose from the seat of his authority, he had but rarely departed from the chair of St. Peter; and but recently Hormisdas had demanded the unconditional submission of the Emperor of Constanti-

¹ This seems the meaning of the sentence in the Anonym. Vales. "ut reconciliatos hæreticos in catholicâ restituat religione." — p. 626.

² Their names in the Anonym. Vales.

noble to his decrees, as the price of his promised condescension to appear at a Council in that city.

The Pope was received in Constantinople with the most flattering honors, as though he had been St. Peter himself. The whole city, with the Emperor at its head, came forth to meet him with tapers and torches, as far as ten miles beyond the gates. The Emperor knelt at his feet and implored his benediction. On Easter day he performed the service in the great Church, Epiphanius the Bishop ceding the first place to the more holy stranger. It was hinted in the West that the Pope had placed the crown on the head of Justin. But of the course and the success of his negotiations all is utterly confused and contradictory. By one account, now abandoned as a later forgery, he boldly confirmed the Emperor in the rejection of all concessions, and himself consecrated all the Arian Churches for Catholic worship.¹ By another, he was so far faithful to his mission, as to obtain liberty of worship, and the restitution of their Churches to the Arians. The Emperor refused only the restoration of those Arians who had embraced the Catholic faith.² All that is certainly known is, that John the Pope on his return was received as a traitor by Theodoric, thrown into prison, and there the highest ecclesiastic of the West languished for nearly a year, and died. But before his return, the deep and wide spread conspiracy, which Theodoric had discovered, or supposed that he had discovered, led to the death of a far greater

Pope John in Constantinople.

March 30, 525.

Imprisonment and death of John. May 18, 526.

¹ Baronius rested this on a supposititious letter of Isidorus Mercator; this letter is exploded by Pagi, sub ann. 526.

² Anonym. Vales. p. 627. Histor. Miscell. apud Muratori.

man, Boethius, and subsequently to that of the virtuous father-in-law of Boethius, the Senator Symmachus. Boethius had lightened the hours in his dreary confinement by the composition of his famous book, the Consolation of Philosophy, <sup>Boethius's
Consolation of
Philosophy.</sup> the closing work of Roman literature. Intellectually, Boethius was the last of the Romans, and Roman letters may be said to have expired with greater dignity in his person, than the Empire in that of Augustulus. His own age might justly wonder at the universal accomplishments of Boethius. Theodoric himself, writing by the hand, and no doubt in the pedantic language of his minister Cassiodorus, had paid homage to his knowledge. "Through him Pythagoras the musician, Ptolemy the astronomer, Nicomachus the arithmetician, Euclid the geometer, Plato the theologian, Aristotle the logician, Archimedes the mechanician, had learned to speak the Roman language." Boethius had mingled in theologic controversy, had discussed the mysterious question of the Trinity without any suspicion of heresy, and steered safely along the narrow strait between Nestorianism and Eutychianism. He is even said, for a time, to have withdrawn to the monastic solitudes, and to have held religious intercourse with Benedict of Nursia, and his followers. All this constitutes the extraordinary, the peculiar character of the Consolation of Philosophy, which appears as the last work of Roman letters, rather than as eminent among Christian writings. It is equally surprising that in such an age and by such a man, in his imprisonment and under the terrors of approaching death, Consolation should be found in Philosophy rather than in Religion; that he should have sought

his examples of patience in Socrates with his hemlock cup, or among the arguments of the Garden or the Porch, rather than in the Gospel or the Legends of Christian martyrdom. From the beginning of the book to the end, there is nothing distinctly Christian; its religion is no higher than Theism; almost the whole might have been written by Cicero in exile, or by Marcus Antoninus under some reverse of fortune. The long and enduring popularity of the Consolation of Philosophy during the dark ages completes the singular and anomalous character of the work itself.

This all-accomplished, all-honored man was not only torn away from his library, inlaid with ivory and glass, from the enjoyment of ample wealth and as ample honor, from the esteem of his friends and the love of his family, left to pine in a remote and lonely prison, and then released by the public executioner—the manner of his death, if we are to trust our authorities, was peculiarly inhuman. He was first tortured, a cord was tightly twisted round his forehead, whether or not to extort confession of his suspected treason; and he was then beaten to death with a club.¹

Nor was the vengeance of Theodoric satiated with the blood of Boethius. Theodoric, dreading the influence of Symmachus, the head of the Senate, a man of the highest virtues; and suspecting, lest, in his indignation at the death of his son-in-law, he should engage or had engaged in some desperate plot against the Gothic kingdom, summoned him to Ravenna, where his head was struck off by the executioner.² This was followed by the imprisonment

Death of
Boethius.

¹ Anonym. Vales. p. 626.

² Anonym. Vales. p. 627.

of Pope John, and his death. Throughout these melancholy scenes, the historian is reduced to a sad alternative. He must either suppose that the clear intellect and generous character of Theodoric had become enfeebled by age; his temper soured by the sudden and harassing anxieties, which seemed to break so unseasonably on the peace of his declining years, and the ingratitude of his Roman subjects for above thirty years of mild and equitable rule; those subjects now would scarcely await his death to attempt to throw off the yoke, and would inevitably league with the East against his infant heir. Theodoric, therefore, blinded by unworthy suspicions, yielded himself up to the basest informers, and closed a reign of justice and humanity, with a succession of acts, cruel, sanguinary, and wantonly revengeful. Or, on the other hand, he must conclude, that notwithstanding his protestations of innocence, Boethius and his friends, dazzled by patriotic visions of the restoration of the Roman power, or, what is less likely, considering the philosophic tone of his religion, by orthodox zeal, had tampered at least with the enemies of the existing government; and that the Roman Senate looked forward in more than quiet prophetic hope, in actual traitorous correspondence, to that invasion from the East, which took place not many years after the death of Theodoric. Both views are perhaps true. Theodoric was a father, a Goth. Kings discriminate not between the aspirations of their subjects for revolt, and actual plans for revolt; they are bound to be far-sighted; their vision becomes more jealously acute, the more remote and indistinct the objects; treason in men's hearts becomes treason in act. On the other hand, insolent Roman vanity, stern

religious zeal, were not likely to be coldly, timorously prudent; desires, hopes would find words; words eager hearers, hearers become informers; and informers are not too faithful reporters. Goths, Arians, courtiers, might, even with no dishonest or sinister intent, hear conspiracy in every boast of Roman freedom, in every reminiscence of Roman pride.

Theodoric was now in his 74th year; almost the last act of his reign was the nomination of the successor of John. His interposition was enforced by the fierce contentions which followed the death of that prelate. His choice fell on Felix, a Samnite, a learned and a blameless man. But the clergy and the people, who were agitated with strife, threatening the peace of the city, and a renewal of the bloody scenes at the election of Laurentius and Symmachus, united in stern resistance to the nomination, in which they had been allowed no voice.¹ Theodoric in his calm wisdom came to an agreement to regulate future elections — an agreement, which in theory subsisted, till the election of the Pope was transferred to the College of Cardinals. The Pope was to be chosen by the free suffrages of the clergy and people, but might not assume his office till confirmed by the sovereign. For his confirmation the Pope made a certain payment to be distributed among the poor. On this understanding the clergy and the city acquiesced in the nomination of Pope Felix.²

Pope Felix,
A.D. 526.
Consecrated
July 12.

¹ Cassiod. Var. viii. 15. This nomination was absolute. Athalaric writes thus: "Oportebat enim arbitrio boni principis (Theodorici) obediri, qui sapienti deliberatione pertractans, quamvis in alienâ religione, talem visus est pontificem delegisse, ut nulli merito debeat displicere. . . . Receptistis itaque virum, et divinâ gratiâ probabiliter institutum, et regali examinatione laudatum."

² He took quiet possession of the throne July 12, 526.

Theodoric died in the month following the peaceful accession of Felix to the Pontifical throne. The glory of his reign passed from the memory of man with the peace and prosperity of Italy. But the hatred of his heretical opinions survived the remembrance of his virtues. He is said to have committed to a Jew, named Symmachus Scolasticus, the framing of an edict, for the expulsion of the Catholics from all their churches; ¹ a statement utterly irreconcilable with his judicious and conciliatory conduct on the election of the Pope. Theodoric, it was observed, died by the same disease which smote the heresiarch Arius in the hour of his triumph. The Greek historian of the Gothic war, who may be taken as representing the Byzantine aversion to the memory of Theodoric, has described him as dying in a terrific agony of remorse at his own crimes. A large fish was placed before Theodoric at his supper. The King beheld in it the gory head of Symmachus, ^{Fate after death.} with the teeth set and gnawing the lower lip, and the eyes rolling in a fierce frenzy, and sternly menacing his murderer. Theodoric, shivering with cold, rushed to his chamber; he called for more clothes to be heaped upon his bed, but nothing could restore the warmth of life; he sent for his physician, and bitterly, and in an agony of tears, reproached himself with the death of Symmachus and of Boethius. ¹ He died a few days after; and even Procopius adds, that these were the first and the last acts of injustice committed by Theodoric against his subjects. But later visionaries did not the less pursue his soul to its eternal condemnation;

¹ Anonym. Vales.; Agnell. in Vit. Pontific. Ravennat

² Procop. de bello Gothico, i. pp. 11, 12.

he was seen by a hermit hurled by the ministers of the divine retribution into the volcano of Lipari: volcanoes in those days were believed to be the openings to hell.¹

Ravenna still, among the later works of Justinian and the Byzantine Exarchs, preserves some memorials of the magnificence of Theodoric. Of his stately palace remain but some crumbling and disfigured walls. Byzantine art has taken possession of his churches; Justinian and Theodora still dimly blaze in the gold and purple of the mosaics.² The monument of Theodoric, perhaps the oldest work of Christian art, is still entire, marking some tendency to that transition from the Roman grandeur of bold and massy arches to the multiplicity of mediæval details. Yet in these remains nothing can be traced which realizes those singular expressions of Cassiodorus, so prophetic it might seem of what was afterwards characteristic of the so-called Gothic architecture—the tall, slender, reed-like pillars, the lofty roof supported, as it were, by clustered lances.³

¹ Gregor. i. Dialog. iv. 36. On this work, see hereafter.

² If we may trust a passage in Agnelli (*Vit. Pontefic. Ravenn. apud Muratori, iii. p. 95*), the church of San Vitale, erected in a city the capital of an Arian sovereign, was unequalled in its splendor, we presume in the West. It cost 26,000 golden solidi. Taking the golden solidus (according to Dureau de la Malle, *Economie Polit. des Romains, i. p. 46*) at 15 francs 10 c., about 12s. 6d., between £15,000 and £16,000.

³ "Quid dicinus columnarum junceam proceritatem. . . Erectis hastilibus contineri moles illas sublimissimas fabricarum."—Cassiod. viii. 15.

CHAPTER IV.

JUSTINIAN.

HISTORY scarcely offers a more extraordinary contrast than that between the reign and the character of the Emperor Justinian. Under the nephew, colleague, and heir of Justin, the Roman Empire appears suddenly to resume her ancient majesty and power. The signs of a just, able, and vigorous administration, internal peace, prosperity, conquest, and splendor surround the master of the Roman world. The greatest generals, since the days perhaps of Trajan, Belisarius and Narses appear at the head of the Roman armies. Persia is kept at bay, during several campaigns if not continuously successful, yet honorable to the arms of Rome. The tide of barbarian conquest is rolled back. Africa, the Illyrian and Dalmatian provinces, Sicily, Italy, with the ancient Capital, are again under the empire of Rome; the Vandal kingdom, the Gothic kingdom fall before the irresistible generals of the East. The frontiers of the empire are defended with fortifications, constructed at enormous cost;¹ but become necessary now that Roman valor had lost its spell of awe over the human mind; and that the perpetual migrations and movements from the North and

¹ Procopius de *Ædificiis*, passim. The first book describes the ecclesiastical buildings of Constantinople; the rest the fortifications and defensive buildings throughout the empire.

the East were continually propelling new and formidable nations against the boundaries of the Roman world. Justinian aspires to be the legislator of mankind ; a vast system of jurisprudence embodies the wisdom of ancient and of imperial statutes, mingled with some of the benign influences of Christianity, of which the author might almost have been warranted in the presumptuous vaticination, that it would exercise an unrepealed authority to the latest ages. The cities of the empire are adorned with buildings, civil as well as religious, of great magnificence and apparent durability, which, with the comprehensive legislation, might recall the peaceful days of the Antonines. The empire, at least at first, is restored to religious unity : Catholicism resumes its sway, and Arianism, so long its rival, dies out in remote and neglected congregations. In Spain alone it is the religion of the sovereign.

The creator of this new epoch in Roman greatness, at least he who filled the throne during its creation, the Emperor Justinian, unites in himself the most opposite vices, — insatiable rapacity and lavish prodigality, intense pride and contemptible weakness, unmeasured ambition and dastardly cowardice. He is the uxorious slave of his empress, whom, after she had ministered to the licentious pleasures of the populace as a courtesan, and as an actress, in the most immodest exhibitions (we make due allowance for the malicious exaggerations in the secret history of Procopius), in defiance of decency, of honor, of the remonstrances of his friends, and of religion, he had made the partner of his throne. In the Christian Emperor seem to meet the crimes of those, who won or secured their empire by the assassination of all whom they feared, the passion for public

diversions without the accomplishments of Nero or the brute strength of Commodus, the dotage of Claudius. Constantinople might appear to retrograde to paganism. The peace of the city and even the stability of the empire are endangered not by foreign invasion, not at first by a dangerous rival for the throne, nor even by religious dissensions, but by the factions of the Circus, the partisans of the Blue and of the Green, by the colors worn in the games by the contending charioteers. Justinian himself, during the memorable sedition, the Nike, had nearly abandoned the throne, and fled before a despicable antagonist. "The throne is a glorious sepulchre," exclaimed the prostitute whom he had raised to that throne, and Justinian and the empire are saved by her courage. This imperious woman, even if from exhaustion or lassitude she discontinued, or at least condescended to disguise those vices which dishonored her husband, in her cruelties knew no restraint. And these cruelties, exercised in order to gratify her rapacity, if not in sheer caprice, as a substitute for that excitement which had lost its keenness and its zest, are almost more culpable indications of the Emperor's weakness. This meanness of subservience to female influence becomes the habit of the court, and the great Belisarius, like his master, is ruled and disgraced by an insolent and profligate wife. Nor do either of them, in shame, or in conscious want of Christian holiness, stand aloof from the affairs of that religion, whose precepts and whose spirit they thus trample under foot. Theodora, a bigot without faith, a heretic, it might almost be presumed, without religious convictions, by the superior strength of her character, domineers in this as in other respects over the whole court, mingles in all religious intrigues,

appoints to the highest ecclesiastical dignities, sells the Papacy itself. Her charities alone (if we except her masculine courage, and no doubt that great ability which mastered the inferior mind of her husband), if they sprung from lingering womanly tenderness, or that inextinguishable kindness which Christianity sometimes infuses into the hardest hearts, if they were not designed as a deliberate compromise with heaven for her vices and cruelties, may demand our admiration. The feeling which induced the degraded and miserable victim of the lusts and contempt of men to found, perhaps, the first penitentiaries for her sisters in that wretched class, as it shows her superior to the base fear of awakening remembrances of her own former shame, may likewise be considered as an enforced homage to female virtue. Even in Theodora we would discover the very feeblest emotions of Christianity. Justinian aspires too to be the legislator not of the empire alone,¹ but of Christendom, enacts ordinances for the whole Church; and unhappily, not content with establishing the doctrines of Nicea and Chalcedon as the religion of the Empire, by his three Chapters replunges Christendom into religious strife.

The reign of Justinian, during the period between the death of Theodoric and the conquest of Italy, was occupied by the Persian and African wars, and the commotions arising out of the public games in Constantinople. The only event which commands religious interest is the suppression of the schools in Athens. That last vain struggle of

Persian and
African
wars.
A.D. 526-533.

¹ I have studied, besides the ordinary authorities, a life of Justinian by Ludewig.—Hal. Salic. 1731. To the great lawyer the vices and weaknesses of Justinian are lost in admiration of his jurisprudence.

Grecian philosophy against Christianity, which had so signally failed even with an Emperor Julian at its head; that Platonic theism which had endeavored to give new life to paganism, by enlisting the imagination in its service, and establishing a sensible communication with the unseen world; which, in order to command the innate superstition of mankind, had allied itself with magic; and which still (its better function) promulgated noble precepts of somewhat dreamy morality; was not allowed to expire like a worn-out veteran in peaceful dignity. Suppression of Schools at Athens. It was forcibly expelled from the ancient groves and porches of Athens, where recently, under Proclus, it had rallied, as it were, for a last gleam of lustre; it was driven out by the impatient zeal of Justinian. Seven followers of Proclus, it is well known, sought a more hospitable retreat in Persia; but the Magianism of that kingdom was not much more tolerant than the Christianity of the East. Philosophy found no resting-place; and probably few of her disciples could enjoy the malicious consolation which might have been drawn from the manner in which she had long been revenging herself on Christianity by suggesting, quickening with her contentious spirit, and aiding with all her subtleties of language those disputes, which had degraded the faith of Jesus from its sublime, moral, and religious dictatorship over the human mind.

Justinian, when he determined to attempt the reconquest of Africa, might take the high position of the vindicator of the Catholics from long, cruel, and almost unrelenting persecution. The African Catholics had enjoyed a short gleam of peace during the reign of Hilderic, who had deviated into toleration, unknown to the Arianism of the Vandals alone; he had restored

about two hundred bishops to their churches. The Catholics might behold with terror the overthrow of the just Hilderic by the stern Gilimer, and might reasonably dread a renewal of the dark days of the great persecutors, of Thrasimund and of Hunneric. The voices of those confessors, who are said to have spoken clearly and distinctly after their tongues had been cut out down to the root; who might be heard to speak publicly (for one of them was a deacon) by the curious or the devout in Constantinople itself, might excite the compassion and animate the zeal of Justinian.¹ The

¹ This is the one post-apostolic miracle which appears to rest on the strongest evidence. If we are to trust Victor Vitensis, we cannot take refuge in the notion that their speech was imperfect. Of one at least, the Deacon Reparatus, he asserts that he spoke both clearly and distinctly. The words of Procopius are ἀκραιφνεῖ τῇ φωνῇ. If we listen to Æneas of Gaza, it is equally impossible to recur to the haste, or slovenly execution of the punishment by the barbarian executioner: he states, from his own ocular inspection, that the tongue had been torn away by the roots. — Victor Vitens. v. 6; Ruinart, p. 483, 487; Æneas Gazensis in Theophrasto in Biblioth. Patr. viii. p. 664, 665; Justinian, codex i. tit. xxvii.; Marcelli in Chronic. Procop. de Bell. Vandal. i. 7, p. 385; Gregor. Magn. Dialog. iii. 32. The question is, the credibility of such witnesses in such an age. A recent traveller has furnished a curious illustration of this one post-apostolic miracle which puzzled Gibbon. The writer is describing Djezzar Pasha's cruelties:—"Each Emir was held down in a squatting position, with his hands tied behind him, and his face turned upwards. The officiating tefèketchy now approached his victim; and standing over him, as if about to extract a tooth, forced open his mouth, and, darting a hook through the top of the tongue, pulled it out until the root was exposed: one or two passes of a razor sufficed to cut it out. It is a curious fact, however, that the tongues grew again sufficient for the purposes of speech."—Colonel Churchill's Lebanon, vol. iii. p. 384. A friend has suggested this more extraordinary passage:—"Zal Khan (condemned by Aga Mohammed Khan to lose his eyes) loaded the tyrant with curses. 'Cut out his tongue' was the second order. This mandate was imperfectly executed; and the loss of half this member deprived him of speech. Being afterwards persuaded that its being cut close to the root would enable him to speak so as to be understood, he submitted to the operation, and the effect has been, that his voice, though indistinct and thick, is yet intelligible to persons accustomed to converse with him. *This I experienced from daily intercourse.* He

frugal John of Cappadocia, the minister of Justinian, remonstrated against an expedition so costly and so uncertain in its event as the invasion of Africa. His apprehensions seemed justified by the disastrous and ignominious failure of that under Basiliscus. But John was silenced by a devout bishop. The holy man had seen a vision, which commanded the Catholic Emperor to proceed without fear to the rescue of his Catholic brethren. Africa, subdued by the arms of Belisarius, returned at once under the dominion of the empire and of Catholicism. The Vandal ^{Conquest of Africa.} Arianism had made no proselytes among the hereditary disciples of Cyprian and Augustine, the hearers of Fulgentius and of Augustine's scholars. Persecution had its usual effect when it stops short of extermination; it had only strengthened the inflexible orthodoxy of the province. One imperial edict was sufficient A. D. 533. to restore all the churches to the Catholic worship. Donatism, which still survived, though included under

often spoke to me of his sufferings. . . ." Sir John Malcolm adds, that he is "ignorant of anatomy, . . . but the facts are as stated, and I had them from the very best authority, old Zal Khan himself." — Sketches of Persia, ii. p. 116. This mutilation, in fact, is common in the East. I have the authority of Sir John Macneill, "that he knew several persons who had been subjected to that punishment, who spoke so intelligibly as to be able to transact business. More than one of them, finding that my curiosity and interest was excited, *showed me the stump.*" Sir John Macneill's description of the mode of operation fully coincides with the following opinion of the most distinguished surgical authority in England:—"There seems to me nothing mysterious in the histories of the excision of the tongue. The modification of the voice forming articulate speech is effected especially by the motions of the soft palate, the tongue, and the lips, and partly by means of the teeth and cheeks. The mutilation of any one of these organs will affect the speech as *far as that organ is concerned and no farther*, the effect being to render the speech more or less imperfect, but not to destroy it altogether. The excision of the whole tongue is an impossible operation." What Colonel Churchill attributed to the growth of the tongue is explained in another manner.

the same condemnation, was endowed with more obstinate vitality, and was hardly extinguished before the final disruption of Africa from the great Christian system by Mohammedanism.

The Ostrogothic kingdom of Theodoric, in the mean time, was declining through internal dissension; the inevitable consequence of female sway, and that of a king too early raised to the throne, too soon emancipated from his mother's control by the mistaken fondness of the Goths, who, while they desired to educate him as a warlike Amala among his noble peers, abandoned him to the unchecked corruption of Roman manners. Rome conquered Athalaric by her vices. Premature debauchery wasted the bodily frame, and paralyzed the intellect of the young Gothic king. Even the accomplished Amalasintha, who spoke the languages of all her subjects with the most exquisite perfection, and, in some degree, blended the virtues of both races, yet wanted somewhat of the commanding strength of character which hallowed the noble Teutonic female. In an evil hour, while her son was sinking towards the grave, she bestowed her hand and the kingdom on her cousin, the unworthy Theodotus. Theodotus, master of the crown, imprisoned Amalasintha, and soon put her to death. He then dragged out a few years of inglorious sovereignty, till the indignant Goths wrested away the sceptre to place it in the hands of the valiant Witiges.

