



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
University of Toronto

Ca Libris

P. G. Burke

STUDIES
IN
CHURCH HISTORY,

BY
REV. REUBEN PARSONS, D. D.

“That a theologian should be well versed in history, is shown by the fate of those who, through ignorance of history, have fallen into error Whenever we theologians preach, argue, or explain Holy Writ, we enter the domain of history.—”

MELCHIOR CANUS, *Loc. Theol.*, B. XI., c. 2.

VOL. II.
CENTURIES IX.-XIV.

SECOND EDITION.

FR. PUSTET & CO.,
NEW YORK AND CINCINNATI

1896.

THE INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES
10 ELMSLEY PLACE
TORONTO 5, CANADA,

OCT 2 - 1931

308

Imprimatur :

✠ MICHAEL AUGUSTINUS

Archiepiscopus Neo Eboracensis.

COPYRIGHT, 1825

REV. REUBEN PARSONS, D. D.

STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.

CHAPTER I.

THE MIDDLE AGES.

So wide-spread is the notion that the Middle Ages furnish no material for admiration, that their very name appears to be synonymous with all that is dark, cruel, and contemptible. The nineteenth century is pre-eminently well pleased with itself; the eighteenth—that is, the philosophasters who gave it its tone—vaunted that period as *the* bright one; the seventeenth and sixteenth complacently smiled at the prospect of an era of prosperity, universal and nearly unalloyed, finally opening to humanity. There were, undoubtedly, many and crying evils in the Middle Ages, especially in their first period—the Church had not yet entirely subdued our barbarian ancestors, and thoroughly assimilated them to her civilization. During the Golden Age of Leo X., men certainly had some reason for complacency with their time, and then, says Cantù, “came the Reformation, to increase the contempt for the Middle Ages. . . . all their institutions were regarded as so much ignorance and superstition. . . . Then came the philosophy of the last century, proposing to itself the demolition of the civil and religious hierarchies. . . . Both of these had been cradled and nourished by the Middle Ages; hence to combat that period appeared to be liberty, and to show one’s self an open enemy, not only to Catholicism, but to Christianity, was regarded as free-thinking” (1). Even among Catholics, we find many who look with distrust upon this eminently Catholic period, for the poison distilled by the Reformers, and by the infidel or

(1) CANTÙ; *Universal History*, 9th Ital. ed., Turin, 1862., B. 8, *Preliminary Discourse*.

semi-infidel historians of the last century, has been eagerly imbibed by many who are deceived by the speciousness of its disguise, and by the ignorant, who know not of the existence of an antidote. There is a certain charm, for many, about Voltaire, even when he says that an inquiry into the Middle Ages produces contempt (1); about Gibbon, when, overcome by his admiration for Pagan Rome, he feigns to lament the corruption of the ensuing centuries (2); about Montesquieu, when he calls "nearly all the medieval laws barbarous" (3); about Botta, finding fault with that miserable time, when society "was regulated by the threats and promises of a future life." We are not at all disgusted with the nineteenth century, nor do we consider the Middle Ages in every respect enviable. "Far from us the wish to pine away in useless regret, and to wear out our eyes weeping over the tomb of nations whose inheritors we are. Far from us the thought of bringing back times which have forever fled. We know that the Son of God died upon the cross to save mankind, not during five or six centuries, but for the world's entire duration. . . . We regret not, therefore, however we may admire, any human institutions which have flourished, according to the lot of everything that is human; but we bitterly regret the soul, the divine spirit, which animated them, and which is no longer to be found in the institutions that have replaced them." (4).

The remark of De Maistre, that for the last three centuries, history has been a permanent conspiracy against truth, is now not quite so true as when he made it. That deliberate conspiracy of the enemies of Catholicism has no longer any effect, unless on the minds of the ignorant or the superficially informed. The labors of the Protestants, Ranke, Voigt, and Hurter, have changed, to some extent, the current of Protestant thought, wherever it has been unallied with ignorance or wilful blindness. What Ranke, in spite of himself (5), succeeded in partially doing for the Papacy of

(1) *Essay on the Morals and Spirit of Nations*, c. 33.

(2) *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, passim.

(3) *Spirit of Laws*.

(4) MONTALEMBERT, *Life of St. Elizabeth of Hungary*, in *Introduction*.

(5) Saint-Cheron, in his preface to his second French edition of Ranke's work, says that the German author was not a little disappointed on seeing the preference accorded to his book by the Catholic public, and "at its having become an active organ of a propaganda in

the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Voigt did more fully for the Popes of the eleventh, and Hurter almost entirely did for the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. The shelves of Catholic libraries had been always loaded with triumphant refutations of Protestant and infidel calumnies against the ages of faith ; every Catholic scholar had been well conversant with such works ; but the great mass of those outside the fold were in Cimmerian darkness as to the true significance of those ages. We could not have expected the prejudices of our dissenting friends to permit of their studying the pages of authors like Cantù, Christophe, Semichon ; but Providence ordained that they should be somewhat enlightened by some of their own brethren. However, the impression remains among the masses, to some extent among Catholics as well as among Protestants and infidels, that there is but little for men to learn from the Middle Ages ; that they were, pre-eminently, ages of barbarism, of ignorance, and of superstition.