Ostrogothic
kingdom.

Death of
Athalaric.

Marriage and
death of
Amalasintha.

Witiges
king.

Justinian watched the affairs of Italy without betraying his ambitious designs; but all who were dissatisfied with the state of affairs, turned their eyes to the

East. Amalasintha at one time had determined to abandon the kingdom, to place herself under the protection of Justinian: the fleet was ready to sail to Dyrrachium. Constant amicable intercourse was still taking place between the Catholic clergy of the East and West, between Constantinople and Rome, between Justinian and the rapid succession of Pontiffs, who occupied the throne during the ten years between the death of Theodoric and the invasion of Italy.

Felix IV. had just been acknowledged as Pope when Theodoric died; his peaceful pontificate Pope Felix IV. 526-530. lasted four years. The contests for the Pa-
pacy were not prevented by the agreement under Theodoric. A double election took place on the death of Felix. The partisans of either faction were prepared for a fierce struggle, when the timely death of his rival Dioscorus left Boniface II. in undisputed possession of the throne. Yet so exasperated October 14. Boniface II. A.D. 530. were the parties, that Boniface would not allow his competitor to sleep in his grave; he fulminated an anathema against him as an anti-Pope, and compelled the clergy to sign the decree. It was revoked during the next pontificate. Boniface was of Gothic blood,¹ perhaps promoted by the Gothic party. He attempted a bold measure in order to get rid of the disgraceful and disastrous scenes of violence A.D. 531. and bribery, which now seemed inveterate in the Papal elections. He proposed that during his lifetime the Pope should nominate his successor; he proceeded to designate Vigilus, a deacon, who afterwards ascended the Papal throne. An obsequious Council ratified this

¹ He was the son of Count Sigisbult or Sigisvult, though called a Roman by Anastasius. — Anastas. in Vit.

extraordinary proceeding. Both parties, however, equally resented this attempt to wrest from them their A. D. 532. undoubted privilege, and thus to reduce the Papacy to an ordinary inheritance at the disposition of its possessor. In a second Council they showed their repugnance and astonishment at the daring innovation. The Pope acknowledged his own decree to be an act of treason against ecclesiastical and even civil law, burned it in public, and left the election of his successor to proceed in the old course.¹ There were again at the death of Boniface fierce strife, undisguised bribery, and shame and horror after all was over. Remedies were sought for this ineradicable disease. Dec. 31, 532. On the death of Boniface, the Roman Senate resumed some of its ancient authority, and issued an edict prohibiting these base and venal proceedings, during which the funds designed for the poor were loaded with debts, even the sacred vessels sold for these simoniacal uses. Athalaric confirmed this edict.² John II., whose former name was Mercurius, ruled for three years. During his papacy arrived a splendid embassy from the East, with magnificent offerings, golden vessels, chalices of silver, jewels, and curtains of cloth of gold for the Church of St. Peter. The pretext was a deferential consultation with the Pope, concerning A. D. 534. the *sleepless* monks, who were still not without some Nestorian tendencies. At the same time

¹ Anastas. in Vit., and Labbe, p. 1690.

² "Ita facultates pauperum extortis promissionibus ingravasse, ut (quod dictu nefas est) etiam sacra vasa emptioni publicæ viderentur exposita." — Athalar. Reg. Epist. apud Labbe, p. 1748. This law annulled all bargains made for the appointment to bishoprics. It declared the offence to be sacrilege; and limited the payments to the chancery on contested elections, — for the papacy to 3000 golden solidi, for archbishoprics or bishoprics to 2000. The largess to the poor was restricted to 500.

came an ambassador to Theodotus, now Ostrogothic King, with expostulations, or rather imperious menaces, on alleged violations of the treaties between the Gothic kingdom and the Empire. During the short and troubled reign of Theodotus, Justinian received petitions from all parts of Italy, and from all persons, lay as well as clerical, with the air and tone of its Sovereign.

The aged Agapetus had succeeded to the Roman See before Justinian prepared for the actual in-^{Agapetus.}vasion of Italy. In the agony of his fear ^{June 3, 535.}Theodotus the Goth had recourse to the same measure which Theodoric had adopted in his pride. He persuaded or compelled the Pope to proceed on an embassy to Constantinople, to ward off the impending danger, to use his influence and authority lest a Roman and orthodox Emperor should persist in his attempt to wrest Italy and Rome from a barbarous Arian; and Theodotus commanded the Prelate to be the bearer of menaces more befitting the herald of war. He was to declare the determination of the Goth, if Justinian should fulfil his hostile designs, to put the Senate to the sword, and raze the city of the Cæsars to the ground.¹ Like his predecessor, Agapetus was received with the highest honors. Justinian had already suspended, for a short time, his warlike preparations; but Agapetus found affairs more within his ^{Agapetus}province, which enabled him to display ^{in Constan-}to ^{tinople.}the despot of the East the bold and independent tone assumed even against the throne by the ecclesiastics of the West. The See of Constantinople was vacant. The all-powerful Theodora summoned Anthi-

¹ The embassy was in Constantinople, Feb. 2, 536.

mus, bishop of Trebisond, to the Metropolitan diocese. Anthimus was suspected as tainted with Eutychian opinions. Agapetus resolutely declined to communicate with a Prelate, whose appointment not merely violated the Canon against translation from one see to another, but one likewise of doubtful orthodoxy. The venal partisans of Anthimus and of Theodora insinuated countercharges of Nestorian inclinations against the Bishop of Rome.² Agapetus, in a conference, condescended to satisfy the Emperor as to his own unimpeachable orthodoxy. Justinian sternly commanded him to communicate with Anthimus. "With the Bishop of Trebisond," replied the unawed ecclesiastic, "when he has returned to his diocese, and accepted the Council of Chalcedon and the letters of Leo." The Emperor in a louder voice commanded him to acknowledge the Bishop of Constantinople on pain of immediate exile. "I came hither in my old age to see, as I supposed, a religious and a Christian Emperor, I find a new Diocletian. But I fear not Kings' menaces, I am ready to lay down my life for the truth." The feeble mind of Justinian passed at once from the height of arrogance to admiration and respect: he listened to the charges advanced by Agapetus against the orthodoxy of Anthimus. In his turn the Bishop of Constantinople was summoned to render an account of his theology before the Emperor, convicted of Eutychianism, and degraded from the see. Mennas, nominated in his room, was consecrated by the Pope. Thus one patriarch of Constantinople was de-
April 22, 536. graded, another promoted by the influence, if not by the authority (the distinction was not marked,

¹ Libellus de Reb. Gestis ab Agap. ad Constant. apud Baronium, 536.

as in later theologic disputes) of the Bishop of Rome. Agapetus did not live long to enjoy his triumph; he died at Constantinople; his funeral rites were celebrated with great magnificence; his body sent to Rome. His memory was venerated alike in the East and in the West.

But the next few years beheld the Papacy degraded from its lofty and independent dignity. Rome was now within the dominions of the sole Emperor of the world. Justinian conquers Italy and Rome. Belisarius, in his unchecked career of conquest, had subdued Africa, Sicily, Naples; he entered undefended Rome as its master.¹ The Pope became first the victim, then the base instrument of the temporal power. Rome, now a city of the Eastern Empire, was brought at once within the sphere of the female intrigues of Constantinople; one Pope, Silverius, suffered degradation; another, the most doubtful character who had yet sat on the throne of St. Peter, received his appointment through the arts of the infamous Theodora, and suffered the judicial punishment of his weaknesses and crimes, — persecution, shame, remorse. Silverius, the new Pope, was the son of the former Pontiff Hormisdas, the legitimate son, born before the father had taken holy orders. Silverius was Bishop of Rome by command of Theodotus, yet undegraded from the Ostrogothic throne.² But the Romans saw with undisguised but miscalculating pride, the Roman banners, floating over the army of Belisarius, approach their walls. The Pope dared (the Goths were in confusion at the degradation of The-

¹ See the war in Gibbon, ch. xli.

² *Sine deliberatione decreti*, Vit. Sylv. Confer. Marcell. Chron. Jaffe Regesta, sub ann. 536. He was consecrated June 8.

odotus, and the elevation of Witiges) to urge the Romans to send an ambassador to hail the deliverer of the city from the barbaric Goth.¹ The Bishop of Rome received the General of the East, and, as it were, restored Rome to the Roman empire. Belisarius was lord of the Capitol, and at once the consequence of Rome's subjugation to the East broke upon the Pope and upon Rome. Theodora had never abandoned her hopes of promoting her favorite, Anthimus, to the See of Constantinople; she entered into a league with the Deacon Vigilus, who had accompanied the Pope Agapetus into the East. Vigilus was a man of unmeasured ambition, and great ability;² he had been designated as his successor by Pope Boniface; and when the unanimous voice of the clergy and the people wrested from Boniface the usurped right of nominating his successor, Vigilus was left to brood over other means of obtaining the pontificate. The compact proposed by the Empress, and accepted by the unscrupulous Vigilus, stipulated on her part the degradation of Silverius, and a large sum of money, no doubt to secure his election, and to consolidate his interest in Rome; on that of the ecclesiastic, no less than the condemnation of the Council of Chalcedon, and the acknowledgment of Anthimus, as Bishop of Constantinople. The degradation of Silverius was intrusted not to the all-powerful Belisarius alone, but to the surer hands of his wife Antonina, the accomplice of the Empress in all her intrigues of every kind, and her counterpart in the

¹ Μάλιστα δὲ αὐτοὺς Σιλβέριος εἰς τοῦτο ἐνήγγεν, ὃ τῆσδε τῆς πόλεως ἀσχερεῖς. Procop. de B. G. i. c. 14.

² "Lubenter ergo suscepit Vigilus permissum ejus, amore episcopatus et auri." — Liberat. Breviar. c. xxii.

arbitrary power with which she ruled her glorious but easy husband. The Pope Silverius was accused of treasonable correspondence with the Goths, witnesses were suborned to support this improbable charge against him who had yielded up the city to the conqueror. Belisarius, it is said, endeavored to save the Pope from degradation, by inducing him to accede to the wishes of Theodora, to con-^{February,}_{March, 537.} demn the Council of Chalcedon, and to communicate with Anthimus. The resolution of Silverius, who firmly rejected these propositions, left him the defenceless victim of Vigilius and of Antonina. The successor of St. Peter was rudely summoned to the Pincian Palace, the military quarters of Belisarius. In the chamber of the General sat Antonina on the bed, with her husband at her feet. "What have we done," exclaimed the imperious woman, "to you, Pope Silverius, and to the Romans, that you should betray us to the Goths?" In an instant the pall was rent from his shoulders by a subdeacon, he was hurried into another room, stripped of the rest of his dress, and clad in that of a monk. The clergy who accompanied him were informed of his degradation in a few careless words, "The Pope Silverius is deposed, and is now a monk." The most extraordinary part of this strange transaction is the utter ignorance of Justinian of the whole intrigue. From Patara, the place of his banishment, Silverius made his way to Constantinople, and to the amazement of the Emperor preferred his complaint of the unjust violence with which he had been expelled from his See. Justinian commanded his instant return to Rome. If, on further investigation, it should appear that he had been unjustly accused of treason, he was

to be reinstated in his dignity. The sudden reappearance of Silverius in Rome (he had outsailed the messengers of Theodora) embarrassed for a time, only for a short time, the unscrupulous Vigilius, and his more than imperial patrons. By the influence of Antonina, Silverius was delivered up to his rival, and banished by him who aspired to be the head of Christendom, to the island of Pandataria, infamous as the place of exile to which the worst heathen emperors had consigned the victims of their tyranny. On this wretched rock Silverius soon closed his life, whether in the course of nature or by violent means, seems to have been known with no more certainty in his own days than in ours.¹

Vigilius was now, by command of Belisarius,² the undisputed Pontiff of Rome.³ He had paid Vigilius Pope. A.D. 544. already a fearful price for his advancement, — false accusation, cruel oppression, perhaps murder. At Rome he declares his adhesion to the four councils and to the letter of Leo; he approves the anathema of Mennas of Constantinople against the Monophysites.⁴ But four years after, Theodora demanded, and Vigilius dared not refuse, the rest of his unholy covenant, at least the base and secret adoption of all her heretical opinions. In a letter still extant,⁵ but con-

¹ Anastasii vita. Liberatus writes briefly and significantly, "Solus ingressus a suis ulterius non est visus." — Breviar. c. xxiii.

² Ἐτερον δὲ ἀρχιερέα. ὀλίγω ὕστερον Βιγίλιον ὄνομα κατεστήσατο. So writes the Greek Procopius of Belisarius.

³ The date of his accession is a point of grave dispute. If it is reckoned from his first nomination to the see, he can only be held an uncanonical usurper of an unvacated see, and that nomination must have been null and void. A second election therefore has been supposed; but of this event there is no accredited record. It is impossible so to connect the broken links of the spiritual genealogy.

⁴ A.D. 540, September 17. — Mansi. ix. 35, 33.

⁵ The letter is given by Liberatus. One main argument against its au-

tested on account of its damning effect on one who was, or who afterwards became Pope, rather than from any mark, either external or internal, of spuriousness, Vigilius gave his deliberate adhesion to Eutychianism. The busy and restless theology of the East had now raised a new question, and Justinian aspired to the dignity of a profound divine, and a legislator of Christian doctrine as well as of Christian civil affairs. He plunged with headstrong zeal into the controversy.¹ The Church was not now disturbed by the sublime, if inexplicable, dogmas concerning the nature of God, the Persons of the Trinity, or the union of the divine and human nature of Christ; concerning the revelations of Scripture, or even the opinions of the ancient fathers: the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of certain writings by bishops, but recently dead, became the subject of Imperial edicts, of a fifth so called Œcumenic Council, held at Constantinople, and a religious war between the East and the West. Under the name of the three Chapters, the Emperor and the obsequious Council

thenticity is, that he was never charged with it by his enemies or by Justinian. But it was a private letter to Theodora, and contains this sentence, "Oportet ergo, ut hæc quæ vobis scribo, nullus agnoscat." The letter may not have come to light till after the death of Theodora. But, with some mistrust of their own feeble critical arguments, the high papal writers assert that Vigilius, when he wrote this letter, was only an antipope and a schismatic. His subsequent legitimate election arrayed him in perfect Christian faith and virtue. He became officially orthodox. *Binii not. in Liberatum.* Dupin ventures to say that *Liberatus* is better authority than either *Baronius* or *Binius*.

¹ Justinian had already made an essay of his theological powers. In Palestine the controversy concerning the opinions of Origen had broken out again, and caused violent popular tumults. Pelagius, the legate of the Pope, and the Patriarch of Constantinople Mennas, urged the interference of Justinian. The emperor threw himself headlong into the dispute, and issued an encyclic letter, condemning the Origenists: the imperial anathema was subscribed by Mennas and many other bishops of Constantinople.

condemned certain works of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of Edessa.¹ These writings, though questionable as the source of, or as infected with Nestorianism, had passed uncondemned by the Council of Chalcedon. The imperial edict usurped the form of a confession of faith, and trespassed on the exclusive right of the clergy to anathematize the holders of erroneous doctrines. Great part of the submissive or consentient East received the dictates of the imperial theologian; the West as generally and resolutely refused compliance. Vigilius was peremptorily summoned to Constantinople. He set forth, loaded with the imprecations of the Roman people, and assailed with volleys of stones, as the murderer of Silverius, and a man of notorious cruelty. It was said that he had killed one of his own secretaries in a fit of passion, and caused his nephew, the son of his sister, to be scourged to death. "May famine and pestilence pursue thee; evil hast thou done to us, may evil overtake thee wherever thou art." A strong guard protected his person first to Sicily, and thence after near two years' delay to Constantinople.

His departure from Rome was fortunate for himself, fortunate perhaps for the dignity of the Papacy. During his absence, Rome was besieged by the Goths. A supply of corn sent by Vigilius from Sicily was inter-

¹ The condemnation of the three chapters implied at least a covert censure of the Council of Chalcedon. I. The fathers of that council had received Theodoret into communion, and, content with his condemnation of Nestorius, had not demanded his retraction of his writings against Cyril of Alexandria. II. They had inserted in their proceedings a letter from Ibas of Edessa to the Persian Maris, in which he highly praised Theodorus of Mopsuestia, the master of Nestorius, blamed Cyril, and accused the Council of Ephesus as having too hastily condemned Nestorius.—Anastas. in Vita.

cepted on the Tiber by the barbarians ; the Bishop Valentinus, who accompanied it, was summoned before the savage conqueror, and appearing to prevaricate, was mutilated by cutting off both his hands. It was fortunate on another account : Constantinople alone witnessed the weakness and tergiversations of Vigilius, who at least three times pliantly yielded to, and then desperately resisted the theologic dictatorship of Justinian ; three times condemned the three Chapters, three times recanted his condemnation. Constantinople alone witnessed the personal indignities, the persecutions of which reports, perhaps exaggerated, reached the West, but which were neither rendered glorious to a servant of Christ by Christian blamelessness (the sense of which might have allayed their bitterness) or by Christian meekness and resolution, which might have turned them to his honor and to his peace. He had the sufferings, but neither the outward dignity nor the inward consolation of martyrdom.

It was a perilous crisis for a Prelate so ambitious, yet so double-minded, so trammelled by former obligations, and so bound by common guilt to one of the A. D. 548. contending parties. For there was division in the court ; Justinian and Theodora, as throughout in religious interests, were on opposite sides ; the East and the West were irreconcilably adverse. Vigilius was emboldened by his honorable reception in Constantinople ; the Emperor and the Pope are said to June 11, 548. have wept, when they first met.¹ The death of Theodora soon relieved Vigilius from some part of his embarrassment. Yet he miscalculated his power, and dared to resist the Imperial will ; he refused to condemn the

¹ Anastas. in Vit.

three Chapters. He even ventured to address the Emperor under the favorite appellation, bestowed on all imperial opponents of ecclesiastical authority, as a new Diocletian. He excluded from his communion Mennas, the Patriarch of Constantinople; he excommunicated Theodorus of Cesarea, and even the departed Empress herself. Mennas threw back the anathema, and on his side excommunicated the Pope. Vigilius was ere long obliged to withdraw his censures, and to reconcile himself with the rival Prelate. Scarcely, indeed, had many months passed before the Pope at the head of a Council of seventy bishops, issued his A. D. 548. infallible anathema *against* the three Chapters. The West at once threw off its allegiance, and refused to listen to the ingenious sophistry with which Vigilius attempted to reconcile his solemn judgment with his former opinions. Illyricum, Africa with all her old dauntless pertinacity, even his own clergy revolted against the renegade Pope. He revoked his imprudent concessions, recanted his recantation, and prevailed on the Emperor to summon a Council, in order, it should seem, either to obtain the support of the Council against the Emperor, or to compel the Western bishops to give up their resistance. The Eastern prelates assembled in great numbers at the Council, the Western stood aloof. Vigilius refused to sanction or recognize the Council in the absence of the Western bishops. Justinian, indignant at the delay, promulgated a new edict, condemning the three Chapters in still stronger terms on his own plenary authority. Vigilius assembled as many bishops as he could collect, solemnly protested against the usurpation of ecclesiastical authority, and cut off from his com-

munion all who received the edict. But a Byzantine despot was not to be thus trifled with or boldly bearded in his own capital, and the Eastern bishops refused to hold communion with the successor of St. Peter. Apprehensive of violence, the Pope took refuge in a sanctuary; but neither the Emperor nor his troops were disposed to reverence the sacred right of asylum. They attempted to drag him forth by the feet, he clung to the altar, and being a large and powerful man, the pillars of the baldachin gave way, and the whole fell crumbling upon him.¹ The populace could not behold without compassion these personal outrages, heaped on a venerable ecclesiastic; the imperial officers were obliged to retire and leave Vigilus within the church. He was persuaded, however, on certain terms to leave his sanctuary. Again he suffered, according to rumors propagated in the West, still more barbarous usage; he was said to have been dragged through the city with a rope round his neck, and reproached with his crimes and cruelties, then committed to a common dungeon, and kept on the hardest prison diet, A.D. 552. bread and water. A second time escaped to his sanctuary, and from thence by night fled over the sea to Chalcedon. There he took refuge in the more awful and inviolable sanctuary of Saint Euphemia. The Emperor condescended to capitulate on honorable terms with the Prelate. He revoked his edict, and left the three Chapters to the decrees of the Council. Vigilus had promised to be present at the Council; but dared not confront alone the host of Eastern bishops who com-

¹ Vigilus himself relates the former outrage, but does not mention particularly the other indignities: but he says, "Dum multa mala intolerabilia sæpius pateremur quæ jam omnibus nota esse confidimus."—*Epist. Enycl. apud Labbe, p. 330.*

posed it. The Council, according to the dominant sentiment of the East, renewed the condemnation of the three Chapters. Vigilius with difficulty collected A. D. 553. sixteen Western bishops, issued a protest against the decree, and a Constitution, solemnly acquitting the three Chapters of heresy. The wrath of the Emperor was again kindled; ¹ Vigilius was once more seized and sent in exile to the dreary and solitary rock of Proconnesus. There his courage or his patience failed. Alarming reports reached him, that his name was to be struck out of the diptychs; that orders were preparing for Rome to elect a new bishop. He intimated that now, at length, on more studious examination, he had detected the subtle and latent errors which had so long escaped his impeccable judgment, and was prepared with a Constitution, A. D. 554. condemnatory of those baneful writings. He was recalled to Constantinople, obtained leave, after his full June 7, 554. submission, to return to Rome, but died in Sicily of the stone, before he could reach his see.

Such was the miserable fate of a Pope who came into direct collision with the Imperial despotism of Constantinople. A Prelate of unimpeachable character, uncommitted by base subserviency to the court, and who had not owed his elevation to unworthy means, or one of more firm religious courage, might have escaped some portion of the degradation and contempt endured by Vigilius; but it is impossible not to observe again how much the Papal power owed to the position of Rome. Even its freedom, far more its

¹ Theodorus of Cesarea was the ecclesiastic who ruled the mind of Justinian. See the imperfect anathema and sentence of deposition against him. — Labbe.

authority, arose out of its having ceased to be the seat of Imperial government, and the residence of the Emperor. During the conquest of Italy by the Eastern Emperors, and for some time after, the Pope was not confronted indeed in Rome by a resident Emperor, but summoned at the will of the Emperor to Constantinople, or in Rome rebuked before a victorious general, or an Exarch, who, though he held his court at Ravenna, executed the commands of a sovereign accustomed to dictate, rather than submit to ecclesiastical power. At scarcely any period did the papal authority suffer greater degradation, or were the persons of the Popes reduced to more humiliating subserviency. Nor is this passive humiliation, which, by the patient dignity with which it is endured, may elevate the character of the sufferer; he is mingled up in the intrigues of the court, and contaminated with its base venality. He is hardly more independent or authoritative than the Patriarch of Constantinople.

The successor of Vigilius was Pelagius I. Pelagius had been the legate or ambassador of Vigilius A. D. 556. at the court of Constantinople. He had won the favor of Justinian, and accumulated considerable wealth. He returned to Rome, a short time before it was besieged by Totila; and the wealth, obtained it might seem by doubtful means in the East, was nobly dispensed among the poor and famishing inhabitants of the beleaguered city. Pelagius during the popedom of Vigilius had been employed on the most important services. When the Goths again contested the dominion of Italy, he had undertaken an embassy in the name of the Romans to avert the wrath of Totila; he had been received with stately courtesy, but dismissed

with no concession on the part of the Goth.¹ After the capture of the city, when the victorious Totila entered the church of St. Peter to perform his devotions, he was met again by Pelagius, with the Gospel in his hands. "Have mercy on thy subjects," implored the earnest priest. "Now," tauntingly replied Totila, "you condescend to appear as a suppliant." "God," answered Pelagius, "has made us your subjects, be merciful to us on that account." His calm and submissive demeanor arrested the wrath of the conqueror. Rome owed to his intercession the lives of her citizens, and the chastity of her females. Massacre and violation were arrested; the discipline of the Goths respected the command of their king. Pelagius

A.D. 549. was sent by Totila as his ambassador to Constantinople to demand peace, under the menace, that the Goth, if Justinian persisted in his hostility, would destroy Rome, and put the Senate to the sword.² Pelagius again in Constantinople, adhered as a faithful partisan to Vigilius, with him he resisted the theologic tyranny of Justinian; and, if he did not share his hard usage and exile, was left to neglect and misery. With Vigilius, having shown himself too pliant to the imperial doctrines, he returned to Rome, and on the death of Vigilius, by the command of Justinian, was elevated to the See.³ But now in Rome, all his former benefactions to the city were forgotten in his treacherous abandonment of the orthodoxy of the West, and his servile compliance with the will of the Emperor; he could not assemble from all the reluctant order three

¹ Procop. de Bell. Gothic., iii. 16.

² Procop. de Bell. Gothic., iii. 20.

³ According to Victor Turon, he at first defended, then recalled from exile, condemned the three chapters (ap. Roncagl. ii. 377).

bishops for the ceremonial of his consecra- June 7, 556.
tion; it was performed by two bishops and a presbyter.¹ His favor with Justinian exposed him to worse, doubtless to unjust suspicions. He was accused of having been the instigator in Constantinople of all the cruelties suffered by Vigilius. The monks, many of the clergy, and of the nobility of Rome, withdrew from his communion. Even when Narses reconquered Rome, the avowed protection of the Emperor's victorious representative could not restore the public confidence to Pelagius. The Pope, with the general by his side, went in solemn procession, chanting a Litany, to the Church of St. Peter; and there Pelagius ascended the chancel, and holding above his head the Book of the Gospels, and the Cross, solemnly declared that he had never wrought or suggested any evil against Vigilius. Pelagius added, and to this he demanded the assent of the people, a strong denunciation of all, who from the door-keeper up to the bishop should attempt to obtain any ecclesiastical office by simony.²

Rome, after this expurgation, acquiesced in the rule of her Pontiff. But the Western bishops could not forgive his adhesion to the fifth Council of Constantinople, whose decrees had in some degree impeached those of the great Council of Chalcedon. Even in Italy the bishops of Tuscany would not admit his name into their sacramental liturgy. Pelagius bitterly reproached them with thus yielding to vulgar clamor; by separating themselves from the communion of an Apostolic See they had separated themselves from the communion of all Christendom. But he thought it necessary to declare his unreserved acceptance of all

¹ Victor Turon., apud Roncagl.

² Marcell. Chronic. apud Roncagli.

the four great Councils (maintaining a prudent silence as to the fifth), and the Letter of his predecessor Leo. Whoever should not be content with this declaration, might demand further explanation from the Pope himself. Yet he condemned all that his predecessors had condemned, venerated as orthodox all that they received, especially the saintly prelates, Theodoret and Ibas.¹ The Pope addressed a letter to the whole Christian world, in which, after reasserting his allegiance to the four Councils, he attempted to justify the fifth as in no way impeaching the authority of Chalcedon. A new royal theologian, Childebert, king of the Franks, entered the field, and required a more explicit statement. With this the Pope condescended to comply; he sent his confession of faith to the King, with an admonition to the orthodox sovereign to exercise vigilance over all heretics within his dominions. Still some obstinate dioceses, chiefly of Venetia and Istria, refused communion with all who adhered to the Synod of Constantinople. Pelagius had recourse to the all-powerful Narses to enforce submission; the most refractory, the Bishop of Aquileia and the Bishop of Milan, who had uncanonically consecrated that prelate, were sent prisoners to Constantinople.

On the death of Pelagius,² Rome waited in obsequious submission the permission of the Emperor to July 14, 560. inaugurate her new Pope, John III. The period between the accession of John III. and that of Gregory the Great is among the most barren and obscure in the annals of the papacy. One act of misjudging authority, and one of intercession, are recorded during the pontificate of John. He received, accord-

¹ Mansi. ix. 17.

² Pelagius died 560.

ing to the permission of the Frankish King, Gunthram, the appeal of two bishops, Salonius of Embrun and Sagittarius of Gap,¹ who had been deposed for crimes most unbecoming their order by a synod at Lyons. These were the first Christian bishops who had appeared in arms, the prototypes of the warlike and robber-prelates of later times. The Pope urged their restoration, the King assented: but the reinstated prelates returned to their lawless and unepiscopal courses, and were again degraded by the common indignation.

The act of intercession was more worthy of the head of Western Christendom. The Eunuch Nar- A.D. 552-567. ses had ruled Italy and Rome as Exarch for fifteen years since the conquest, with vigor and justice. Justinian and Theodora had gone to their account; the throne of the East was occupied by Justin the younger. But the province groaned under the rapacity of Narses. Petitions were sent to Constantinople with the significant words, that the yoke of the barbarian Gauls was lighter than this Roman tyranny. Narses was superseded by the Exarch Longinus, insult was added to his degradation. "Let him to his dis-taff," is the speech ascribed to the imperious wife of the Emperor Justin the younger. "I will weave her such a web as she will find it hard to unravel," rejoined the indignant Eunuch. He returned to Naples, from whence he entered into negotiations with the terrible Lombards, who had once already invaded Italy. Revolt, with Narses at its head, threatened the peace of Italy. The Pope undertook an embassy to Naples, appeased the wrathful Eunuch, who return-

¹ Ebrodonum. Vapincum.

ed to Rome, and closed his days as a peaceful subject of the empire.

The few years of the pontificate of Benedict I. were occupied with the miseries of the Lombard invasion. His successor Pelagius II. in those disastrous times was consecrated without awaiting the sanction of the Emperor.¹ Pelagius in vain endeavored to reduce the bishops of the north of Italy to accept the fifth Council of Constantinople. Some who were now under the Lombard dominion paid no regard to his expostulations; a synod at Grado rejected his mandates, and the bishops defied the power of the Exarch, through whom Pelagius sought to awe them to submission. Yet Pelagius, in one respect, maintained all the haughtiness of his See. The Bishop of Constantinople had again assumed the title of Œcumenic Patriarch, the assumption was confirmed by a Council at Constantinople. Pelagius protested against this execrable, sacrilegious, diabolic usurpation: but in Constantinople his invectives made no impression. Pelagius was succeeded by Gregory the Great.

Since the conquest of Italy the Popes had been the humble subjects of the Eastern Emperor. They were appointed, if not directly by his mandate, under his influence. They dared not assume their throne without his permission. The Roman Ordinal of that time declares the election incomplete and invalid till it had received the imperial sanction.² Months elapsed, in the case of Benedict ten months, before the clergy ventured to proceed to the consecration.

¹ Sine jussione Principis, Vit. Pelag. II.

² Compare Schroeck, xvii. p. 236.

Pelagius II. was chosen when Rome was invested by the Lombards; for this ignominious reason he had been consecrated without the consent of the Emperor.

The conquest of Italy by the Greeks was, to a great extent at least, the work of the Catholic clergy. Their impatience under a foreign and an Arian yoke is by no means surprising; nor could they anticipate that the return to Roman dominion would be the worst evil yet endured by Italy. Rome suffered more under the alternate sieges and alternate capture by the Byzantines and the Goths than it had from Alaric or even Genseric, as much perhaps as in its later sieges by Robert Guiscard, and by the Constable Bourbon. The feeble but tyrannical Exarchs soon made Italy regret the just, if oppressive and ungenial rule of the Goths. The overthrow of the Gothic kingdom was to Italy an unmitigated evil. A monarch like Witiges or Totila would soon have repaired the mischiefs caused by the degenerate successors of Theodoric, Athalaric and Theodotus. In their overthrow began the fatal policy of the Roman See, fatal at least to Italy (however, by the aggrandizement of the Roman See, it may have been, up to a certain time, beneficial to northern Christendom), which never would permit a powerful native kingdom to unite Italy, or a very large part of it, under one dominion. Whatever it may have been to Christendom, the Papacy has been the eternal, implacable foe of Italian independence and Italian unity; and so (as far as independence and unity might have given dignity, political weight, and prosperity) to the welfare of Italy. On every occasion the Goths, the Lombards, as later the Normans and the House of Arragon, found their deadliest enemies in the popes. As

now from the East, so then from beyond the Alps, they summoned some more remote potentate, Charlemagne, the Othos, Charles VIII., Charles of Anjou, almost always worse tyrants than those whom they overthrew. From that time servitude, servitude to the stranger, was the doom of Italy. To Rome herself, the foreign sovereign (the tyranny of the Eastern Emperor and his Exarchs was an admonition of what the transalpine emperors might hereafter prove) was hardly less dangerous than a native and indigenious sovereign would have been. And if the papacy had been more confined to its religious power, less tempted or less compelled to assume temporal as well as ecclesiastical supremacy, that power had been immeasurably greater, as less involved in political strife, less exposed to that kind of personal collision with the temporal monarchy, in which a sovereignty which rests on the awe and reverence of men must suffer; it might have maintained its ecclesiastical supremacy over obedient and tributary Christendom, even held as vast possessions on the tenure not of a temporal principedom, but of an ecclesiastical endowment; and thus more entirely ruled the minds of men by confining its authority to that nobler and, for a time at least, more unassailable province.

Rome, jealous of all temporal sovereignty but her own, for centuries yielded up, or rather made Italy a battle field to the Transalpine and the stranger; and at the same time so secularized her own spiritual supremacy as to confound altogether the priest and the politician, to degrade absolutely and almost irrevocably the kingdom of Christ into a kingdom of this world.

CHAPTER V.

CHRISTIAN JURISPRUDENCE.¹

CHRISTIANITY had been now for more than two centuries the established religion of the Roman Empire ; it was the religion of all those independent kingdoms which were forming themselves within the dissevered provinces of Rome. Between the religion and the laws of all nations must subsist an intimate and indissoluble connection. During all that period the vast and august jurisprudence of Rome had been constantly enlarged by new imperial edicts or authoritative decrees, supplementary to, or corrective and interpretative of, the ancient statutes.

I. The jurisprudence of the old Roman Empire at first admitted, but only in a limited degree, this modifying power of Christianity. The laws which were purely Christian were hardly more than accessory and supplementary to the vast code which had accumulated from the days of the republic, through the great lawyers of the empire, down to Theodosius and Justinian. But the complete moral, social, and in some sense political revolution, through Christianity, could not be with-

¹ Let me not be suspected of the vain ambition of emulating Gibbon's splendid chapter on Roman Law, which has become the text-book in universities (see my edition of Gibbon). My object is more narrow and limited; and appeared necessary to the history even of Latin Christianity; to show the interworking of Christianity into the Roman jurisprudence.

out influence, both as creating a necessity for new laws adapted to the present order of things, or as controlling, through the mind of the legislator, the general temper and spirit of the legislation. A Christian Emperor could not exclude this influence from his mind, either as affecting his moral appreciation of certain obligations and transgressions, or as ascertaining and defining the social position, the rights and duties, of new classes and divisions of his subjects. Under Christianity a new order of men of a peculiar character, with special privileges, immunities, and functions, had grown up throughout the whole society; new corporate bodies, the churches and the monasteries, had been formed, holding property of every kind by a new tenure; certain offences in the penal code were now looked on with a milder or more severe aspect; a more strict morality had attempted to knit more closely some of the relations of life; vices which had been tolerated became crimes against social order; and an offence, absolutely new in the extent of odiousness in which it was held, and the rigor with which it was punished, Heresy, or dissent from the dominant religion, in all its various forms, had been introduced into the criminal jurisdiction, not of the Church only, but of the Empire. The imperial legislation could not refuse, it was not inclined to refuse, to take cognizance of this novel order of things, and to adapt itself to the necessities of the age.

II. The Barbaric Codes, which embodied in written statutes the unwritten, immemorial, and traditional laws and usages of the Teutonic tribes (the common law of the German forests), assuming their positive form after the different races had sub-

First effects
of Christian-
ity.

Barbaric
codes.

mitted to Christianity, were more completely interpenetrated, as it were, with Christian influences. The unlettered barbarians willingly accepted the aid of the lettered clergy, still chiefly of Roman birth, to reduce to writing the institutes of their forefathers. Though these codes therefore, in their general character and main principles, are essentially Teutonic — in their broad principles are deduced from the free usages of the old German tribes — yet throughout they are modified by Christian notions, and admit a singular infusion, not merely of the precepts of the New Testament, but of the positive laws of the Old.

But III. Christianity had its own peculiar and special jurisprudence. The Christian community, or rather the separate communities, ^{Christian jurisprudence} had originally exercised this power of internal legislation. They held each its separate tribunal, which adjudicated not only on religious matters, but, as an acknowledged wise and venerated arbitrator, in civil litigation. This legislation and administration of law had gradually become vested in the clergy alone; and, instead of each community ruling its own internal concerns, and presiding over its own separate members, the Church, as chiefly represented by the bishops, either in local or national synods, or in general councils, enacted statutes or canons, considered binding on the whole Christian world. The sanctions of this Christian jurisprudence were properly altogether religious: they rested on opinion, on the voluntary submission of each individual mind to spiritual authority. Their punishments and rewards were properly those of the life to come. The only punishments in this world were those of the penitential discipline, or excommuni-

cation from the Christian society, which was tantamount, with all who believed salvation to be the exclusive privilege of the Church, to a sentence of eternal damnation. Those who braved that disfranchisement — who either, as the Jews, never had entered within the community, or as holding heretical opinions had renounced it — were rightfully beyond its jurisdiction. The legislators and administrators of the laws had lost all cognizance over those upon whose faith or whose fears they had no hold. These were outlaws, who, as they blindly or obstinately disclaimed the inestimable privileges of the Church, could not be amenable at least to its temporal penalties. Unhappily the civil and canon, the Imperial and Christian, legislation would not maintain their respective boundaries. This arose partly from the established constitutional doctrine of Rome, that the Republic (now the Emperor) was the religious as well as the civil head of the Empire; partly from the blindness of Christian zeal, which thought all means lawful to advance the true, or to suppress erroneous, belief; and therefore fell into the irreconcilable contradiction of inflicting temporal penalties by temporal hands for spiritual offences. Athanasius hailed and applauded the full civil supremacy of the state when it commanded the exile of Arius; contested, resisted, branded it as usurping tyranny, when it would exact obedience from himself. Thus, though the Councils were the proper legislative senates of Christianity, so long as the Empire lasted in the West, even later; and in the East down to the latest times; the Emperors enacted and enforced the observation of the ecclesiastical as well as of the civil law. Theodosius and Gratian define or ratify the defi-

Supremacy
of the Em-
peror.

nition of doctrines, declare and condemn heretics. Justinian is a kind of Caliph of Christianity, at once in the authoritative tone and in the subjects which he comprehends under his decrees he is a Pope and an Emperor. In the barbaric codes there is the same absolute supremacy of the sovereign law — in theory the same, but restricted by the more limited royal power, and the peculiar relation of the clergy to tribes newly converted to Christianity. Where there is a strong monarchy, it assumes a dominion scarcely less full and complete than under the Christian Emperors. Charlemagne, in his imperial edicts, is at once the legislator of the Church and of the State.

Thus then in Christendom there are three systems of jurisprudence, the Roman Law, the Barbaric or Teutonic Law, the Law of the Church — Three systems of law. this last, as yet but young, humble and limited in its pretensions, a discipline rather than a law, or confined, in a great degree, to the special observance of the clergy.

I. The Emperor Justinian, having now reunited the Eastern and Western Empires, aspired to be Justinian code. the legislator of the world; on Christendom and on the Roman Empire, according to his notions commensurate, he would bestow a full, complete, indefeasible Code of Law. Of the barbaric codes, if even in their initiatory growth or existence, the Roman law, which still held the whole Roman world to be its proper dominion, would be as disdainfully ignorant, as if they were yet the usages of wild tribes beyond the Rhine or the Danube. Even over the Church or Canonical Jurisprudence it would assert, as will immediately appear, majestic superiority; it would admit, con-

firm, sanction such parts as might demand the supreme imperial intervention, or require imperial authority.

Justinian aspired to consolidate in his eternal legislation all the ancient and modern statutes of the realm. The necessity for a complete and final revisal — an authoritative reconstruction and harmony of the vast mass of republican, senatorial, imperial decrees, or those accredited interpretations of the law which had become law, and were admitted in the courts of justice — had long been acknowledged. The Roman jurisprudence must become a Code; the decisions of the great lawyers must be selected, distributed under proper heads, and rules be laid down for the superiority of some over others. This jurisprudence comprehended unwritten as well as written law. The unwritten were the ancient Roman traditions, and the principles of eternal justice. The sources of the written law were the XII Tables, the Laws of the Republic, whether *Senatus-Consults* or *Plebiscites*, the decrees of the Emperors, the edicts of the *Prætors*, and the answers of the learned in the law.¹ Already attempts had been made to systematize this vast, multifarious, and comprehensive jurisprudence in the *Gregorian*, *Hermogenian*, and finally the *Theodosian codes*. But the enormous mass of laws which had still accumulated, the conflicting decisions of the lawyers, the oppugnance of the laws themselves, seemed to demand this ultimate organization of the whole; and in *Tribonian* and his *Byzantine lawyers*, Justinian supposed that he possessed the wisdom, in himself the power and authority, to establish forever the jurisprudence of Rome.

¹ *Responsa prudentum*.

But the change which has come over the Roman Empire is manifest at once. That Justinian ^{Justinian a Christian emperor.} is a Christian Emperor appears in the front of his jurisprudence. Before the august temple of the Roman law, there is, as it were, a vestibule, in which the Emperor seats himself as the religious legislator of the world in its new relation towards God. The Christian Emperor treats all mankind as his subjects, in their religious as well as in their civil capacity. The Emperor's creed, as well as his edicts, is the universal law of the Empire. That which was accessory in the code of the former Christian Emperors, and in the Theodosian code fills two supplementary books, stands in the front, and forms the Preface to that of Justinian. His code opens with the Imperial Creed on the Trinity, and the Imperial Anathema against Nestorius, Eutyches, Apollinarius. Justinian declares indeed that he holds the doctrine of the Church, of the Apostles and their successors. He recognizes the authority of the four great Councils. He even acknowledges the supremacy of the Roman Church, and commands all Churches to be united with her. At the time of the publication of the code, John III. was Bishop of Rome; but he had been appointed under the Exarch, his inauguration had submissively awaited the Emperor's approbation. Rome therefore, it was hoped, had become, notwithstanding the rapid advance of the Lombards, an integral, an inseparable part of the Empire. Justinian legislates therefore for Rome as for the East. But though the Emperor condescends thus to justify the orthodoxy of his creed, it is altogether of his absolute, uncontrolled, undisputed will that it is law. It might seem indeed that the clergy were the subjects, as first in rank,

whose offices, even whose lives, must first be regulated by imperial legislation.

In the following chapters the appointment, the organization, the subordination, the authority of the ecclesiastical, as of the civil magistrates of the realm, is assumed to emanate from, to be granted, limited, prescribed by, the supreme Emperor. Excommunication is uttered indeed by the ecclesiastics, but according to the imperial laws and with the imperial warrant. He deigns indeed to allow the canons of the Church to be of not less equal authority than his laws; but his laws are divine, and those divine laws all metropolitans, bishops, and clergy are bound to obey, and, if commanded, to publish.¹ The hierarchy is regulated by his ordinance. He enacts the superiority of the Metropolitan over the bishop, of the bishop over the abbot, of the abbot over the monk. Distinct imperial laws rule the monasteries. The law prescribes the ordinations of bishops, the persons qualified for ordination,² the whole form and process of that holy ceremony. The law admitted no immunities in the Clergy for crimes committed against the state and against society. It took upon itself the severe superintendence of clerical morals. The passion for theatrical amusements, for the wild excitement of the horse-race and the combat with wild beasts, or even more licentious entertainments, had carried away many of the clergy, even of the bishops. A law, more than once reënacted and modified, while it acknowledged the power of the cler-

¹ Τοὺς δὲ θειοὺς κανόνας οὐκ ἔλαττον τῶν νόμων ἰσχύειν καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι βούλονται νόμοι. — Cod. ii. 3, 44. They are to publish τὸν θεῖον ἡμῶν τοῦτον νόμον. — Cod. ii. 3, 43.

² Especially Nov. cxxiii.; it assesses the fees to be paid on each promotion.

gy's prayers to obtain victory over the barbarians, and to obtain from Heaven extended empire, declared that for this reason they should be unimpeachable. But, notwithstanding the most solemn admonition, they could not be persuaded, not even the bishops, to abstain from the gaming-table, or the theatre with all its blasphemies and license. The Emperor was compelled to pass this law, prohibiting, under pain of suspension for the first offence, of irrevocable degradation and servitude¹ to the public corporations, any one of the clergy, of any rank, from being present at the gaming-table or at any public spectacle. These penalties, with other religious punishments, as fastings, were to be inflicted, according to the rank of the offender, by the bishop or the metropolitan. The refusal to punish, or the endeavor to conceal, such offences made both the civil officers and ecclesiastics liable to civil as well as to ecclesiastical penalties.

The Bishop was an imperial officer for certain temporal affairs. In each city he was appointed, with three of the chief citizens, annually to inspect the public accounts, and all possessions or bequests made for public works, markets, aqueducts, baths, walls and gates, and bridges. Before him guardians of lunatics swore on the Gospels to administer their trust with fidelity,² and many legal acts might be performed either in the presence of the Defensor or the bishop of the city.³ For the discharge of these temporal functions the bishops were reasonably answerable to the Emperor; and thus the empire acknowledged at

¹ Δουλεύειν. — Cod. i. 14, 34.

² Cod. i. 4, 27.