There are two kinds of barbarism, remarks Condillac : one which precedes enlightened periods, and another which follows them. And, well adds Benjamin Constant, the first, if compared with the second, is a desirable condition. Deeply hostile to the ages of Catholic unity, to that period to which they would fain ascribe the adulteration of primitive Christianity, heterodox polemics have not adverted to the ungraciousness of an accusation of barbarism formulated against the Middle Ages by men who regard as enlightened the times which produced Henry VIII., Elizabeth, Cromwell, in England ; which tolerated the civil wars of the sixteenth century in France ; which have witnessed the modern wars of succession, and more than one Reign of Terror. And whence came the quota of cruelty, destructiveness, and injustice, which many complacent moderns regard as characteristic of the Middle Ages ? From the Catholic clergy, reply the ignorant and malignant, who ignore the innate barbarism of the Northern hordes and the posterior civilization of these by the same Catholic

favor of the misunderstood authority of the heads of our holy Church . . . in spite of him, the divine face, which he tried to leave in shadow, has been illumined by the splendor of truth."

BQX

77

.P26

Vol. 2

clergy. The fact is also ignored that, while nearly every ruin on European soil was made such by the Pagan invaders, or by the heretics of the sixteenth century, or by the impious of the eighteenth; nearly all the miracles of architectural skill and beauty now admired in Europe are the work of the Middle Ages, conceptions of Catholic minds, and results of Catholic generosity. We are frequently told that the Middle Ages were distinguished for oppression of the individual; but in those days originated the political constitutions of modern nations (1).

As for the barbarism so justly lamented when and where it did exist, blind injustice alone can ascribe it to the Catholic clergy, for they were always the first victims of the barbarians; their churches, libraries, and monasteries were sacked and burnt, the priests and monks often ruthlessly massacred. And how ungrateful is this charge, since it was this same Catholic clergy who transformed the devastating beasts into men and Christians, who repaired the damage inflicted, and preserved all of civilization that they themselves had not created.

(1) "I say nothing about the Canon Law, which was an immense advance in mercy and equity, and in which brute force was first opposed by discussion, baronial caprice by written law; in which, for the first time, all were declared equal before the law. But how great as legislators were Charlemagne, Alfred of England, St. Stephen of Hungary, St. Louis of France, and a few of the German emperors? Then England wrote her *Charta*, imperfect, yes, but not yet excelled or equalled, and which, although founded on feudalism, so well guarantees personal and real liberty. Then the commercial republics of Italy compiled a maritime code which is still in force. Then the various Communes provided themselves with statutes, which appear curious only to those who know nothing of those times and places. Then the republics of Germany, of Switzerland, and of Italy experimented with every kind of political regime, trying constitutions not at all academical—constitutions adopted, not because they were English or Spanish, but because they were opportune, peculiar, historical. Then the middle class, showing the best indication of strength—growth, caused by resistance—penetrated into the monarchy, giving to it life, force, and glory; and although the present and future importance of this class was not understood, it became the people, the nation, the sovereign. Observe the Congress of Pontida, or the Peace of Constance, or the nocturnal meetings under the oak of Truns or in the meadows of Rütli, where simple-minded men swear, in the name of that God who created both serf and noble, to maintain their customs and their country's freedom! Observe those Synods, in which religion makes herself guardian of the rights of man. Observe the people at the *witena-gemot* of England, at the French *Champs de Mai*, at the diets of Roncaglia, or at that of Lanego, where a new nation draws up the constitution of Portugal—more liberal than many modern ones—with a throne surrounded by a nobility not derived from conquest, not founded on possessions or bought with money, but conferred on those who have been loyal to Church and country, valorous in freeing the latter from the foreigner. And these laws were confirmed because they were *good* and *just*, conditions ignored by the ancient jurists, and forgotten by many modern ones." CANTU; *loc. cit.*—We learn from Tacitus (*Customs of the Germans*) that the ancient Germans met in parliament on certain days, in the open fields. Fredegarus (*p.* 776) informs us that the Franks continued the custom in the assemblies called of the *Campi Martii*, and afterwards of the *Campi Martii*. Landolph the Younger (*c.* 9 and 31) says that the archbishops of Milan met their vassals in similar diets. For such assemblies the Holy Roman emperors, as kings of Italy, chose the plains of Roncaglia, between the Po and the Nura, about three miles from Piacenza. According to Arnolphus (*H. R. Empire*, v. IV., b. 3, c. 4.) Henry II. met the first diet in 1047. The *Acts of the parliament held at Roncaglia under Barbarossa* are found in Pertz's *Hist. Monuments of Germany*, v. II.; Hanover, 1837.—TOSTI; *History of the Lombard League*, B. II., note A; Montecassino, 1848.