³ De Episcop. Audient.

the inspiration of Christianity a new order of magistracy.

The law limited the number of clergy to be attached to each Church. This constitution was demanded in order to check that multiplication of the clergy which exhausted the revenues of the Church, and led to burdensome debts. In the great Church at Constantinople the numbers were to be reduced to 425, besides 100 ostiarii.¹ The smaller churches were on no account to have more than they could maintain.

The State issued laws for the regulation of monasteries. None were to be established without the consent of the Bishop. The Bishop elected the superior from the community. Slaves might be admitted as well as freemen. A probation of three years was required from all. A slave, if a runaway or thief, might be claimed by his master during those three years. When a monk, he could no longer be claimed, unless he abandoned the monastic life. All were to live in common, to sleep in one chamber. If a monk wished to leave his monastery he went forth a beggar; the monastery retained all his property. If he entered into the army, it could only be into the lowest rank. No monk could leave one monastery for another.²

¹ 60 presbyters, 100 male 40 female deacons, 90 subdeacons, 110 readers, 25 singers. — Novell. iii. There is a curious law concerning interments in Constantinople. 1000 shops, or their rent, seem to have been bestowed on the church for the burial of the poor; they had a bier and the attendance of the clergy without charge. The rich paid according to their means and will; there was a fixed payment for certain more splendid biers and more solemn attendance. — Novell. xciii.

² The Institutes acknowledge the Bishop, with the Defensor, to have certain powers of appointing guardians. — i. 20, 5. Justinian speaks of the modesty of his times. — i. 22, 1. Two clauses (2, i. 8, 9) relate to churches, &c., iii. 28, 7. Churches named. — iv. 18, 8. Rape of nuns made a capital crime.

Such were the all-comprehending ecclesiastical laws which the Emperor claimed the power to enact. In many cases he commanded or limited the anathema or the interdict. The obedient world, including the Church, acknowledged, at least by submissive obedience, this imperial supremacy.

It is not till Justinian has thus, as it were, fulfilled his divine mission of legislating for his subjects as Christians, that he assumes his proper function, his legislation for them as Romans, and proceeds to his earthly task, the consolidation of the ancient and modern statutes of the Empire.

But the legislation of Justinian, as far as it was original, in his Code, his Pandects, and in his Institutions, within its civil domain, was still almost exclusively Roman. It might seem that

Roman law
purely
Roman.

Christianity could hardly penetrate into the solid and well-compacted body of Roman law; or rather, the immutable principles of justice had been so clearly discerned by the inflexible rectitude of the Roman mind, so sagaciously applied by the wisdom of her great lawyers, that Christianity was content to acquiesce in those statutes, which even she might, excepting in some respects, despair of rendering more equitable. Christianity, in the Roman Empire, had entered into a temporal polity, with all its institutions long settled, its laws already framed. The Christians had in their primitive state no natural place in the order of things. That separate authority which the Church exercised over the members of its own community from its origin, and without which the loosest form of society cannot subsist, was in no way recognized by the civil power; they were the voluntary laws of a voluntary

association. But, besides these special laws of their own, the Christians were in every respect subjects of the Empire. They were strangers in religion alone. After the comprehensive decree of Caracalla, they, like the rest of mankind within the pale of the Empire, became Roman citizens; and the supremacy of the State in all things which did not concern the vital principles of their religion (for which they were still bound, if the civil power should exercise compulsion, to suffer martyrdom) was acknowledged, both in the West and in the East, both before and after the conversion of Constantine.

The influence therefore of Christianity on the older laws of the Roman Empire could only be exercised through the mind of the legislator, now become Christian; and the general moral sentiment, which became more pure or elevated, might modify, and gradually mitigate, some provisions, or more rigidly enforce certain obligations. The Roman law, in its original code, might seem indeed to take a pride in resting upon its antiquity and its purely Roman character; it admits not the language, it appears even to affect a supercilious ignorance of the religion, of the people.¹ In the *Institutes* of Justinian² it requires keen observation to detect the Christianity of the legislator. Tribonian, the great lawyer, to whom the vast work of framing the whole jurisprudence was committed by the Em-

¹ There are several quotations from Homer, not one allusion to any of the sacred writings of Christianity.

² The *Institutes* are without those prefatory chapters of Christian legislation contained in the Code. From those chapters we pass into the Roman Code, as into another land; and it demands our closest attention to discern how far, now that he has abandoned all the language of Christianity, the spirit of the religion follows the emperor into the ancient realm.

peror, has incurred the suspicion of atheism, an accusation which, just or not, is strong evidence that his work had refused to incorporate any of the statutes, and bore no signs of Christianity. The prefatory Christian laws, though now become fundamental, are altogether extraneous to the old reënacted system. They are recorded laws before Tribonian assumes his functions.

The Roman Law may be most conveniently considered, in connection with the influence of Christianity, as it regards A. Persons; B. Property; and C. Crime.¹

A. The law as regards Persons comprehends the ranks and divisions, and the relations of mankind to each other, sanctioned or recognized by the law, with the privileges, rights, and immunities it may grant, the duties it may impose on each. In nothing is the stern and Roman character of the Justinian Code more manifest than in its full recognition of slavery. Throughout, the broad distinction of mankind into freemen and slaves is the unquestioned, admitted groundwork of legislation. It declares indeed the natural equality of man, and so far is in advance of the doctrine which prevailed in the time of Aristotle, and is vindicated by that philosopher, that certain races or classes of men are pronounced by the unanswerable voice of nature, by their physical and intellectual inferiority, as designed for and irrevocably doomed to servitude. But this natural equality is absolutely and entirely forfeited by certain acknowledged disqualifications for freedom, by captivity in war, self

¹ This in some degree differs from the division adopted by many writers from the Institutes of Justinian, under which the criminal law ranks as a branch of the law of actions or obligations.

vention into slavery, or servile descent. Christianity had indeed exalted the slave to spiritual equality, as having the same title to the blessings, consolations, and promises of the Gospel, as capable of practising all Christian virtues, and therefore of obtaining the Christian's reward. This religious elevation could not be without influence, besides the more generous humanity to which it would soften the master, on their temporal and social position. It took them out of the class of brute beasts or inanimate things, to be transferred like cattle or other goods from one master to another, which the owner might damage or destroy with as much impunity as any other property ; and placed them in that of human beings, equally under the care of Divine Providence, and gifted with the same immortality. But the legislation of the Christian Emperor went no further. It makes no claim to higher humanity ; it does not attempt to despoil the pagan Emperors of the praise due to the first step made in that direction. It ascribes to the heathen sovereign, Antoninus, the great change which had placed the life of the slave under the protection of the law. Even his punishment was then restricted by legislative enactment.¹ But the abrogation of slavery was not contemplated even as a remote possibility. A general enfranchisement seems never to have dawned on the wisest and best of the Christian writers, notwithstanding the greater facility for manumission, and the sanctity, as it were, assigned to the act by Constantine, by placing it under the special superintendence of the clergy.

The law of Justinian gave indeed, or recognized, a

¹ Caius, i. 53 ; Just. Instit. i. viii. 2. Constantine, in 312, had enlarged this law. — C. Theod. de emend. serv., l. 9, 1.

greater value in the life of the slave. The edict of Antoninus had declared the master who killed his own slave without cause, liable to the same penalty as if he killed the slave of another.¹ The Code of Justinian ratified the law of Constantine, which made it homicide to kill a slave with malice aforethought; and it describes certain modes of barbarous punishment, by which, if death follows, that guilt is incurred.² The Code confirms the law of Claudius against the abandonment of sick and useless slaves; it enjoins the master to send them to the public hospitals. These hospitals were open to slaves as well as to poor freemen. "In these times, and under our empire," writes Justinian, "no one must be permitted to exercise unlawful cruelty against a slave." The motive, however, for this was not evangelic humanity, but the public good, which was infringed if any man ill-used his property.³

But while it protected the life, to a certain extent the person, of the slave, it asserted as sternly as ever his inferior condition. He was the property of his master. Whoever became a slave lost all power over his children.⁴ His testimony could be received against his master only in cases of high treason. His union with his wife was still only concubinage, not marriage.⁵ The slave had no remedy for adultery before the tribunals; it was left to the master to punish the offence. A free woman who had unlawful connection

¹ Caius, i. 53.

² Cod. Just. ix. 14.

³ "Expedit enim reipublicæ, ne quis *re suâ* utatur male." — Instit. i. viii.

⁴ Instit. i. 16, and ii. 9, 3. Cod. ix. 1, 20.

⁵ Contubernium, not connubium.

with her slave, according to the law of Constantine, not, as it seems, repealed by Justinian, was to be put to death, the slave to be burned alive. But the law of Constantine, confirmed in the West by Anthemius, which prohibited the union of a freeman and a slave, at least a freeman of a certain rank, under the penalty of exile and confiscation of goods, and condemned the female to the mines, appears to have been mitigated; at least the law of Claudius, which condemned the free-woman who married a slave to servitude, was tempered to a sentence of separation. In the old Roman society in the Eastern Empire this distinction between the marriage of the freeman and the concubinage of the slave was long recognized by Christianity itself. These unions were not blessed, as the marriages of their superiors had soon begun to be, by the Church.¹ Basil the Macedonian² first enacted that the priestly benediction should hallow the marriage of the slave; but the authority of the Emperor was counteracted by the deep-rooted prejudices of centuries. Later laws appear to have attempted the reconciliation of the Christian privilege with the social distinction. The marriages of slaves were to be celebrated in the Church; slaves and freemen were to receive the same nuptial benediction, without conferring freedom on the slave.³ As late as the thirteenth century a mandate of Nicetas, archbishop of Thessalonica, excommunicates masters who refuse to allow their slaves to be married in the Church.

¹ It was thought that the marriage before the church would of itself confer civil freedom. — Biot, sur l'Esclavage, p. 146.

² A.D. 867–886.

³ Constitut. Imp. xi. Jus Gr. Roman. i. p. 145. Biot, p. 213.

The trade in slaves was still a principal and recognized branch of commerce. Man was a marketable commodity. The whole code of Justinian speaks of the slave as bearing a certain appreciable value, to be held by the same tenure, transferred by the same form, as other property. It was the weakness of Rome, not her humanity or her Christianity, which, by ceasing to supply the markets with hordes of conquered barbarians, diminished the trade; and Roman citizens were sold, with utter disregard of their haughty privileges, by barbarian or Jewish slave-venders. Throughout Greek and Latin Christendom, however the Church, by its precept and example, might rank the redemption of Christian slaves from bondage as a high virtue, the purchase and the sale of men, as property transferred from vendor to buyer, was recognized as a legal transaction of the same validity with the sale of other property, land, or cattle.

The Christian family, in its more restricted sense, comprehending the relations of husband and wife, of parent and children, had been the centre from which the Gospel worked outwards with all its beneficent energy on society. But Christianity, conscious of its more profound and extensive influence on morals, was in most respects content to rest without intruding into the province of laws.¹ It superadded its own sanctity to the dignity with which marriage had been arrayed by the older Roman law: it superadded its own tenderness to that mitigation of the arbitrary parental power with which the

¹ See throughout this chapter—the Codes, Pandects, and Institutes. Of modern works, Gibbon's celebrated chapter, with Warnkönig's notes; Ferdinand Walter, *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts*, pp. 332 *et seq.*

more humane habits of later times, and the wisdom of the great lawyers, had controlled the despotism of the Roman father. The Roman definition of marriage might almost satisfy the lofty demands of Christianity. Matrimony is the union of man and woman, constraining them to an inseparable cohabitation.¹ Polygamy had been prohibited by the Prætorian Edict with a distinct severity not to be found in the New Testament.² Marriage, in the oldest Roman law, was a religious rite. The purchase of the wife, the partaking of food together,³ took place in the presence of the pontiffs. These ceremonials were at no time absolutely necessary; but even, under the Republic, marriage was altogether, as to its validity, a civil contract. With the Christians marriage had resumed a more solemn religious character. Certain forms of espousals or of wedlock are among the most unquestionable usages of the earliest Christian antiquity. On marriage the Christian is taught to take counsel of the bishop.⁴ Some kind of benediction in the Church, or

¹ "Nuptiæ autem sive matrimonium est viri et mulieris conjunctio, *individuum* vitæ consuetudinem continens." — Instit. i. ix. 1.

² "Neminem qui sub ditione sit Romani nominis binas uxores habere posse vulgo patet; cum etiam in *Edicto Prætoris* hujusmodi viri infamia notati sint: quam rem competens judex inultam esse non patietur." — Cod. v. tit. 5, 2. The silence of the New Testament as to polygamy, excepting in the doubtful text about the bishop, has been the subject of much learned contest and inquiry. The desuetude into which it had fallen among the Jews, and its prohibition by Roman manners, if not by Roman laws, accounts for this silence, in my opinion most fully, considering the popular character of our Lord's teaching and that of his apostles.

³ *Coemptio et confarreatio*. — The *confarreatio* was the more solemn form of marriage, and could only be annulled by certain tremendous rites, which represented as it were the death of the contracting parties. — Festus, *Deconfarreatio*. It had fallen into disuse with the extinction of the older families. The other two forms of marriage-contract were *coemptio* and *usus*.

⁴ Ignat. Epist. ad Polycarp. This passage is found in Mr. Cureton's Syriac version.

in the presence of the community, gave its peculiar holiness to the marriage ceremony.¹ Christianity did not decline some of the gayer and more innocent usages of Jewish and heathen marriages — the crowns, the ring, the veil of the virgin. Still, the Christian might hallow his union by the benediction of the Church; the betrothal or the espousals might take place in the presence of the religious community;² yet the Roman citizen was bound only by the civil contract. On this alone depended the validity of the marriage, the legitimacy and right of succession in the children. The Church, or the clergy representing the Church, had no jurisdiction in matrimonial questions till after the legislation of Justinian. It was never perfect and supreme in the East; in the West it grew up gradually with the all-absorbing sacerdotal power.

As to incestuous marriages, marriages within the more intimate degrees of relationship, Christianity might repose upon the rigor of the Roman law.³ There was no necessity to recur to ^{Prohibited degrees.} the books of Moses. That law prohibited the union of brothers with sisters, of uncles and aunts with nephews and nieces: it did not proscribe that of cousins german.⁴ The Roman law extended this prohibition

¹ Tertull. ad Uxor. ii. c. 2-9; de Monogam. c. 11. "Unde sufficimus ad enarrandam felicitatem ejus matrimonii, quod ecclesia conciliat, et confirmat oblatio, et obsignat benedictio," &c. &c.: compare Augusti, Denkwürdigkeiten, x. p. 288.

² This was a voluntary rite, superinduced by Christian manners upon the law of the realm.

³ On forbidden marriages, Gaius i. 53-62; Ulpian, v. 6; Collat. Leg. Mosaic. vi. 4-17; J. C. de Nupt. 5, 4, 1 to 5.

⁴ Plutarch, Quæst. Rom. 6; Cicer. pro Cluent. 5; Capitol. M. Antonin. The Emperors Arcadius and Honorius married their cousins. Instit. i. x. The old law (Caius, Instit. p. 27) allowed a man to marry his niece on the brother's, not on the sister's, side. The Emperor Claudius availed himself

to connections formed by affinity and by adoption. Connections formed by marriage were as sacred as those of natural kindred, and an union with an adopted brother or sister was as inflexibly forbidden as in the case of blood.

But of the few passages in the Code of Justinian which reveal the Christian legislator, that extraordinary one stands out in peculiar contrast, which extends the prohibited degrees to spiritual relationship. But the manner, almost as it were furtive, in which this prohibition is introduced, shows how it grew out of the existing state of Roman feeling. The jealous law had prohibited, besides the incestuous degrees of relationship, the union of a guardian, or the son of a guardian, with his ward.¹ But a man might marry an alumna whom he had educated as a slave, but to whom he had afterwards granted liberty.² The education as a slave implied that he had not towards her the affection of a parent. No one, however, would be so impious as to marry one whom he had brought up in his house as a daughter. On this principle it was that, whether brought up in his family or not, the sponsorship in baptism implied an affection so tender and parental as to render such a marriage unholy.

of this privilege. The Roman law, in fact, was not greatly extended by the canon law, the prohibitory degrees of which are summed up in these lines,—

*Nata, soror, neptis, matertera patris, et uxor,
Et patris conjux, mater, privigni, noverca,
Uxorisque soror, privigni nata, nurusque,
Atque soror patris conjungi lege vetantur.*

¹ Cod. Justin. v. 6, 1 et 7.

² Cod. Justin. v. 4, 26. There were other civil prohibitions: marriage of freeman with slave (see above), with a freed man or woman, by the Julian law confined to senators and their children (Inst. 16, de Sponsal.; Justinian Cod. de Nupt. 28, 5, 4), of senators with actors (Ulpian, xiii. 1, xvi. 2) or persons of infamous occupations, &c. &c. — See Walter, p. 539.

Roman pride and rigid Christian morality would concur in some of those prohibitions which interdicted free Romans from certain degrading or disreputable marriages. There could be no marriages with slaves: children born from that concubinage were servile. The Emperor Valentinian further defined low and abject persons who might not aspire to lawful union with freemen — actresses, daughters of actresses, tavern-keepers, the daughters of tavern-keepers, procurers (lenones) or gladiators, or those who had kept a public shop.¹

The Roman law had gradually expanded from that exclusive patrician haughtiness which would not recognize the marriage with plebeians: it had admitted unions between all of Roman birth; but till Roman citizenship had been imparted to the whole Roman Empire, it would not acknowledge marriage with barbarians to be more than concubinage. Cleopatra was called only in scorn the wife of Antony. Berenice might not presume to be more than the mistress of Titus. The Christian world closed marriages again within still more and more jealous limits. Interdictory statutes declared marriages with Jews and heathens not only invalid but adulterous. The Councils condemned marriages with heretics in terms almost of equal rigor. The legislature was silent; though Manicheans especially, being outcasts by the law, marriages with them must have been of questionable validity.²

¹ All this, however, was in the spirit of the ancient Roman law.

² Cod. Theodos. iii. 7, 2, ix. 7, 5, xvi. viii. 6; Cod. Justin. i. 9, 6. These laws, in the time of Augustine and Jerome, were by no means unnecessary. "At nunc pleræque contemnentes apostoli jussionem, junguntur gentiibus et templa Christi idolis prostituunt, nec intelligunt se corporis ejus partem esse cujus et costæ sunt." — Hieron. In Jovin. i. 10: compare Augustin.

Yet, however lofty the theory of the Roman lawyers as to the sanctity and perpetual obligation of marriage, it was practically annulled by the admitted right and by the inveterate usage of divorce. It was a contract which either party might dissolve, almost without alleged cause. In the older law, the wife being, like the rest of his family, the property of the husband, he might dismiss her at any time from his service. Even the law of the Twelve Tables admitted divorce. But the severer morals of the older Republic disdained to assert this privilege. The sixth century of Roman greatness is said to have begun, before the public feeling was shocked by the repudiation of a virtuous but barren wife by Spurius Carvilius Ruga.¹ But in the later Republic the frequency of divorce was at once the sign, the cause, and the consequence of the rapid depravation of morals. Paulus Æmilius discarded the beautiful Papiria with a scornful refusal to assign any reason.² Cato, Cicero, exchanged or dismissed their wives. And the wives were not behind their husbands in vindicating their equal rights. Paula Valeria repudiated her husband without cause to become the wife of Decimus Brutus.³ Augustus might endeavor by laws and by immunities to compel or allure the reluctant aristocracy of Rome to marriage; he might limit divorce by statute:⁴ but his example more

de fid. et oper. c. 19. They gradually, as heathenism expired, became less denunciatory against such marriages, but maintained and even increased their rigor against Jewish connections. — Concil. Laodic. x.; but add xxxi.; Concil. Agath. lxxvii.; Concil. Arelat. xi.; Illiber. xvi. xvii.

¹ Dion. Hal. ii. 93; Val. Max. ii. 1; Aulus Gellius. iv. 3. Plutarch in Numâ.

² "My shoes are new and well-made, but no one knows where they pinch me." — Plutarch. Vit. Paul. Æmil.

³ Cic. ad Fam.

⁴ See the lex Papia Poppæa.

powerfully counteracted his own laws. He compelled the husband of Livia to divorce her during a state of pregnancy, and by marrying her became the father of a doubtful offspring. Mæcenas changed his wives as he changed his dress.¹ Seneca, in his lofty Stoic morality, declares that the noble women of Rome calculated the year not by the Consuls, but by their husbands.² Juvenal, in the bitterness of his satire, might describe the husband discarding his wife for the slightest infirmity;³ Martial might point an epigram against these legal adulteries;⁴ and all these writers might dwell, and with licensed exaggeration, only, or principally, on the manners of the capital and those of the higher orders; but throughout the Roman world there can be no doubt that this dissolution of those bonds which unite the family was the corroding plague of Roman society. Christianity must have subjugated public feeling to a great extent; it must have overawed, and softened, and rendered attractive the marriage state by countless examples in every part of the Empire (like that so beautifully described by Tertullian),⁵ far more than by its monastic notions of the superior dignity of virginity, before even Constantine could venture on his prohibitory law against divorce. Marriage was absolutely annulled by three causes, retirement to a monas-

¹ "Qui uxorem millies duxit." Such is the hyperbole of Seneca, who hated, perhaps because he envied, the memory of Mæcenas. "Quotidiana repudia." — De Provid. c. 3.

² Senec. de Benef. iii. 16.

³ Conlige sarcinulas, dicet libertus, et exi;
Jam gravis es nobis, et sæpe emungeris; exi
Ocius et propera: sicco venit altera naso.

Sat. vi. 146.

⁴ "Quæ nubit toties, non nubit, adultera lege est." — vi. 7.

⁵ Ad uxor. ii. c. 9.

tic life, impotence, and captivity. The period at which captivity dissolved the tie, and permitted the husband or the wife to marry again, was differently defined in successive statutes. The divorce law of Constantine limited repudiation to three causes: against the husband, if he was a homicide, a magician, a violator of tombs.¹ In either of these cases the wife recovered her dowry. If she sued for a divorce for any other cause, she forfeited her dowry, her jewels, even to the bodkin of her hair, and was sentenced to deportation into a desert island. Against the wife the three crimes were adultery, witchcraft, or acting as procuress. If the husband repudiated her for one of these causes he retained the dowry; if for any other the penalty was the forfeiture of the dowry. If he married again, the repudiated wife might enter his house and seize the dowry of the new bride. But the severity of this law was mitigated by Honorius,² its penalties abrogated by Theodosius the younger. This law, which is recited in the Code and in the *Novellæ* of Justinian, adds to the causes which justify divorce: on the part of the wife, if the husband is guilty of adultery, high treason, or forgery, sacrilege, pillage of churches, robbery or harboring robbers, cattle-driving, man-stealing, having, to the disgrace of his family, connection with loose women in the sight of his wife, attempting her life by poison or violence, or scourging her in a manner insupportable to a freewoman. On the part of the husband, besides all these, frequenting the banquets of strangers without his knowledge or consent, passing the night

¹ Cod. Theod. de repud. iii. xvi.

² Novell. xvii. de repudiis ad calc. cod. Theodos. Ritter observes that the constitutions were not annulled by this edict, only the penalties.

abroad without just cause or permission, or indulging in the Circus, the theatre, or the amphitheatre, without his leave.¹

The legislation of Justinian is obviously embarrassed with the difficulty of the question of repudiation: it reënacts, but with some hesitation, the severe statutes of Theodosius: a succession of new laws explains, restricts, or confirms the plainer language of the Code. Justinian, indeed, first extended the penalties of the laws against divorce to cases of marriage without dower: if the husband repudiated an undowered wife without just cause, he forfeited to her one fourth of his property.² But the successor of Justinian was compelled to sweep away all these provisions, and to restore the liberty of divorce by mutual consent. The Emperor, as the law declares, was beset by complaints and remonstrances, that inextinguishable hatred was implanted in families by these restrictions, that secret poisonings would become common: he resisted long, but was compelled to yield to the general clamor. The manners of Constantinople, perhaps of the Roman world, triumphed over the severer authority of the Church.

Concubinage, a kind of inferior marriage, of which the issue were natural children not bastards, *Concubinage.* had been, to a certain extent, legalized by Augustus. The Christian Emperors endeavored to give something of the dignity of legitimate marriage to this union, by enlarging the rights of natural children to succession; but in the East it was not abolished, as a legal union,

¹ Cod. v. xvii.; Pandects, xxiv. ii.; Novellæ, xxii. cxvii. cxxxiv. The Institutes avoid the subject.

² Cod. v. xvii. ii. To the first causes were added, endeavor to procure abortion, and indecent bathing in the public baths with men.

till the time of Leo the Philosopher; in the West it was perpetuated by the pride of the conquering races, and in some respects by the practice of the clergy themselves to a much later period.¹

That primeval constitution of Roman society, which made each family a little state, with its peculiar sacrifices and peculiar jurisdiction, of which the father was Priest and King, had long fallen into disuse. The parental power, in theory absolute, had been limited by public feeling and long desuetude. Even under the old republic, Brutus and Manlius were magistrates and generals as well as fathers; the execution of their sons was a sacrifice to Roman liberty and to Roman discipline, not an exertion of parental authority. Erixo, a Roman knight in the time of Seneca, whose son died under his chastisement, was pursued through the forum by the infuriated people.² Alexander Severus limited the parental power by law. It was well perhaps for human nature that this change had taken place before the promulgation of Christianity. It was spared those domestic martyrdoms which might have taken place in many families. For that which the divine wisdom of its founder had foreshown was inevitable. Youth, in its prospective ardor, would be more prone to accept the new religion, than age, rigidly attached to ancient and established usages. It is the constant reproach, with which the apologists of Christianity have to contend, that it nurtured filial disobedience, and taught children to revolt against the authority of parents.³ But this conflict was over long

Parental
power.

¹ Ducange, art. *Concubina*.

² Seneca de *Clement.* i. 14.

³ Tertull. *Apologet.* c. 3; Origen contra *Cels.*; Hieronym. *Epist. ad Lætam.*

before Christianity entered into Roman legislation. The life of the child was as sacred as that of the parent; and Constantine, when he branded the murder of a son with the name of parricide, hardly advanced upon the dominant feeling. Some power remained of moderate chastisement, but even this was liable to the control of law. Disinheritance remained the only penalty which the father could arbitrarily inflict upon the son; for by degrees that absolute possession of all the property of the son which of old belonged to the father had been limited. The peculium over which full power was vested in the son was extended by Augustus, Trajan, and Hadrian to all which he might acquire in military service, even to captives who became his slaves, to be disposed of by gift or will; by Constantine and later Emperors to all emoluments obtained in civil employments; by Justinian to the inheritance, in certain cases, of the mother's property.

Infanticide was thus a crime by law, but the sale and exposure of children, the most obstinate *Infanticide*. vestige of the arbitrary parental power, aggravated by the increasing misery of the times, still contended with the humane severity of the laws, and the fervent denunciations of the Christian teachers.¹ The sale of children was prohibited by law, yet prevailed to late times. The Emperor Trajan had declared that a free-born child, exposed by its parents and brought up by a stranger, did not forfeit its liberty.² The Christian Emperor first declared exposure of infants a crime;³

¹ Athenagor. Apologet. Tertullian, Apologet. 9; Lactantius, D. I. vi. 20.

² Pliny, Epist. x. 7.

³ The Cod. Justin. iv. 43, 1, confirmed the declaration of the law by Diocletian. "Liberos a parentibus neque venditionis neque donationis titulo, aequè pignoris jure, aut alio quolibet modo, nec sub prætextu ignorantie

at the same time he declared the children of such poor parents as should be unable to nourish them, children of the state, to be clothed and supported by the public treasury. This vast poor law could not have been carried into effect, or was necessarily modified by new laws, providing for children thus exposed. The stranger who took up such child and maintained it, might, according to a law of Theodosius the Great, bring it up as his own son, or as his slave. The father who had exposed his child, having abandoned his paternal power, could not reclaim it; he, however, who had sold his child through poverty might redeem it by paying the same price, or replacing it by another slave. But one of Justinian's supplementary laws both shows the unrepressed frequency of the practice, and by its strong language the profound sense of its inhumanity. It was now the custom to leave the children not merely in the streets, but in the churches, in order, no doubt, to appeal to the kindness of the clergy and the more pious worshippers. If, says the law, worn-out slaves, who are exposed by their masters, obtain their freedom, how much the rather freeborn infants? But, as if aware that this was rather a penalty on the charitable person, who might undertake the care of such children (for whom it might be better to be brought up as slaves than left to perish), condign punishment is threatened, it is to be presumed the penalty for murder, against the guilty parties. It is probable, however, that the practices though not so clearly trace-

accipientes, in alium transferri posse, manifestissimi juris est." Yet in the life of Paphnutus by Jerome we read: "*Mihi est maritus qui fiscalis debiti gratiâ, suspensus est et flagellatus, ac pœnis omnibus cruciatus, servatur in carcere. Tres autem nobis filii fuerunt, qui pro ejusdem debiti necessitate distracti sunt.*"

able, expired but slowly in the East; in the West it still required the decrees of Councils and the edicts of sovereigns to extirpate this pertinacious crime.¹

B. Christianity made no change in the tenure or succession to property. The Christian churches succeeded to that sanctity which the ancient law ^{Law of} had attributed to the temples; as soon as they ^{property.} were consecrated they became public property, and could not be alienated to any other use. The ground itself was hallowed, and remained so even after the temple had been destroyed. This was an axiom of the heathen Papinian.² Gifts to temples were alike inalienable, nor could they be pledged; the exception in the Justinian code betrays at once the decline of the Roman power, and the silent progress of Christian humanity. They could be sold or pledged for the redemption of captives, a purpose which the old Roman law would have disdained to contemplate.³ The burial of the dead made ground holy. This consecration might be made by any private person; but a public burial-ground became, in a certain sense, public property.⁴

The great law of Constantine, which enabled the

¹ Capit. vi. c. 142; Decret. Gregor. de exposit. lib. ii. 971, 972, 973.

² Instit. ii. 1, 8. Papinian lived under the reign of Severus.

³ Property might be bequeathed in general terms for the redemption of captives. c. i. 3, 48.

⁴ Instit. ii. 1, 9. If the owner gave consent, a body might be interred in any ground, which thereby became sacred; if the owner afterwards wished to withdraw his consent, he could not: his right was lost in the sanctity of the ground. Paolo Sarpi supposes, but quotes no authority, that the churches had even before Constantine received lands by bequest, but contrary to law. They were confiscated by Diocletian. The following is a law of Diocletian and Maximian, A.D. 290: "Collegium, si nullo speciali privilegio subnixum sit, hæreditatem capere non posse, dubium non est." — C. 8 de hæred. instit.; Sarpi Opere, iv. 71.

Christian churches to receive gifts and bequests, was but an extension or transference of the right belonging to heathen temples¹ and priesthoods, many of which were endowed with large estates.² Even during the reign of Constantine some parts of the estates of the heathen temples were made over to the Christians; but the private offerings of the faithful, by donation and by will, poured in with boundless prodigality. Already *hæridipety*, seeking inheritances by undue means, is branded as an ecclesiastical vice by the severer teachers, and restrained by law;³ already the abuses of wealth begin to appear. The Apostolic Constitutions enact that the property of the bishop should be kept distinct from that of his see,⁴ his own he may bequeath by will to his wife, his children, or other heirs; the property of the Church is to descend sacred and inviolate. Already bishops are reproached, as too much involved in worldly affairs; Councils declare that they must be relieved from the administration of the temporal concerns of their churches; a steward or *œconomus* must be appointed in each church for this end.⁵ The sovereigns, instead of endeavoring to set bounds to this tide of wealth which was setting into the Church, to the loss of the imperial exchequer, swelled it by their own munificence, as well as by the

¹ A law in the Justinian code declares all gifts or bequests to heathen persons or places (*i. e.* priests and temples) null and void. — Leo. l. 11, 9.

² On the *church* property of the ancients see the curious passage in Apian. During the pressure of the Mithridatic war, Sylla sold as much of the property devoted to sacrifices as produced 9000 pounds of gold. — *De Bello Mithrid.*, c. xxii.

³ Hieronymus in *Nepot.*, *Epist.* xxxiv. The law of Valentinian. See page 68.

⁴ *Apostol. Constit. can.* 33.

⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* lxxxvi. in *Mathæum.* *Concil. Antioch. Synod. Chalced. can.* 26.

tenor of their laws. They dared not incur the reproach at once of want of respect to the clergy, of parsimony to the poor, of stinting the magnificence of the edifices, now everywhere rising for the honor of God. These were the three acknowledged purposes to which were devoted the ecclesiastical revenues.

The legislation of Justinian confirmed all the provisions of former Christian emperors for the security and enlargement of ecclesiastical wealth. A law of Leo and Anthemius was the primary palladium of Church property. It declared every kind of property in land, in houses or rents, in movables, in peasants or slaves, absolutely inalienable even with the concurrent consent of the bishop, the steward, and all the clergy. All such sacrilegious alienations by gift, bequest, or exchange, were absolutely null and void. The steward guilty of such alienation lost his office, and was bound to make good the loss out of his own property. The notaries who drew such deeds were condemned to perpetual exile; the judges who confirmed them lost their office and forfeited all their property.¹ The lease or usufruct only could be granted under certain precise stipulations.

A law of Valentinian and Marcian empowered all widows, deaconesses, or nuns to bequeath to any

¹ "Nec si omnes eum religioso episcopo et œconomo clerici in eorum possessionum alienationem consentiant." — c. i. 2, xiv. This law, which was originally limited to the church of Constantinople, was reenacted with some slight alterations by Anastasius and by Justinian. — Constit. 7. Justinian extended this law to the whole empire, including the West. — Nov. 7. Const. ix. These two constitutions (c. i. 11, 24) gave the right of claiming bequests to the church for 100 years; this was afterwards limited to 40. — Nov. Constit. iii. 131-36. The emperor might, for the public good, receive church property in exchange, giving more valuable property. — Nov. 7.

church, chapel, body of clergy, monastery, or to the poor, the whole or any part of their property. Zeno enacted that any one who had bestowed any property on any martyr, prophet, or angel, to build a house of prayer; in case he died before the work was finished, his heirs were bound to complete it.¹ The same applied to caravansaries, hospitals, or almshouses. The bishop or his officers might exact the completion to the full.² Justinian recognizes bequests simply to Jesus Christ, which might be claimed by the principal church of the city; and bequest made to any archangel or saint, without specified place, went to the nearest church dedicated to that angel or saint.³

Founders of churches possessed the right of patronage, but the bishop might refuse an unqualified priest.⁴

All church property was declared free from baser services, and from extraordinary contributions.

Thus the Church might constantly receive and never depart from property; and thus began its immunities from public burdens. In the rapid change of masters, undergone in far the larger part of the Roman world, property of all kinds was constantly accumulating in the hands of the Church, which rarely, except through fraud or force, relaxed its grasp. The Church was the sole proprietor, whom forfeiture or confiscation could never reach; whose title was never antiquated; before whose hallowed boundaries violence stood rebuked; whom the law guarded against her own waste or prodigality; to whom it was the height of piety, almost insured salvation, to give or to bequeath, sacrilege to despoil, or to defraud; whose

¹ C. i. 2, xv.

² C. i. 3, 45.

³ Cod. i. 2, 26.

⁴ Nov. 123. Nov. Constit. 57, 2.

property if alienated was held under a perpetual curse, which either withered its harvest, or brought disaster and ruin on the wrongful possessor.

C. The penal laws of the Roman Empire, excepting in the inflexible distinction drawn between the freeman and the slave, were not immoderately severe, nor especially barbarous in the execution of punishment. In this respect Christianity introduced no great mitigation. The abolition of crucifixion as a punishment by Constantine was an act rather of religious reverence than of humanity. Another law of Constantine, if more rigorously just, sanctions the cruel iniquity, which continued for centuries of Christian legislation—the torture. No one could be executed for a capital crime, murder, magic, adultery, except after his own confession, or the unanimous confession of all persons interrogated or submitted to torture.¹

Some crimes were either made capital or more rigidly and summarily punished with death by the abhorrence of Christianity for sensual indulgences. The violation of virgins, widows, or deaconesses professing a religious life, was made a capital offence, to be summarily punished.²

The crime against nature, the deep reproach of Greek and Roman manners, was capitally punished.³

But remarkable powers had been given by former Emperors, and enlarged by Justinian, or rather, it was made a part of the episcopal function, to visit every

¹ By the Justinian code, Nov. cxxiii. c. 31, torture (*βάσανοι*) and *exilē* were the punishment of any one who insulted a bishop or presbyter in the church. The disturbance of the sacred rites was a capital offence.

² Cod. i. 3, 53.

³ Two bishops were publicly executed for this offence by Justinian.—Theophanes, p. 27.

month the state prisons, to inquire into the offences of all persons committed, and to admonish the civil authorities to proceed according to the law.¹ Private prisons were prohibited; the bishop was empowered to order all such illegal places of confinement to be broken open, and the prisoners set free.²

In certain points the bishops were the legal as well as the spiritual guardians of public morality. They had power to suppress gaming of certain prohibited kinds.³ With the presidents of the provinces they might prevent women from being forced on the stage, or from being retained against their will in that dangerous and infamous profession.⁴ If the president, in his office of purveyor for the public amusement, should be the person in fault, the bishop was to act of himself, either of his own authority or by appeal to the Emperor.

A new class of crimes, if not introduced by Christianity, became multiplied, rigorously defined, mercilessly condemned. The ancient Roman theory, that the religion of the State must be the religion of the people, which Christianity had broken to pieces by its inflexible resistance, was restored in more than its former rigor. The code of Justinian confirmed the laws of Theodosius and his successors, which declared certain heresies, Manicheism and Donatism, crimes against the State, as affecting the common welfare. The crime was punishable by confiscation of all property, and incompetency to inherit or to bequeath. Death did not secure the hidden heretic from prosecution; as in high treason, he might be convicted in his grave.

¹ Cod. i. 4, 22.

³ Cod. ii. 4, 14.

² Cod. i. 4, 22.

⁴ De Episcop. Audient. ii. 4, 33.

Not only was his testament invalid, but inheritance could not descend through him. All who harbored such heretics were liable to punishment; their slaves might desert them, and transfer themselves to an orthodox master.¹ The list of proscribed heretics gradually grew wider. The Manicheans were driven still farther away from the sympathies of mankind; by one Greek constitution they were condemned to capital punishment. Near thirty names of less detested heretics are recited in a law of Theodosius the younger, to which were added, in the time of Justinian, Nestorians, Eutychians, Apollinarians. The books of all these sects were to be burned; yet the formidable number of these heretics made, no doubt, the general execution of the laws impossible. But the Justinian code, having defined as heretics all who do not believe the Catholic faith, declares such heretics, as well as Pagans, Jews, and Samaritans, incapable of holding civil or military offices, except in the lowest ranks of the latter;² they could attain to no civic dignity which was held in honor, as that of the defenders, though such offices as were burdensome might be imposed even on Jews.³ The assemblies of all heretics were forbidden, their books were to be collected and burned, their rites, baptisms, and ordinations prohibited.⁴ Children of heretical parents might embrace orthodoxy; the males the parent could not disinherit, to the females he was bound to give an adequate dowry.⁵ The testimony of Manicheans, of

¹ Cod. de Hæret. i. 5, 11.

² There was an exception for the Goths in the service of the Empire.

³ Cod. i. ix. 5.

⁴ Cod. i. 5, 21.

⁵ Cod. i. 5, 21.

Samaritans, and Pagans could not be received; apostates to any of these sects and religions lost all their former privileges, and were liable to all penalties.¹

II. The Barbaric Laws² differed from those of the empire in this important point. The Roman
Barbaric codes. jurisprudence issued entirely from the will of the Emperor.³ The ancient laws, whether of the Republic or of his imperial predecessors, received their final sanction, as comprehended within his code: the answers of the great lawyers, the accredited legal maxims, obtained their perpetuity, and became the permanent statutes of the realm through the same authority. The barbaric were national codes, framed and enacted by the King, with the advice and with the consent of the great council of his nobles, the flower and representative of the nation.⁴ They were

¹ Cod. i. 7.

² All the barbarian codes are in Latin, but German words are perpetually introduced for offices and usages purely Teutonic. — Wergelda, Rachimburg. See Eichhorn, Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte, i. p. 232. See curious extract from Lombard Law on manumission, p. 331. The collection which I have chiefly used is the latest, that of Canciani, *Leges Barbarorum*, Venice, 1781.

³ Many Christians, even of honorable birth, according to Salvian, fled from the cruel oppressions of the Roman law, no doubt the fiscal part, and took refuge among the heathen barbarians. “Inter hæc vastantur pauperes, viduæ gemunt, orphani proculcantur, in tantum ut multi eorum et non obscuris natalibus editi et liberaliter instituti ad hostes fugiunt, ne persecutionis publicæ afflictione moriantur, quærentes scilicet apud barbaros Romanum humanum, quia apud Romanos barbaram inhumanitatem ferre non possunt. Et quamvis ab his, ad quos confugiunt, discrepent ritu, discrepent linguâ, ipso etiam, ut ita dicam, corporum atque induviarum barbaricarum fœtore dissentiant, malunt tamen in barbaris pati cultum dissimilem quam in Romanis injustitiam severientem.” — *De Gub. Dei*, lib. v.

⁴ “Hoc decretum est apud Regem et principes ejus, et apud *cunctum populum* Christianum, qui infra regnum Merovingorum consistunt.” — *Præf. ad Leg. Ripuar.* The Salic law is that of the Gens Francorum incluta, among whose praises it is that they had subdued those Romans, who burned or slew the martyrs, while the Franks adorn their relics with gold and precious stones. — *Præf. ad Leg. Salic.*

the laws of the people as well as of the King. As by degrees the bishops became nobles, as they were summoned or took their place in the great council, their influence becomes more distinct and manifest: they are joint legislators with the King and the nobles, and their superior intelligence,¹ as the only lettered class, gives them great opportunity of modifying, in the interest of religion or in their own, the statutes of the rising kingdoms. This, however, was of a later period. The earliest of these codes, the Edict of Theodoric, is so entirely Roman, Laws of Theodoric and Athalaric. that it can scarcely be called barbaric jurisprudence. It is Roman in its general provisions, in its language, in its penalties; it is Roman in the supreme and imperial power of legislation assumed by the King: there is, in fact, no Ostrogothic code. The silence as to ecclesiastical matters in the edicts of Theodoric and Athalaric arises from the peculiar position of Theodoric, an Arian sovereign in the midst of Catholicism dominant in Rome and throughout Italy.² But there is a singular illustration of the theory of ecclesiastical power, as vested in the temporal sovereign. The Arian Athalaric, the son of Theodoric, at the request of the Pope himself, issues a strong edict against simony, which by his command is affixed, with a decree of the Senate to the same effect, before the porch of St. Peter's. The

¹ The first instance of this is in the preface to the code of Alaric. "Utilitates populi nostri propitiâ divinitate tractantes, hoc quoque quod in legibus videbatur iniquum meliori deliberatione corrigimus, ut omnis legum Romanarum et antiqui juris obscuritas, adhibitis sacerdotibus et nobilibus viris, in lucem *intelligentiæ melioris* deducta resplendeat."

² There are some provisions favorable to the church borrowed from the Roman law. The church inherited all the property of clergy dying intestate. — xxvii.; apud Canciani, i. p. 15.

points in which the Ostrogothic edict departs from the Roman law are : I. The stronger difference drawn between the crimes of the nobles and of the inferior classes. Already the Teutonic principle of estimating all crimes at a certain pecuniary amount, according to the social rank of the injured person, the *wehrgelt*, is beginning to appear, as well as its consequence, that he who could not pay by money must pay by his life.¹ False witness is punished with death in the poor, by a fine in the rich ; the incendiary is burned alive if a slave or serf,² if free he has only to replace the amount of damage ; should he be insolvent, he is condemned to beating and exile. Wizards, if of honorable birth, were punished with exile ; if of humbler descent, with death ; while a freeborn adulteress was sentenced to death, in a vile and vulgar woman the crime was venial.³ In seduction, the seducer was obliged to marry the woman ; if married, to endow her with a third of his estate ; if ignoble, he suffered death.⁴ II. The edict, in the severity of its punishments, exceeds the Roman law, especially, as might be expected among the Goths, in all crimes relating to the violation of chastity. Capital punishments were multiplied, and capital punishments almost unknown to the Roman law. The author of sedition in the city or the camp was to be burned alive.⁵ The male adulterer was to be burned, the female capitally punished.⁶ Death was enacted against pagans, soothsayers, lowborn wizards ; against destroyers of tombs, against kidnappers of freemen, against forgery, against the judge who sentenced contrary to law ;⁷ against

¹ xc. l.² xcvi. colonus.³ lxii.⁴ lix.⁵ cxii.⁶ lxi.⁷ li.

robbery of churches, or forcibly dragging persons thence, death.¹

Not only were adulterers capitally punished, but whoever lent his house for the perpetration of the crime, or persuaded the woman to its perpetration.² Rape of a free-woman or virgin was death, which extended to all who were aiding or abetting. Parents neglecting to prosecute for rape on a girl under age were condemned to exile. The consenting female suffered death.³

The law of divorce, however, remained Roman: it admitted the same causes, and was limited by the same restrictions.⁴ The Edict of Athalaric against concubinage reduced the children of the freeborn concubine to slavery. The slave concubine was in the power of the matron, who might inflict any punishment short of bloodshed. Polygamy was expressly forbidden.⁵

The Lombard laws are issued by King Rotharis,⁶ with the advice of his nobles.⁷ The Burgundian, in their whole character, are intermediate between the Roman and Barbaric jurisprudence. The bishops first appear as co-legislators among the Visigoths. Already in France Alaric the Visigoth adopts the abridgment of the Roman law, by the ad-^{Clergy co-legislators.} vice of his priests as well as of his nobles.⁸ But it is

¹ cxxv.

² xxxix. So also the Lombard Law, cxxii. A man might defend himself from a charge of adultery by an oath or by his champion. — cxxiv.

³ xvii. xviii.

⁴ liv.

⁵ vii. vi.

⁶ The laws of Rotharis were written seventy-six years after the invasion of Italy by the Lombards. The Lombards, it must be remembered, were still Arians. The church, therefore, is not co-legislative with the nobles.

⁷ "Cum primatibus meis iudicibus." — Præfat. in Canciani, vol. i.

⁸ "Adhibitis sacerdotibus ac nobilibus viris;" compare Canciani, in

in Spain, after the Visigoths had cast off their Arianism, that the bishops more manifestly influence the whole character of the legislation. The synods of Toledo were not merely national councils, but parliaments of the realm.¹ After the ecclesiastical affairs had been transacted, the bishops and nobles met together, and with the royal sanction enacted laws.² The people gave their assent. The King himself is subject to the Visigothic law. The unlawful usurper of the Crown is subject to ecclesiastical as well as to civil penalties, to excommunication as well as to death. Even ecclesiastics consenting to such treason are to be involved in the interdict. These ecclesiastical lawgivers, while they arm themselves with great powers for the public good, claim no immunity. Bishops are liable to fines for disregard of judges' orders.³ The clergy are amenable to the same penalty for contumacy as the laity.⁴ But great powers are given to the bishops to restrain unjust judges, even the counts.⁵ The terrible laws against heresy, and the atrocious juridical persecutions of the Jews, already designate Spain as the throne and centre of merciless bigotry.

The Salic law proclaims itself that of the noble na-

Præfat. p. xiii. Eichhorn, not reckoning the Edict of Theodoric, arranges the codes thus: I. *Lex Visigothica*—the origin of the *Fuero Juzgo*—which, however, has many late additions. II. *Lex Salica*. III. The *Burgundian*. IV. *Ripuaria*, *Alemannica*, *Bavarica*. These betray higher kingly power.

¹ Canciani, iv. p. 52.

² *Leges Visigoth.* ii. 1, 6.

³ ii. 1, 18, *ibid.*

⁴ ii. l. 29, 30.

⁵ In the Visigothic code the observance of the Sunday and of holydays is appointed by law. The holydays were fifteen at Easter, seven before, seven after. The Nativity, Circumcision, Epiphany, Pentecost, Ascension, and certain days at harvest and vintage time.

tion of the Franks, lately converted to the *Salic law*. Catholic faith, and even while yet barbarians untainted with heresy. In a later sentence it boasts that it has enshrined in gold and precious stones the relics of those martyrs whom the Romans burned with fire, slew with the sword, or cast to the wild beasts.¹ But it is the law of the King and the nobles: the bishops are not named, perhaps because as yet the higher clergy were still of Roman descent.

Still, however the Teutonic kings and Teutonic legislators at first perhaps in their character of conquerors, assumed supreme dominion over the Church as well as over the State, and the subject bishops bowed before the irresistible authority. St. Remigius violated a canon of the Church on the ordination of a presbyter at the command of Clovis.² Among the successors of Clovis no bishop was appointed without the sanction of the Crown.³ Theodoric, son of Clovis, commanded the elevation of St. Nicetius to the see of Treves.⁴ The royal power was shown in the shameless sale of bishoprics.⁵ The nomination or the assent of the clergy and the people was implied in the theory of the election, but often overborne by the awe of the royal authority.⁶ The Council of Orleans, which condemned

¹ Apud Canciani, vol. ii. see p. 370.

² "Scribitis canonicum non fuisse quod jussit. . . . Præsul regionnm, custos patriæ, gentium triumphator illud injunxit." — Epist. S. Remigii; Bouquet iv. p. 52.

³ Planck, ii. 114. A.D. 529.

⁴ "Eum ad episcopatum jussit accersiri." — Gr. Tur.

⁵ "Jam tunc germen illud iniquum cœperat fructificare, ut sacerdotium aut venderetur a regibus, aut compararetur a clericis." — Greg. Tur. Vit. Patr. vi. 3.

⁶ "Ut nulli episcopatum præmiis aut comparatione liceat adipisci: sed cum *vobintate regis* juxta electionem cleri ac plebis," &c. A.D. 549. Concil. Can. 10

the sale of bishoprics, fully acknowledged the supremacy of the royal will. A few years later a Council at Paris endeavored to throw off the yoke. It declared the election to be in the clergy and the people. It disclaimed the royal mandate, and condemned the bishop who should dare to obtain ordination through the King to be excluded from the fellowship of the bishops of the province.¹ But the fierce Frankish sovereigns, while they appeared to accede to these pretensions, trampled them under foot. The right seems to follow them in their career of conquest. Dalmatius, Bishop of Rhodéz, in his last will, besought the King, under the most terrible adjurations, not to grant his office to a foreigner, a covetous person, or a married man.² In 562 a synod, held under Leontius, Archbishop of Bordeaux, deposed the Bishop Emerius, as consecrated by a decree of King Chlotaire without his sanction. When the new Bishop Herculius presented himself at Paris, "What!" exclaimed King Charibert, "do men think that there is no son of Chlotaire to maintain his father's decrees, that ye dare to degrade a bishop appointed by his will?" He ordered the rash intruder to be thrown into a cart strewn with thorns, and so sent into banishment; the Bishop Emerius to be reinstated by holy men.³ He fined the synod. The royal

¹ "Nullus civibus invitis ordinetur episcopus, nisi quem populi et clericorum electio plenissimâ quæsierit voluntate. *Non principis imperio*, neque per quamlibet conditionem, contra metropolis voluntatem vel episcoporum provincialium ingeratur. Quod si *per ordinationem regiam* honoris istius culmen pervadere aliquis nimiâ temeritate præsumpserit, a comprovincialibus loci ipsius episcopus recipi nullatenus mereatur, quem indebitè ordinatum agnoscunt." — Can. viii.

² Gregor. Tur. v. 47.

³ Gregor. Tur. iv. 26. Loëbel observes that Gregory, from his expression, "Et sic principis ultus est injuriam," thought the king in the right.

prerogative was perpetually asserted down at least to the time of Charlemagne.¹

In the Gothic kingdom of Spain, so long as it was Arian, the kings interfered not in the appointment of bishops. Their orthodox successors left, it should seem, affairs to take their own course.² But towards the close of the seventh century the Council of Toledo acknowledged the King as invested with the right of electing bishops.³ Ecclesiastical synods were only held by royal permission. Their decrees required the royal sanction.⁴ This theory may be traced through the numerous synods for ecclesiastical purposes in Gaul, between the conquest and the close of the sixth century.⁵ In Spain the custom appears distinctly recognized even under Arian kings.⁶

As under the Roman law no one could elude civil office by retreating into holy orders. No deacon could be ordained without special permission. No freeman could be ordained in the Barbaric kingdoms with-

¹ See instances in Loëbel. King Guntran, in 584, rejected (it seemed an extraordinary case) gifts for episcopal appointments. "Non est principatus nostri consuetudo sacerdotium venundare sub pretio, sed nec vestrum cum præmiis comparare: ne et nos turpis lucri infamiâ notemur, et vos mago Simoni comparemini." — Greg. Tur. vi. 39.

² Pope Hilarius laid before a synod at Rome a letter of the Tarragonian bishops complaining that in the other provinces of Spain episcopal elections had ceased. The bishop nominated his successor in his testament. — Baron. sub ann. 466.

³ "Quod regiæ potestatis sit episcopos eligere."

⁴ Planck, ch. ii. p. 125; from 511 to 590, were held twenty-one Gallic synods: most of them have permission "gloriosissimi regis," or some such phrase.

⁵ Planck, note, page 130.

⁶ King Theudes, in 531, permits the orthodox bishops "in Toledanam urbem convenire, et quæcunque ad ecclesiasticam disciplinam pertinerent dicere, licenterque dicere." — Isid. in Chron. ad A.D. 531.

out the consent of the king, because thereby the king lost his military service.¹

Below the sovereign power the people maintained the right of the joint election of bishops with the clergy. This old Christian usage would fall in with the Teutonic habits. As the Teutons raised their king upon the buckler, and proclaimed him with the assent of the freemen of the tribe, so the acclamation of the people ratified or anticipated the nomination of the bishop.²

The clergy enjoyed no immunity from the laws of the land.³ In criminal cases two successive Councils, at Macon and at Poitiers,⁴ acknowledged that for all criminal offences, as homicide, robbery, witchcraft, to which the latter adds adultery, they were amenable to the civil jurisdiction.⁵ At a later period the presence of the bishop was declared necessary.⁶ If indeed the awe of the clergy might repress, or the obstinate claim to immunity embarrass, the ordinary judge, the royal authority was neither limited by fear nor scruple.⁷ Nu-

¹ Conc. Aurelian. A.D. 511, can. 6. confirmed by a capitulary, A.D. 805. I. c. 114. — Marculf. i. 19. — *Præceptum de Clericatu*. — Planck, 159.

² For the usage under the Roman dominion in Gaul, from the earliest period to the fifth century, see Raynouard, *Histoire du Droit Municipal en France*, i. ch. xxvi. It continued to the twelfth century.

³ The appeal of the clergy to the civil courts for the redress of ecclesiastical grievances was strictly forbidden. — Concil. Tolet. iii. 13. Conc. Paris. A.D. 589. c. 13. Council under St. Recared, enacted, "*Ne amplius liceat clericis conclericos suos relicto Pontifice ad judicia secularia pertrahere.*" — A.D. 589. c. 13.

⁴ Concil. Matiscon. A.D. 581. Concil. Pictav.

⁵ According to Gregory of Tours, Count Leudastes of Tours had, almost every day, when he sat in justice, priests brought before him in chains. — Lib. v. c. 49.

⁶ Capit. i. 23.

⁷ At the end of the sixth century, the civil authorities in Spain took upon them to enforce clerical continence. They visited the houses of the clergy, and took out all suspicious females. With the consent of the bishops,

merous instances occur of bishops treated with the most cruel indignity by the fierce Frankish sovereigns for real or imputed crimes.¹ At times indeed they submitted to the tardier process of a previous condemnation by an ecclesiastical synod. Prætextatus, Bishop of Rouen, was accused by King Chilperic as an accomplice in the rebellion of his son, before a synod in Paris. Prætextatus was in danger of being dragged from the church and stoned by the Franks. The bishops were prepared to utter the ban. But his defence was undertaken by the historian, Gregory of Tours. Neither fear nor bribery could deter the intrepid advocate from maintaining the innocence of the bishop.² When the King could not obtain his condemnation,³ either the tearing his holy vesture, or the imprecation of the 108th Psalm against him, or even his exclusion from Christian communion, Prætextatus was suddenly hurried away to prison; on his attempt to escape, grievously beaten and sent into exile.⁴ This transaction, notwithstanding its melancholy close, shows some growing respect for ecclesiastical tribunals in cases even of high treason. The Spanish kings threaten bishops with royal as well as ecclesiastical censure.⁵

There were appeals from ecclesiastical synods to the Crown; in some cases the royal authority interposed

who seem to have approved of this procedure, they might seize the women as slaves. — Concil. Hispal. 3.

¹ Greg. Tur. vi. 24.

² "Ducentas argenti libras promisit, si Prætextatus, me impugnante opprimeretur."

³ Gregory himself admits the supremacy of the king over the clergy. "Si quis de nobis, o rex, justitiæ tramitem transcendere voluerit a te corrigi potest; si vero tu excesseris, quis te corripiet?"

⁴ Greg. Tur. v. 18.

⁵ Planck, ii. 188.

to mitigate or to relieve from ecclesiastical penalties.¹

But there is a strong converse to this subjection of the Church to the power of the King or the nobility. Already in the sixth and seventh centuries, the bishops appear in all the great assemblies of the people.² They have a voice in the election of the King; before long, his coronation becomes a religious ceremony. It was not, according to one theory, that they succeeded the Druids of Gaul and the Teutonic priests in their dignity (the Druids and their religion had long ceased to maintain any influence, the German priests do not appear to have formed a part of the great warlike migrations of the tribes), nor that the bishops claimed the privilege of all free Franks to give their suffrage in the popular assembly. There were few of these regular parliaments; they were rather great councils summoned by the king. The position of the Bishops, their influence with the people, their rank in public estimation, their superior intelligence, designated them as useful members of such council. The later Gothic kings of Spain felt even more awe of the clergy: they had been rescued by their zeal, not merely from the terrible retribution which awaited heathenism, but from that of heresy. Their conversion to orthodoxy showed the power which the Latin clergy had obtained over their minds; and they would hasten to lay the

¹ See the curious *Hist. of the Royal nuns* (Greg. Tur. x. 20), and the excommunication of Archbishop Sisibert of Toledo: "Ut in fine vitæ tantum communionem accipiat, excepto, si regia pietas antea eum absolvendum crediderit." — A.D. 693. Planck, p. 194.

² According to Eichhorn, the first manifest "Concilium mixtum" was in A.D. 615. From this emanated the constitutions of Chlotaire II. which recognized the temporal powers of the hierarchy. — i. p. 520.

first fruits of their gratitude, submission, and reverence, at the feet of the clergy. Nor were the affairs discussed at these great councils strictly defined. There was no distinct line between civil and religious matters. This distinction belongs to a later period of civilization. The clergy were not unwilling to obtain the royal or the national assent to their spiritual decrees. The king naturally desired the intelligence, the love of order, the authority, the influence of the clergy, to ratify his civil edicts. The reciprocal rights of each party had been as yet too little contested to awaken that sensitive jealousy of interference which grew up out of centuries of mutual aggression.

But if in the great public assemblies the bishops had already taken this rank, each in his city held an authority partly recognized by law, partly resting on the general awe and reverence.¹ As in the East, the bishop had a general superintendence over the courts of law. He had, if not always the presidential, a seat in the judicial tribunal.² He was, if not by statute, by universal recognition, what the defensor had been in the old municipal system, only with all the increased influence of his religious character. To him the injured party could appeal in default of justice. He was the patron, the advocate of the poor. He had power to punish subordinate judges for injustice in the absence of the king. In Spain the Bishops had a special charge to keep continual watch over the administration of justice,³

¹ So King Chlotaire ordained. — Greg. Tur. vi. 31.

² On the residence of the bishops in the cities, its effect on the great increase in the power of the bishop, and on the freedom of the cities, compare Thierry. — Récits. Mérovingiens, i. 266.

³ "Ex decreto domini regis — simul cum sacerdotali concilio convenient ut discant quam piè et justè cum populis agere debeant." — Concil. Tolet. iii. 33.

and were summoned on all great occasions to instruct the judges to act with piety and justice.¹

Thus the clergy stood between the two hostile races in the new constitution of society — the reconcilers, the pacifiers, the harmonizers of the hostile elements. They were Latin in general in descent, in language, yet comprehending both races under their authority and influence; admitted to the councils of the Kings, and equal to the count or the noble in estimation; controlling one race by awe, looked up to by the other as their natural protectors; opposing brute force by moral and religious influences; supplying the impotency of the barbaric law to restrain oppression and iniquity (where every injury or crime had its commutative fine) by the dread of the religious interdict and the fears of hell; stooping unconsciously to the superstition of the times, but ruling more powerfully through that superstition. They were the guardians and protectors of the conquered, of the servile classes, whose condition was growing worse and worse, against the privileged freemen; enduring, mitigating, when they could not control, the wild crimes of the different petty kings, who were constantly severing into fragments the great Frankish monarchy, and warring, intriguing, assassinating for each fragment. The Bishops during all that period, in Spain, in France, in Italy — making every allowance for the legendary and almost adoring tone in which their histories have descended to us — appear as the sole representatives of law, order, and

¹ “Sint prospectores episcopi qualiter iudices cum populis agant, ut ipsos præmonitos corrigant, aut insolentiam eorum principum auribus innotescant. Quod si correptos emendare nequiverint, et ab ecclesiâ et a communione suspendant.” — *Ibid.*: compare *Leg. Visigoth.* ii. 1, 29, 30; *Synod. Tolet.* A.D. 633, can. 32.

justice, as well as of Christian virtue and humanity. There is even a cessation of religious persecution, except against the Jews. After the extinction of Arianism, the human mind had sunk into such inactivity and barrenness that it did not even produce a new heresy. Except the peculiar opinions of Felix and Elipandus, and those of Adelbert and Clement in Gaul, down to the time when the monk Gotschalk started the question of predestination, the West slumbered in unreasoning orthodoxy.

A. The Barbaric codes, like the Roman, recognized slavery as an ordinary condition of mankind.¹ Man was still a marketable commodity. The captive in war became a slave; and it was happy for mankind that he became so, otherwise the wars which swept over the whole world, civilized and uncivilized, must have been wars of massacre and extermination. The victory of Stilicho over Rhadagaisus threw 200,000 Goths or other Germans into the market, and lowered the price of a slave from twenty-five pieces of gold to one.² The well-known story of the Anglo-Saxon youths who excited the compassion of Pope Gregory I. shows that in his time the public sale of slaves was still common in Rome. The redemption of captives — that is the repurchase of slaves in order to restore them to freedom — is esteemed an act of piety in the West as in the East. The first prohibition of this traffic, both by law and by public sentiment, was confined to the sale

Rights of
persons
under Bar-
baric codes.

¹ The church lived according to the Roman law: "Legem Romanam quæ ecclesia vivit." — Eichhorn, i. 297. In the Ripuarian law the wehrgeld of the clergyman was at first according to his birth, "Servus ut servum;" afterwards according to his ecclesiastical rank. — Ibid.

² Orosius, vii. 37.

of Christians to pagans, Jews, and in some cases to heretics. The Jews were the great slave-merchants of the age.¹ But it was the religion rather than the personal freedom which was taken under the protection of the law. The capture and sale of men was part of the piratical system along all the shores of Europe, especially on the northern coasts. The sale of pagan prisoners of war was authorized by Clovis after the defeat of the Alemanni; by Charlemagne after that of the Saxons; by Henry the Fowler, as to that unhappy race which gave their name to the class — the Slaves.²

The barbarian codes seem to acknowledge the legality of marriages between slaves, and their religious sanctity; that of the Lombards on the authority of the Scriptural sentence, "Whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." All unlawful connection with married or unmarried slaves is forbidden.³ The slave who detected his wife in adultery might, like the freeman, kill the two criminals.⁴ Still, however, they were slaves. The law interfered to prohibit marriages between the slaves of different masters. If the marriage took place without the consent of the master, the slave was punishable, by the Salic law, either by a mulct of threepence, or was to receive a hundred stripes. The later laws became more lenient, and divided the offspring between the two masters.

The barbarian codes were as severe as the Roman in prohibiting the debasing alliance of the freeman with

¹ Hist. of Jews, iii.

² Compare Biot, p. 185, *De l'Abolition de l'Esclavage ancien en Occident* Paris, 1840.

³ Lex Salic. tit. xxviii.

⁴ Lex Salic. xxviii. 5.

the slave. The Salic and Ripuarian law ^{Marriage of freemen and slaves.} condemned the freeman guilty of this degradation to slavery; ¹ where the union was between a free-woman and a slave, that of the Lombards ² and that of the Burgundians ³ condemned both parties to death; but if her parents refused to put her to death, she became the slave of the crown. The Ripuarian law condemned the female delinquent to slavery; but the woman had the alternative of killing her base-born husband. She was offered a distaff and a sword. If she chose the distaff, she became a slave; if the sword, she struck it to the heart of her paramour, and emancipated herself from her degrading connection. ⁴ The Visigothic law condemned the female who had connection with or wished to marry her own slave, or even a freedman, to death. ⁵ For the same offence with the slave of another, both were punished with a hundred stripes. For the fourth offence the woman became the handmaid of the slave's master. The Saxon law still more sternly interdicted all marriages below the proper rank, whether of nobles, free men, or slaves, under pain of death. The laws of the Lombards and of the Alemanni were more mild. The latter allowed the female to separate from her slave husband on certain conditions, if she had not degraded herself by any servile occupation. ⁶

¹ Lex Sal. xxix. v. 3: Lex Ripuar. lviii. 9.

² cxxxii.

³ Tit. xxxv. 2.

⁴ Lex Ripuar. lviii. 18.

⁵ Lex Visigoth. iii. ii. 2.

⁶ Adam. Brem., Hist. Eccles. i. 5. By the Bavarian law, a slave committing fornication with a free-woman was to be given up, to be put to death if they pleased, to the parents, and not to pay any mulct: "quia talis præsumptio excitat inimicitias in populo." — ii. ix.

Under the barbarian as under the Roman law, the slave was protected chiefly as the property of his master. All injury or damage was done to the thing rather than the person, and was to be paid for by a mulct to the owner, not a compensation to the sufferer.¹ By the edict of Theodoric, he who killed the slave of another might be prosecuted for homicide, or sued by a civil process for the delivery of two slaves in place of the one killed.² But slaves bore the penalty of their own offences, and even of those of their masters. If guilty of acts of violence, though under their masters' orders, they suffered death.³ The slave was not to be tortured, except to prove the guilt of his master, unless the informer would pay the master his value. If bought in order to suppress his evidence, he might be repurchased at the same price, and put to the torture.⁴ The right of life and death still subsisted in the master. According to some of the barbaric codes, here retrograding from the Roman, he had full power to make away with his own property. This usage, noticed by Tacitus as common to the German tribes, continued to

¹ In the Burgundian law, the murder of a slave is only punished by a fine, according to his value.* The humaner Visigothic code distinctly prohibited the murder of a slave. The punishment was fine and infamy. Another law recognized the image of God in the slave, and therefore interdicted his mutilation.

² The Burgundian law shows that the artisans in the mingled Roman and barbarian society were chiefly slaves. "Quicumque vero servum suum aurificem, argentarium, ferrarium, fabrum ærarium, sartorem vel sutorem, in publico adtributum artificium exercere permiserit," &c. — Tit. xxi.

³ Art. lxxvii.

⁴ Art. c. ci. By the Bavarian law, if a slave was unjustly put to the torture, the false accuser of the slave was to give another slave to the master if the slave died under torture, two.†

* Tit. x.; *Leges Visigoth.* vi. v. 12; *Law of Egica*, vi. v. 13.

† Tit. viii. 18, 1, 2: compare Burgundian law, Tit. vii.

the Capitularies of Charlemagne. That code adopts the Mosaic provisions.¹ Under Lewis the Debonnaire and Lothaire, the arbitrary murder of a slave was punished by excommunication or two years' penance.²

The runaway slave was the outcast of society. At first he was denied the privilege of asylum.³ It was a crime to conceal him; he might be seized anywhere; punished by his master according to his will; and according to some codes he might be slain in case of resistance. The influence of the Church appears in some singular and contradictory provisions.⁴ The Churches themselves were slaveholders.⁵ There were special provisions to protect their slaves. By the law of the Alemanni, whoever concealed an ecclesiastic's slave was condemned to a triple fine.⁶ In the Bavarian law, whoever incited the slave of a church or a monastery to flight, must pay a mulct of fifteen solidi, and restore the slave or replace him by another. The Church gradually claimed the right of asylum for fugitive slaves. The slave who had taken refuge at the altar was to be restored to his master only on his promise of remitting the punishment.⁷

As under the Roman law, peculiar solemnity attached to the emancipation of the slave in the church

¹ Exod. xxi. 20, 21.

² Dachery, *Spicileg. Addit. ad Cap. c. 49*; Biot, p. 286

³ Edict. Theodor. lxx.; Leg. Longobard. cclxxxii.

⁴ *Lex Salica*; *Lex Ripuar.* xiv.

⁵ "Non v' era anticamente Signor Secolare, Vescovo, Abbate, Capitolo di Canonici, e Monastero, che non avesse al suo servizio molti servi." Manumission was more rare among the clergy than among secular masters, because it was an alienation of the property of the church. — Muratori, *Ant. Italiane*, Diss. xv.

⁶ *Lex Alemann.* 3.

⁷ Concil. Aurelian.: compare the Visigothic law, ix. 1, de fugitivis.

and before the priest; and emancipation thus became an act of piety. So in some of the Teutonic codes, as in the Visigothic, emancipation before the parish priest was an ordinary act recognized by the law. It was a common form that it was done by the pious man for the remedy or the ransom of his soul.¹

Easter was usually the appointed time for this public manumission in the churches; and no doubt the glad influences of that holy season awoke the disposition and the emulation, in many Christian minds, of conferring the blessing of freedom upon their slaves.

Gregory the Great seems to have been the first who enfranchised slaves on the pure and noble principle of the common equality of mankind.

But the great change in the condition of the servile order arose chiefly from other causes, besides the influence of Christianity. This benign influence operated no doubt in these indirect ways to a great extent, first on the mitigation, afterwards on the abolition of domestic slavery; but it was perhaps the multiplication of slaves which to a certain extent slowly wrought its own remedy. The new relations of the different races consequent on the barbaric conquests, the habits of the Teutonic tribes settled within the Empire, the attachment of the rural or prædial slave to the soil, the change of the slave into the serf, which became universal in Europe, tended in different ways to the general though tardy emancipation. The serf was immovable as the soil: he became as it were part of it,

¹ *Leges Visigoth.* v. vii.: compare note of Canciani, and the 15th Dissertation of Muratori. This began early both in East and West. "*Servum tuum manumittendum manu ducis in ecclesiam. Fit silentium. Libellus tunc recitatur, aut fit desiderii tui prosecutio.*"—S. August. *Serm.* xxxi. It was done pro remedio, or pro mercede animæ suæ.

and so in some degree beyond the caprice or despotism of his master. Already under the Empire, the system of taxation had affixed the peasant to the soil: the owner paid according to the number of heads of slaves, as he might of cattle. Whether the cultivators were originally born on the estate ascribed to them, or settled upon it, they were equally irremovable. No one could sell his estate, and transfer the slaves to another property. The estates of the Church were no doubt, as they yet enjoyed no immunity of taxation, subject to the same laws. It may be generally said that the whole cultivation of the Roman empire was conducted, if not by slaves, by those whose condition did not really differ from slavery. The emancipation began at a period in the Christian history, centuries later than that at which we are arrived at present.¹

The barbaric codes, as well as the edict of Theodoric,² retained the high Teutonic reverence for the sanctity of marriage. In the Burgundian law, adultery was punishable by death.³ In all cases it rendered the woman infamous. A widow guilty of incontinency could not marry again—at least could not receive dower. In the Visigothic code the adulteress and her paramour were given up to the injured husband, to be punished according to his will: he might put them to death.⁴ The law of divorce under the Burgundian law

¹ Tit. xl.-xlviii.: compare, the Justinian code "De agricolis et censitis et colonis." Law of Constantius, i.—Law of Valentinian and Valens. "Omnes omnino fugitivos adscriptitios, colonos vel inquilinos, sine ullo sexus, muneris conditionisque discrimine ad antiquos penates, ubi *censiti* itque educati natique sunt, provinciis præsidentes redire compellant." On the change of the slave into the serf in the Carlovingian times, compare Lahuërou, *Institutions Carlovingiennes*, page 204 *et seq.*

² See above.

³ Tit. lxxviii. and lii.

⁴ *Leges Visigoth.* iii. iv. 14 *et seq.*

was Roman, excepting that the woman who divorced her husband without cause, according to an old German usage as to infamous persons, was smothered in mud.¹ Among the Visigoths, divorce was forbidden, excepting for adultery. Incest, by the Visigothic law, was extended to the sixth degree of relationship. Rape was punished by confiscation of property, or failing that, by reduction to slavery.² This code contained a severe statute against public prostitutes, rendering them liable to whipping. Incontinence in priests was corrected by penance; the woman was to be whipped. The former statute was in that stern tone towards unchastity which in the Goths Salvian contrasts with the impurity of Roman manners.³ The later laws seem gradually to soften off into mulcts or compositions for these as for other crimes.

But among the yet un-Romanized Saxons, down to the days of St. Boniface, the maiden who has dishonored her father's house, or the adulteress, is compelled to hang herself, is burned, and her paramour hung over the blazing pile;⁴ or she is scourged or cut to pieces with knives by all the women of the village till she is dead.

¹ *Necetur in luto*, xxxiv. 1. "Ignavos et imbelles et corpore infames cœno ac palude injectâ super crate, mergunt." — Tacit. Germ. c. xii.

² Tit. iii. vi. Unnatural crimes were punished by castration. By the Bavarian law, whoever took away a nun to marry her committed adultery. "Scimus illum crimini obnoxium esse qui alienam sponsam rapit, quanto magis ille obnoxius est crimini qui Christi usurpavit sponsam." — xii. 1.

³ iii. iv. 17. "Esse inter Gothos non licet scortatorem Gothum, soli inter eos præjudicio nationis ac nominis permittuntur impuri esse Romani." — Salvian. de Gub. Dei. vii. Lahuërou, however, observes: "Voyez quelle énorme disproportion la loi met entre les obligations et les devoirs des deux époux! Le mari peut être infidèle autant de fois et à tel degré qu'il le voudra, sans que la femme ait le droit de s'en plaindre." The German woman was in fact, though in a less degree than the Roman, the property of her husband. — Lahuërou, *Institutions Carlovingiennes*, p. 38.

⁴ A.D. 743. Bonifac. Epist. ad Ethelbal. Reg. Merciaë.

B. In the barbaric as in the Roman code, the law of property might seem enacted with the special view of securing to the Church wealth which could not but be constantly accumulating, and could never diminish. Every freeman might leave his property to the Church. No duke or count had a right to interfere. The heir who ventured to reclaim such dedicated property was liable to the judgment of God and to excommunication, recognized in more than one code.¹ The freeman might retain to himself and so enjoy the usufruct during his own life, and leave his heirs beggars. The proofs of such donations were all to the advantage of the Church. The barbaric codes left the clergy to secure the inalienability of their property by their own laws. At first, and until the bishop began to be merged in the temporal feudatory, it was comparatively safe in its own sanctity. In the division of the conquered lands by the barbarians, the Church estates remained sacred. The new converts could not show their sincerity better than by their prodigality to the Church. Clovis and his first successors, ignorant of the value of their new acquisitions, awarded large tracts of land with a word. St. Remigius received a great number of lands to be distributed among the destitute churches. Their successors complained of this thoughtless prodigality. Already they had discovered that the royal revenues had been transferred to the Church.² The whole Teutonic law, which appointed certain compensations for certain crimes, would have suggested, had suggestion been nec-

¹ *Lex Alemann. et Lex Burgund., in initio.*

² "Ecce, aiebat Rex, pauper remansit fiscus noster, et divitiæ nostræ ad æclesias sunt translata." — *Greg. Tur. vi. 46.*

essary, the commutation system of the Church. God, like the freeman or the King, might be propitiated by the wehrgeld; the penance of the Christian be compensated by a pecuniary mulct. Already Queen Fredegunde satisfies the conscience of two hesitating murderers whom she would employ to assassinate her brother-in-law, King Sigebert, by the promise of large alms to the Church, in order to secure them from hell or purgatory.¹ So rapidly and alarmingly was the Church in France becoming rich, that King Chilperic passed a law annulling all testaments in which the Church was constituted heir; but Gunthran, not long after, repealed the sacrilegious statute, and these murderous and adulterous and barbarous kings and nobles were again enabled to die in peace, confident in the remission of their sins by the sacrifice of some portion of their plunder (the larger the offering the more secure) on the altar of God.²

But the barbarous times which bestowed so lavishly were by no means disposed superstitiously to respect the property of the Church. It was often but late in life that the access of devotion came on, while through all the former part, either by right of conquest, by terror, or by bribery, the barbarian had not scrupled to seize back consecrated land. Even kings were obliged to ratify and solemnize their own grants by synods or by national assemblies.³ The deepening of the imprecations ut-

¹ *Gesta Francorum*. Planck, ii. 199.

² All the laws acknowledged the right of alienating some portion from the rightful heir, "pro remedio animæ," or "in remissionem peccatorum." There are legal formulæ in Marculf to this effect. Some codes, however, prohibited the absolute disinheritance of the right heir for the good of the church. Eichhorn, p. 359: compare 363 *et seq.*

³ In a synod at Valence, King Gunthran demanded the ratification of

tered by these synods against robbers of the Church shows their necessity. These lands began to be guarded by all the terrors of superstition; wild legends everywhere spread of the awful and miraculous punishments which had fallen on such offenders.¹ In a few centuries the deliverer of Europe from the Mahomedan yoke, Charles Martel, was plunged into hell, and revealed in his torments to the eyes of men, as a standing and awful witness to the inexorable sin of sacrilege.

The property of the Church as yet enjoyed no immunity from taxation. Gradually special exemptions were granted. At length the manse of the church (a certain small farm or estate) was entirely relieved from the demands of the state. Even the claim to absolute freedom from contribution to the public expenses was of a much later period.²

C. The criminal law of the barbaric codes tended more and more to the commutation of crime or injury for a pecuniary mulct. High treason Criminal law of barbarians. alone, compassing the death of the King, corresponding with the enemies of the realm, or introducing them within its frontier, was generally a capital crime. Yet in the Visigothic code the capital punishment of treason could be commuted for putting out the eyes, shaving the hair, scourging, perpetual imprisonment, or exile, with confiscation and attainder, and in

all the gifts which he, his wife, and daughters had bestowed on the church. All plunderers of this property "anathemate perpetui iudicii divini plec-tendi atque supplicii æterni obnoxii tenendi sunt." King Dagobert confirmed his legacies in a parliament, the legacies which he had be-queathed "memor malorum quæ gesserit."—Planck, 203.

¹ Gregory of Tours is full of such tales.

² Planck, ii. ch. vii. King Chlotaire, in 540, demanded a third part of the revenue of the church as an extraordinary loan.—Greg. Tur. iv. 2.

this case the criminal could not make over his property to the Church.¹ Such donations were void. But of all crimes the King had power of pardon with the consent of the clergy and the great officers of his palace. The Bavarian law adds sedition in the camp to acts of treason, but even this might be forgiven by the royal mercy.² As to other crimes, except adultery and incest, it was Teutonic usage, not Christian humanity, which abrogated the punishment of death. In the Burgundian law homicide is still a capital crime; but gradually the life of every man below the King is assessed, according to his rank, at a certain value, and the wehr-geld may be received in atonement for his blood.³ Even the sacred persons of the clergy had their price, which rises in proportionate amount with their power and influence. By the Bavarian law, should any one kill a bishop lawfully chosen,⁴ a tunic of lead was to be fitted to the person of the bishop, and the commutation for his murder was as much gold as that tunic weighed: if the gold was not to be had, the same value in money, slaves, houses, or land; if the offender had none of these, he was sold into slavery. Nor was it life only which was thus valued; every wound and mutilation of each particular member of the body was carefully registered in the code, and estimated according as the man was noble, freeman, slave, or in holy orders. The slave alone was still liable to capital punishment for certain

¹ *Lex Visigoth.* vi. 1, 2.

² "Et ille homo qui hæc commisit benignum imputet regem aut ducem si ei vitam concesserit." — *Lex Bavar.* ii. iv. 3.

³ Parricide alone, by the Visigothic law, was punished by the same death as that inflicted.

⁴ "Si quis episcopum quem constituit rex, vel populus elegit." — *Lex Bavar.* xi. 1.

offences ;¹ the Visigothic code condemned him to be burned.² Torture was not only, according to Roman usage, to be applied to slaves, but even to freemen in certain cases.³

The privilege of asylum within the Church is recognized in most of the barbaric codes.⁴ It is asserted in the strongest terms, and in terms impregnated with true Christian humanity, that there is no crime which may not be pardoned from the fear of God and reverence for the saints.⁵ As yet perhaps the awe of the Christian altar only arrested justice in its too hasty and vindictive march, and in these wild times gave at least a temporary respite, for the innocent victim to obtain liberty that he might plead his cause against the fierce populace or the exasperated ruler, for the man of doubtful guilt to obtain a fair trial, or for the real criminal to suffer only the legal punishment for his offence. As yet the priest could not shield the heinous criminal. By the Visigothic code he was compelled to surrender the homicide.⁶ With the ruder barbarians the sanctity of holy places came in aid of the sacerdotal authority ; and in those savage times no doubt the notion that it was treason against God to force even the most flagrant criminal from his altar, protected many innocent lives, and retarded the precipitancy even of justice itself.⁷

¹ Or scourging, for theft, by the Burgundian law. — iv. 2.

² *Lex Visigoth.* iii. iv. 14.

³ *Lex Visigoth.* vi. 1, 2, ii. iv. 4.

⁴ On the subject of asylum, compare the excellent dissertation of Paolo Sarpi, *De jure Asylorum.* — *Opera*, iv. p. 191.

⁵ "Nulla sit culpa tam gravis, ut non remittatur, propter timorem Dei et reverentiam sanctorum." — *Lex Bavar.* vii. 3. It was an axiom of the Roman law, "Templorum cautela non nocentibus sed læsis datur a lege." — *Justin. Novell.* xvii. 7.

⁶ *Lex Visigoth.* vi. v. 16.

⁷ See *Greg. Tur.* vii. 19 ; iv. 18.

The right was constantly infringed by violent kings or rulers, but rarely without strong remonstrance from the clergy; and terrible legends were spread abroad of the awful punishments which befell the violators of the sanctuary¹.

Already, in the earliest codes, appears the abrogation of the ordinary tribunals of justice by appeal to arms, and to the judgment of God: even the Burgundian law admits the trial by battle.²

The ordeal is a superstition of all nations and of all ages. God is summoned to bear miraculous witness in favor of the innocent, to condemn the guilty.³ The Ripuarian law admits the trial by fire,⁴ the Visigothic by redhot iron.⁵ The Church, at a later period, took the ordeal under its especial sanction. There was a solemn ritual for the ceremony.⁶ It took place in the church. The scalding water, the redhot iron, or the ploughshare were placed in the porch of the church

¹ Restrictions were placed on this undefined right. In a capitular of 779 — "Homicidæ et cæteri rei, qui mori debent legibus, si ad ecclesiam confugerint, non excusentur, neque eis ibidem victus detur."

² Tit. xlv.

³ Compare Calmet and Grotius on Numbers v. 31, for the instances from classical antiquity. Pliny and Solinus mention two rivers, which either by scalding or blinding, detected perjury. — H. N. xxxi, cap. xviii. 2.

Ἦμεν δ' ἔτοιμοι καὶ μύδρους αἶρειν χερσῶν,
καὶ πῦρ διέρπειν, καὶ θεοῦς ὀρκωμοτεῖν,
τὸ μήτε δρᾶσαι, μήτε τῷ ξυνευδέναι
τὸ πρᾶγμα βουλευσάντι μήτ' εἰργασμένῳ.

Sophocl. Antig. 264.

"Et medium freti pietate per ignem
Cultores multâ premimus vestigia prunâ."

Virg. Æneid. xi. 787.

⁴ Tit. xxx.

⁵ *Lex Visigoth.* vi. 1, 3. See the very curious note of Canciani, and quotation from the Constitutions of Baeça on this passage.

⁶ See the very remarkable ritual in Canciani, ii. 453.

and sprinkled with holy-water. All the most awful mysteries of religion were celebrated to give greater terror and solemnity to the rite. Invention was taxed to discover new forms of appeal to the Deity; swearing on the Gospels, on the altar, on the relics, on the host; plunging into a pool of cold water, he who swam was guilty, he who sunk innocent; they were usually held by a cord. There were ordeals by hot water, by hot iron, by walking over live coals or burning ploughshares.¹ This seems to have been the more august ceremony for queens and empresses—undergone by one of Charlemagne's wives, our own Queen Emma, the Empress Cunegunda. The ordeal went down to a more homely test, the being able to swallow consecrated bread and cheese.

The new crimes which the Christianity of these ages had introduced into the penal code of the Empire found their place in the barbaric codes. At first, indeed, they were left to the cognizance of the clergy, and to be visited by ecclesiastical penalties. The Arianism of the primitive Teutonic converts compelled the toleration of the laws, and retained a kind of dread of touching on such subjects in the earlier codes; but in proportion as the ecclesiastics became co-legislators,

¹ The ordeal was condemned in later days by many popes as tempting God: by Alexander II., Stephen X., Honorius III. Muratori thought that it was abolished in the twelfth century. Canciani quotes later instances. That of Savonarola, a real ordeal, might suffice. Even Canciani seems to look back upon it with some lingering respect: "Ego reor Deo Opt. Max. plus placuisse majorum nostrorum simplicitatem et fidem quam recentiorum sapientum acutissimam philosophiam."—Vol. ii. p. 293. Greg. Turon. de Martyr. 69, 70. All the ritualists, Martene, Mabillon, Ducange, under the different words, Muratori in two dissertations, one on the ordeal, one on duel, furnish ample citations. Almost all, however, are later than these primitive barbaric laws.

heresies became civil crimes, and liable to civil punishments.¹ The statutes of the orthodox Visigothic kings, so terrible against the Jews, were not more merciful to heretics. The Franks were from the first the army of orthodoxy; heretics were traitors to the state, as well as rebels against the Church, confederates of hostile Visigoths, or Burgundians, or Lombards.

Witchcraft was a crime condemned by the Visigothic law.² Its overt acts were causing storms, invocation of demons, offering nightly sacrifices to devils. The punishment was 200 stripes, and shaving the head. Consulting soothsayers concerning the death of the King was punished in a freeman by stripes and confiscation of property, and perpetual servitude: wizards guilty of poisoning suffered death.

III. But external to and independent of the Imperial Law and the constitutions of the new western kingdoms was growing up the jurisprudence of the Church, commensurate with the Roman world, or rather with Christendom. Every inhabitant of the Christian empire, or of a Christian kingdom, was subject to this second jurisdiction, which even by the sentence of outlawry which it pronounced against heretics, assumed a certain dominion over those who vainly endeavored to emancipate themselves from its yoke. The Church as little admitted the right of sects to separate existence, as the empire would endure the establishment of independent kingdoms or republics within its actual pale. Of this peculiar jurisprudence of the Church the clergy were at once the legislature

¹ Laws of Recared, xii. 2, 1.

² Lex Visigoth. vi. 2, 3. There was a singular provision against judges consulting diviners in order to detect witches.

and the executive. This double power tended more and more to concentration. In the State all power resided in the Emperor alone; the unity of the empire under a monarch inevitably tended to that of the Church under one visible head. As the clergy more and more withdrew itself into a privileged order, so the bishops withdrew from the clergy, the Metropolitans rose above the bishops, and the Bishop of Rome aspired to supreme and sole spiritual empire. Had Rome remained the capital of the whole world, the despotism, however it might have suffered a perpetual collision with the imperial power, ruling in the Eternal City, would probably have become, as far as ecclesiastical dignity, an acknowledged autocracy. A people habituated for centuries to arbitrary authority in civil affairs would be less likely to question it in religion. The original independence of the Christian character which induced the first converts in the strength of their faith to secede from the manners and usages as well as the religious rites of the world, to form self-governed republics, as it were, within the social system — this noble liberty had died away as Christianity became a hereditary, an established, an universal religion. Obedience to authority was inveterate in the Roman mind; reverence for law had sunk into obedience to despotic power; arbitrary rule seemed the natural condition of mankind. This unrepining, unmurmuring servility could not be goaded by intolerable taxation to resistance. Nothing less than religious difference could stir the mind into oppugnancy, and this difference was chiefly concentrated in the clergy: when a heretic was in power the orthodox, when the orthodox the heretic, alone asserted liberty of action or of

thought. In all other respects the law of the Church, as enacted by the clergy, was received with implicit submission. In the provinces, as the Presidents, or Prefects, or Counts, in their regular gradation of dignity, ruled with despotic sway, yet were but the representatives of the remote and supreme central power, so the Bishops, Metropolitans, Patriarchs rose above each other, and culminated, as it were, to some distant point of unity. The Patriarchates had been fixed in the greatest cities of Europe, Asia, and Africa. These were the seats likewise of the highest provincial governments; the other chief provincial cities were usually the seats of local administration, and of the metropolitan sees; and so the stream of public business, civil and ecclesiastical, was perpetually flowing to the same centre. It was at once the place at which all that remained, the shadow, as it were, of the old popular assemblies, as well as the ecclesiastical synods, were convened; appeals came thither from all quarters, imperial mandates were issued to the province or theme. On this principle Constantinople continued still to rise in influence; Alexandria for above a century resisted, but resisted in vain, the advancement of the upstart unapostolic See. The new Rome asserted her Roman dignity against the East, while on every favorable opportunity she raised up claims to independence, to equality, even to superiority, against the elder Rome, now a provincial city of the Justinian empire.

Rome was the sole Patriarchate of the West, the head and centre of Latin Christianity. Rome stood alone, almost without rival or reclamation. Ravenna, as the seat of empire under the exarchs, might aspire to independence, to equality; her pretensions

were soon put down by her own impotence and by common opinion. Wherever the Latin language was spoken there was no rival to the supremacy of Rome. The African churches, distracted by the Donatists, oppressed and persecuted by the Arian Vandals, revived but as the churches of a province of the Eastern empire. Carthage was still one of the great cities of the world, her bishop the acknowledged head of the churches in Africa. But the African Church, though obedient to the East, after Justinian's conquest, and just emerging into ascendancy over the Arians, had neither ambition nor strength to assert independence. Of the Teutonic kingdoms founded within the ancient realm of Rome, three had been destroyed during the sixth century, those of the Ostrogoths in Italy, of the Vandals in Africa, of the Burgundians in France. Of the four which survived, the Lombard was still Arian, the Anglo-Saxon was heathen and not yet consolidated into one kingdom; those of the Visigoths in Spain and of the Franks in Gaul, if still of uncertain boundaries, and frequently subdivided in different proportions, accepted the supremacy of Rome as part of the Catholicism to which one had returned after a long apostacy, with all the blind and ardent zeal of a new proselyte; the other, whose war-cry of conquest had been the Catholic faith, would bow down in awe-struck adoration before the head of that faith. The Latin clergy, who had made common cause with the Franks, would inculcate this awe as the most powerful auxiliary to their own dominion.

In the West the state of ecclesiastical affairs tended constantly to elevate the actual power of the single Patriarchate. The election of the bishops in the Ro-

man provinces and in the new Teutonic kingdoms was in the clergy and the people. Strife constantly arose; the worsted party looked abroad for aid; if they found it not with the Metropolitan, they sought still further; and as the provincial of old appealed to Rome against the tyranny of the civil governor, so the clergy against the bishop, the bishop against the Metropolitan. They fled in the last resort to what might seem to be an impartial, at least might be a favorable tribunal.

But throughout these kingdoms there was another strong bond to Rome — the common interest of the Latin part of the community against the foreign and Teutonic. The old Roman aristocracy of the provinces, except in some municipal towns, perished or were degraded from their station by the new military aristocracy of the conquerors. But the clergy could not but continue, it has been seen that they did continue, for a considerable period to be Roman. They were thus a kind of peaceful force, bound together by common descent, and still looking to Rome as their parent. Nothing is known of the Arian clergy who accompanied the Goths, the Vandals, or the Lombards, and kept up the tradition of the heterodox faith, whether they too were chiefly Roman, or had begun to be barbarian.¹ The rare collisions which are recorded, the general toleration, except among the Vandals in

¹ In the *Collatio Episcoporum*, where Avitus of Vienne challenged the Arian clergy to bring their conflicting doctrines to the issue of a public disputation, the head of the Arian clergy is named Boniface. The Arians (it is a Catholic account) were struck dumb, or replied only in unmeaning clamors; one sentence alone betrays the ground they took; they stood on the Scripture alone; the Catholics were *præstigiatores*; did they mean workers of false miracles? "Sufficere sibi se habere scripturam, quæ sit fortior omnibus præstigiis." The conference was in the year 419. — *D'Achery*, iii. p. 304.

Africa, might lead to the conclusion that they were the Teutonic clergy of a Teutonic people, each contentedly worshipping apart from each other, as under its separate law, so under its separate religion, until the superior intelligence, the more ardent activity of the orthodox Latins, brought over first the kings and nobles, as Recared in Spain and the later Lombard kings, afterwards the people, to the unity of the Church. The toleration of the Arians, and even writers like Orosius admit that in Gaul the Goths and Burgundians treated the orthodox Christians as brothers, was, after all, but indifference, or ignorance that there was another form of Christianity besides that which they had been taught.¹ It was more often that the Catholics provoked than suffered persecution wantonly inflicted.² That submission which the Roman paid to the clergy out of his innate and inveterate deference for law, if not from servility, arose in the Teuton partly from his inherent awe of the sacerdotal character, partly from his conscious inferiority in intellectual acquirements.³ No doubt already the Latin of the ordinary Church services had become, and naturally became more and more, a sacred language.⁴ The Gothic version of the

¹ Orosius, vii. 33. There was a kind of persecution of some bishops in Aquitaine.—Sidon. Apoll. vii. 6. Modaharius the Goth, a citizen, not a clergyman, is named by Sidonius—The name sounds like Latinized Teutonism. Of Euric, Sidonius says, "Pectori suo catholici mentio nominis acet." At this time the bishoprics of Bordeaux and eight others were vacant, no clergy ordained, the churches in ruins, herds pasturing on the grass-grown altars.

² See on the confederacy of the orthodox bishops in Burgundy with the Franks, ch. ii.

³ Compare Paullus Diaconus on the conversion of the Lombards, iv. 44.

⁴ I cannot refrain from quoting the observations of a modern writer:—"Christianity offered itself, and was accepted by the German tribes, as a law and as a discipline, as an ineffable, incomprehensible mystery. Its fruits

Scriptures was probably confined to that branch of the nation for which it had been made by Ulphilas: it could not have been disseminated widely. The Latin clergy, even if they had the will, could not, during the formation of the various dialects or languages which grew up in Europe, have translated the sacred books or the services of the Church into the ever-shifting and blending dialects. Till languages grew up, recognized as their own by nations, there could be no claim to a vernacular Bible or a vernacular Liturgy. Latin would establish a strong prescription, a prescription, in fact, of centuries; and that, as on the one hand it would tend to keep the clerical office chiefly in the hands of those of Latin descent, would likewise preserve the unity of which the centre was Rome.¹

Rome throughout this period is still standing in more lonely preëminence: from various circumstances, perhaps from the continually shifting boundaries of the kingdoms, the Metropolitan power, especially in Gaul, only centuries later, if ever, assumed its full weight. On the other hand, that of the bishops over the inferior clergy became throughout the western kingdoms more arbitrary and absolute. The bishop stands alone, the companion and counsellor of kings and nobles, the

were, righteousness by works (*Werkheiligkeit*), and belief in the dead word. But in a barbarous people it is an immense advance, an unappreciable benefit. Ritual observance is a taming, humiliating process; it is submission to law; it is the acknowledgment of spiritual inferiority; it implies self-subjection, self-conquest, self-sacrifice. It is not religion in its highest sense, but it is the preparation for it." — Ritter, *Geschich.*, *Christ. Philos.* i. p. 40.

¹ Planck supposes that for half a century after the conversion of the Franks the bishops were, without exception, Latin; about 566 appears a Meroveus, Bishop of Poitiers. — *Greg. Tur.* ix. 40; *Planck*, ii. 96. In the eighth century the clergy were chiefly from the servile class. — p. 159.

judge, the ruler; the College of Presbyters, the advisers, the coördinate power with the bishop, has entirely disappeared. It is rarely at this period that we discern in history the name of any one below the episcopal rank. Even in the legends of this age we scarcely find a saint who is not a bishop, or at least, and that as yet but rarely, an abbot.¹ The monasteries at first claimed no exemption from the episcopal autocracy: they aspired not yet to be independent, self-governed republics. The primitive monks, laymen in every respect, would have shrunk from the awful assertion of superiority to the common law of subjection. The earlier councils prohibited the foundation of a monastery, even of a solitary cell, without the permission of the bishop. Gradually monks were ordained, that the communities might no longer depend for the services of religion on the parochial clergy; but this infringement on the profound humility of the monk was beheld with jealousy by the more rigid. St. Benedict admits it with reserve and caution. It was not till splendid monasteries were founded by religiously prodigal nobles, kings, and even prelates, and endowed with ample territories and revenues, that they were withdrawn from the universal subordination, received special privileges of exemption, became free communities under the protection of the King, or of the Pope.² The lower clergy were in fact in great numbers ordained slaves, slaves which the Church did not choose at hazard from the general servile class, but from her own serfs, and who were thus trained to

¹ Planck, ii. 368.

² Compare M. Guizot, *Civilisation Moderne*, Leçon xv., who has traced the change, and cites the authorities with his usual sagacity and judgment.

habits of homage and submission. The first Franks or Goths who entered into holy orders would hardly be tempted by a less prize, or stoop to a lower dignity, than that of a bishop, except as far as it might be necessary to pass rapidly through the lower orders. The clergy were so entirely under the power of the bishop that a Spanish council thinks it necessary and seemly to secure them from arbitrary blows and stripes.¹

The ecclesiastical jurisprudence, therefore, was entirely, as well as the administration of the law in its more solemn form, in the bishops. They alone attended the synods or councils, they alone executed the decrees. Their mandate or their sanction was necessary for every important act of religion.

The whole penitential system was under their control and rested on their authority. Private confession might be received, absolution for private offences be granted by the priest: public or notorious crimes could be remitted by the bishop alone.

This ecclesiastical jurisprudence had its specific laws as ordinances for the government of the clergy; its more general statutes, which embraced all mankind. Every man, barbarian or Roman, under whichever civil law he lived, freeman or slave, was amenable to this code, which had the penitential system for its secondary punishment; excommunication, which in general belief, if the excommunicated died unreconciled, was tantamount to eternal perdition, for its capital punishment. The excommunication as

Penitential
system.

¹ "Ne passim unusquisque episcopus honorabilia membra sua presbyteros sive Levitas, prout voluerit et complacuerit, verberibus subjiciat et dolori." — Syn. Bracar. iv. A.D. 675, can. 7.

yet was strictly personal: it had not grown into the interdiction which smote a nation or a country.

Of this twofold law, that over the clergy and that over the laity, the administration of the first was absolutely in the bishops—that of the second only more remotely, and in the last resort. The usual penalties were different. The sacred person of the priest had peculiar privations and penalties, in some respects more severe, in others more indulgent, chastisements. The attempt to reconcile the greater heinousness of the offence in the sinful priest with the respect for his order, led at times to startling injustice and contradiction.¹

The delinquent clerk might be deprived for a time of his power of administering sacred things; he might be thrown back, an unworthy and a despised outcast, into the common herd of men, or rather lower than the common herd (for the ineffaceable ordination held him still in its trammels, in its responsibility, though he had forfeited its distinctions and its privileges), but even then the mercy of the Church provided courses of penance more or less long and austere, by which, in most cases, he might retrieve the past, and rise, to some at least, of his lost prerogatives. The monasteries, in later times, became a kind of penal settlements, where under strict provisions the exile might expiate his offences, work out the redemption of his guilt, if not permitted to return to the world, at

¹ Throughout the Penitentials, the penalties are heavier on the clergy than the laity. For murder, a clerk did penance for ten years, three on bread and water; a layman three, one on bread and water. The clergy too were punished according to their rank, where one in inferior orders has six, a deacon has seven, a priest ten, a bishop twelve years penance.—Morinus.

least die in peace; at all events his degradation was concealed from a babbling and censorious world.

The law administered by the clergy, throughout the Christian polity, comprehended every moral or religious act; and what act of man could be beyond that wide and undefined boundary? Whatever the Church, whatever the individual clergyman, declared to be sin (the appeal even to the bishop was difficult and remote), was sin. The timid conscience would rarely dare to judge for itself: the judge therefore was at once the legislator, the expounder of the law, the executioner of the law.¹

This law had its capital punishment — excommunication, which absolutely deprived of spiritual life. Excommunication, in its more solemn form, was rarely pronounced by lower than bishops.² It was the weapon with which rival bishops encountered each other, which they reserved for enemies of high rank. It was the sentence of Councils only which cut off whole sects from the communion of the Church.

But excommunication in a milder form — the temporary or the enduring deprivation of those means of grace without which salvation was hopeless, the refusal of absolution, the key which alone opened the gates of heaven — was in the power of every priest: on his judgment, on his decree, hung eternal life, eternal death.

¹ “Itaque postquam criminum omnium occultorum pœna quibuslibet presbyteris concessa est, libelli Pœnitentiales præter canones conditi sunt in quibus hæc omnia distincte in simpliciorum presbyterorum gratiam et necessariam instructionem enarrabantur, ut pœnitentiarum imponendarum officio defungi possent.” — Morinus. This work of Morinus de Pœnitentiâ affords ample and accurate knowledge on the history of the Penitential law, and of the different penitentials which prevailed in the Western churches.

² Public penance was at first only adjudged by the bishops. — Sirmond. de Pœnit. Public.; Opera, vol. iv.

But though this, like all despotic irresponsible power, or power against which the mass of mankind had no refuge, was liable to abuse, was often no doubt abused, it was still constantly counteracted by the Penitentials which as wisely (lest men should break the yoke in utter despair) as mercifully, were provided by the religious code of Christianity. The Penitentials were part of the Christian law; how early part of the written law, is not quite clear; nor were they uniform, or in fact established by any universal or central authority — that of Pope or Council;¹ but they were not the less an admitted customary or common law, a perpetual silent control on the arbitrary power of the individual priest, a guarantee as it were to the penitent, that if he faithfully submitted to the appointed discipline, he could not be denied the inappreciable absolution. The Penitentials thus, by regulating the sacerdotal power, confirmed it; that which might have seemed a hard capricious exaction became a privilege; the mercies of the law were indissolubly bound up with its terrors. However severe, monastic; unchristian, as enjoining self-torture; degrading to human nature, as substituting ceremonial observance for the spirit of religion; debasing instead of wisely humiliating; and resting in outward forms which might be counted and calculated (so many hours of fasting, so many blows of the scourge, so many prayers, so many pious ejaculations, for each offence) yet as enforcing, it might be, a rude and harsh discipline, it was still a moral and religious discipline. It may have been a low, timid, dependent

¹ The three oldest were the Penitentials of Archbishop Theodore of Canterbury, of Bede, and the Roman. That of Rabanus Maurus obtained in Germany. — Morinus.

virtue to which it compelled the believer, yet still virtue. It was a perpetual proclamation of the holiness and mercy of the Gospel. It was a constant preaching, on one hand, it might be of an unenlightened, superstitious Christianity, but still of Christianity. Yet, on the other hand, it was a recognition of a divine law, submission to a religion which might not be defied, which would not be eluded — a religion which would not deny its hopes to the worst, but would have at least resolutions, promises of amendment — the best security which it could obtain — from the unreasoning and fallible nature of man. It aspired at least to effect that which no human law could do, which baffled alike imperial and barbaric legislation, to impose constraint on the unchristian passions and dispositions. When sacerdotal religion was, if not necessary, salutary at least to mankind, it was the great instrument by which the priesthood ruled the mind of man. If it increased the wealth of the clergy, it was wealth much of which lawless possessors, spoilers, robbers, had been forced to regorge. If it invested them with an authority as dangerous to themselves as to the world, that authority was better than moral anarchy. However administered, it was still law, and Christian law, grounded on the eternal principles of justice, humanity, and truth.¹

¹ It will hereafter appear in our History how the penitential system degenerated into commutations for penance by alms (alms being only part of the penance, compensated for prayer), fasting, and other religious observances; alms regulated indeed by the rank and wealth of the transgressor, but with full expiatory value; commutations became indulgences; indulgences, first the remission of certain penitential acts, then general remissions of sins for definite periods, at length for periods almost approximating to eternity; and these for the easiest of religious duties, visits to a certain church, above all ample donations.

Widdleton's Editions of Choice Standard Works.

MILMAN'S HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

A HANDSOME LIBRARY EDITION.

THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY. From the Birth of Christ to the Abolition of Paganism in the Roman Empire. By HENRY HART MILMAN, Dean of St. Paul's. A New Edition, thoroughly revised and corrected. In 3 Volumes, crown 8vo. In large, clear type, on fine paper. Cloth, \$5.25; half calf, \$10.50.

This standard work of Milman, after having been before the world for a quarter of a century, and having for that period sustained the test of criticism and received the admiring homage of more than one generation of men, has now been thoroughly revised by its distinguished author, and produced in a style which, in size, clearness of type, and convenience of form, must recommend itself to all readers.

The work is divided into four "Books," which respectively treat of: I. The Life of Christ. II. The Resurrection, and the Promulgation of Christianity, with its Progress, to the Persecution of Diocletian. III. From Constantine to Jerome, and concluding with the Monastic System. IV. The Roman Empire under Christianity, with a sketch of the Public Spectacles of Rome, Christian Literature, and the Fine Arts.

These topics, of great interest in themselves, are rendered more interesting and attractive by the masterly manner in which they are treated.

Uniform with "History of Christianity,"

MILMAN'S HISTORY OF THE JEWS. From the Earliest Period down to Modern Times. A New Edition, thoroughly revised and extended. In 3 Volumes, crown 8vo. Cloth, extra, \$5.25; half calf, \$10.50.

And

MILMAN'S HISTORY OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY, including that of the Popes, to the Pontificate of Nicholas V. 8 Vols., crown 8vo. Cloth, extra, \$14.00; half calf, \$28.00.

No more acceptable present to a clergyman or student could be made than a set of Dean Milman's Works, comprised in the above 14 volumes, or any one of the works separately.

For sale at principal Bookstores throughout the country, and mailed by Publisher on receipt of Price.

W. J. WIDDLETON, PUBLISHER,
27 Howard Street, New York.

SINAI AND PALESTINE,

By ARCHBISHOP STANLEY,

Author of the History of the Eastern and the Jewish Church,

AND UNIFORM WITH THOSE VOLUMES.

SINAI AND PALESTINE, in Connection with their History. By ARTHUR PENRIYN STANLEY, D.D. With Colored Maps and Plates. A large Octavo Volume. Elegantly printed in large, clear type, on fine tinted paper. Price, in cloth, \$4.00; half calf, \$6.00.

Maps.

- I. DIAGRAM OF THE HEIGHTS OF EGYPT, SINAI, AND PALESTINE.
- II. EGYPT.
- III. PENINSULA OF SINAI.
- IV. TRADITIONAL SINAI.
- V. PALESTINE.
- VI. SOUTH OF PALESTINE.
- VII. PLAIN OF ESDRAELON AND GALILEE.

Wood-cuts.

1. SKETCH-MAP OF SYRIA.
2. SKETCH-PLAN OF JERUSALEM.
3. SKETCH-PLAN OF SHECHEM.
4. SKETCH-PLAN OF HOUSE AT NAZARETH AND AT LORETTO.

"Those who visit or who describe the scenes of sacred history expressly for the sake of finding confirmations of Scripture, are often tempted to mislead themselves and others by involuntary exaggeration or invention. But this danger ought not to prevent us from thankfully welcoming any such evidences as can truly be found to the faithfulness of the sacred records.

"One such aid is sometimes sought in the supposed fulfilment of the ancient prophecies by the appearance which some of the sites of Syrian or Arabian cities present to the modern traveller. But, as a general rule, these attempts are only mischievous to the cause which they intend to uphold. The present aspect of these sites may rather, for the most part, be hailed as a convincing proof that the Spirit of prophecy is not so to be bound down. The continuous existence of Damascus and Sidon, the existing ruins of Ascalon, Petra, and Tyre, showing the revival of those cities long after the extinction of the powers which they once represented, are standing monuments of a most important truth; namely, that the warnings delivered by 'holy men of old' were aimed not against stocks and stones, but then, as always, against living souls and sins, whether of men or of nations."—*From Author's Introduction.*

For sale at principal Bookstores throughout the country, and mailed by Publisher on receipt of Price.

W. J. WIDDLETON, PUBLISHER,

27 Howard Street, New York.

SYDNEY SMITH'S
WIT AND WISDOM.

THE WIT AND WISDOM OF SYDNEY SMITH.

Being Selections from his Writings, and Passages of his Letters and Table-talk. With a Steel Portrait, a Memoir, and Notes. By E. A. DUYCKINCK. Crown 8vo. Cloth, extra, \$2.25; half calf, \$4.00.

“When wit is combined with sense and information; when it is softened by benevolence and restrained by strong principle; when it is in the hands of a man who can use it and despise it, who can be witty and something much better than witty, who loves honor, justice, decency, good-nature, morality, and religion ten thousand times better than wit, — wit is then a beautiful and delightful part of our nature.”—SYDNEY SMITH.

“The remarkable union of good sense and rich humor in the writings of Sydney Smith renders his works among the most wholesome and refreshing of all the modern British essayists. The geniality of the man pervades the intelligence of the writer; reviews, sermons, table-talk, and lecture are permeated with the magnetic wisdom of a humane and vivacious character. It is not surprising, therefore, that a judicious selection from Sydney Smith's writings should have proved highly acceptable as a domestic memorial of the genial churchman. The editor has done his work with rare skill and judgment, and the result is one of the most charming volumes. It is just the book to keep at hand for recreation and suggestive reading. It abounds with passages of choice English, laden with truth and wisdom; it sparkles with wit and abounds in anecdote; and is like a living presence in its serene, solid, pleasant spirit. We know of no similar work so adapted to make a companion of as this felicitous compend of Sydney Smith's wit and wisdom.”

For sale at principal Bookstores throughout the country, and mailed by Publisher on receipt of Price.

W. J. WIDDLETON, PUBLISHER,
27 Howard Street, New York.

Milman's History of the Jews.

THE HISTORY OF THE JEWS. From the Earliest Period down to Modern Times. By HENRY HART MILMAN, Dean of St. Paul's. A New Edition, thoroughly revised and extended. In 3 Volumes, crown 8vo. Cloth, \$5.25; half calf, \$10.50.

" . . . Though the Jewish people are especially called the people of God, though their polity is grounded on their religion, though God be held the author of their theocracy, as well as its conservator and administrator, yet the Jewish nation is one of the families of mankind; their history is part of the world's history. The functions which they have performed in the progress of human development and civilization are so important, so enduring; the veracity of their history has been made so entirely to depend on the rank which they are entitled to hold in the social scale of mankind; their barbarism has been so fiercely and contemptuously exaggerated, their premature wisdom and humanity so contemptuously depreciated or denied; above all, the barriers which kept them in their holy seclusion have long been so utterly prostrate; friends as well as foes, the most pious Christians as well as the most avowed enemies of Christian faith, have so long expatiated on this open field, that it is as impossible, in my judgment, as it would be unwise to limit the full freedom of inquiry.

"Such investigations, then, being inevitable, and, as I believe, not only inevitable, but the only safe way of attaining to the highest religious truth, what is the right, what is the duty of a Christian historian of the Jews (and the Jewish history has, I think, been shown to be a legitimate province for the historian) in such investigations? The views adopted by the author in early days he still conscientiously maintains. These views, more free, it was then thought, and bolder than common, he dares to say not irreverent, have been his safeguard during a long and not unreflective life against the difficulties arising out of the philosophical and historical researches of our times; and from such views many, very many, of the best and wisest men whom it has been his blessing to know with greater or less intimacy, have felt relief from pressing doubts, and found that peace which is attainable only through perfect freedom of mind."—*Extract from Author's Preface.*

Uniform with "History of the Jews,"

MILMAN'S HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

New and Revised Edition. 3 Volumes, crown 8vo. Cloth, \$5.25; half calf, \$10.50.


And

MILMAN'S LATIN CHRISTIANITY. 8 Volumes, crown 8vo. Cloth, \$14.00; half calf, \$28.00.


For sale at principal Bookstores throughout the country, and mailed by Publisher on receipt of Price.

W. J. WIDDLETON, PUBLISHER,

27 Howard Street, New York.







UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

INTERLIBRARY LOANS

REC'D LD-UMI

MAY 07 1986

~~MAY 27 1986~~

Two Weeks From Date of Receipt



3 1158 01105 376

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY



A 000 352 06