Until comparatively late days, few historians seem to have regarded the Middle Ages as worthy of serious investigation. According to many of these—generally successful—formers of public opinion, even the land of Dante and Petrarch was buried in ignorance the most dense, until the fall of Constantinople caused Grecian scholars to claim her hospitality; “not a painter had flourished before Cimabue, and no artist merited notice until the favor of some prince created Michael Angelo and Raphael; the Italians had lost even the remembrance of their ancient laws, until, during some devastation, a copy of the *Pandects* was unearthed; only a capricious jargon was written and spoken until the present Italian language was improvised, and—like armed Minerva from the brain of Jove—issued forth, wonderful virgin, to influence the entire universe.” (1). But with the indefatigable labors of cardinal Baronio, who, from the monuments of the Vatican, methodically and lucidly extended the *Annals of the Church* (and precisely therefore, of what was then the civilized world), new light was shed upon the intellectual condition of the Middle Ages (2). Much more knowledge was contributed by Muratori (3), a diligent and critical annalist to whom, more than to all other

(1) CANTU; *loc. cit.*—

—Hallam, although not addicted to criticism or to investigation of original sources of history, because he regarded such labors as “not incumbent on a compiler,” (*View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, chap. i., note 1), nevertheless hit upon truth when he said: “Italy supplied the fire from which other nations, in this first, as afterwards in the second era of the revival of letters, lighted their own torches. Lanfranc, Anselm, Peter Lombard, the founder of systematic theology in the twelfth century, Irnerius, the restorer of jurisprudence, Gratian, the author of the first compilation of Canon Law, the School of Salerno, that guided medical art in all countries, the first dictionaries of the Latin tongue, the first treatise on Algebra, the first great work that makes an epoch in Anatomy, are as truly and exclusively the boast of Italy, as the restoration of Greek literature and of classical taste in the fifteenth century.”—*Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the 15th, 16th, and 17th Centuries*, vol. i., c. 2.

(2) *Annals of the Church, from the Birth of Christ to the year 1198*, Rome, 1588—1607, 12 vols. in fol. These *Annals* have been continued by, 1st, the Polish Dominican Bzovius (Rome, 1616), and augmented (Cologne 1621—1640), down to 1572; 2d, by Spondannus, bishop of Pamiers (Paris, 1640); 3d, by Oderico Rinaldi, Oratorian, 7 vols. fol. (Rome, 1646—1663), from 1198, where Baronio ended, down to 1566; 4th, by Laderchius, 3 vols. fol. (Rome, 1728—1737); 5th, by Augustine Theiner, Oratorian, prefect of the Vatican Archives, 3 vols. fol. (Rome, 1856), from 1572 to our days. Baronio does not always distinguish apocryphal from authentic documents, and he not seldom uses Greek versions of dubious sincerity—faults rather of his age than his own; but with the aid of the corrections by the Franciscan, Pagi, by Mansi (Cong. Mother of God), and by the Protestant Casaubon, his work is invaluable.

(3) *Annals of Italy, from the birth of Christ to 1750*, Milan, 18 vols. 8vo, 1753—56. — *Writers on Italian Matters, from 500 to 1500*, 28 vols. fol., Milan, 1723—51. The expense of this publication was defrayed by sixteen Italian gentlemen, who each contributed 4000 scudi.—*Italian Antiquities of the Middle Age, from the fall of the Roman Empire until 1500*, Milan, 6 vols. fol. 1739—43.—*Estensian Antiquities*, Modena, 1717—40, 2 vols. fol. When it is remembered that Muratori edited over fifty folio volumes, nearly fifty quartos, and innumerable octavos and duodecimos, it seems strange that more inexactnesses do not occur.

writers, modern historians must refer. Tiraboschi (1), Scipio Maffei (2), Du Cange (3), Tillemont (4), Pertz (5), Leo (6), J. Moeller (7), may be consulted with profit. As for English historians of the Middle Ages, several are pretentious, few recommendable. Robertson (8) is carried away by his contempt for this period, and, to use the words of Cantù, "infatuated with the present liberties of his country, he calumniates the time when the edifice was not complete, forgetting that just then its foundation was laid, and its grandeur prepared." "Hume," says the same judicious and impartial critic, "in order to flatter the Encyclopedists, then the dispensers of fame, too often adopts the weapons of contempt and ridicule, capital enemies of reflection; and, sceptical of generosity, understands liberty only under certain appearances. Endowed with reason, but with no imagination; a sceptic in history as in philosophy; evidently and unfortunately partial; he entirely misunderstands the Anglo-Saxon period, regarding the English constitution as already formed at the birth of the nation. Of what assistance can he be, therefore, in an endeavor to become acquainted with foreign peoples"? Hallam has eyes for governments, never for peoples; hence, while he follows the development of a constitution, he disconnects it from the sources of its origin. Gibbon, most renowned of English historians, "regarded," says Cantù, "with veneration by his school, and respected even by his opponents, is vastly erudite, shows great sagacity in discovering new sources, artfully groups facts and interprets intentions. What book, therefore, can flatter to a greater extent the convenient propensity to agree with an author? But reflecting readers perceive in his writings a continuous diatribe, inspired by the simultaneous prejudices of a Jew, a heretic, and a 'philosopher'—a diatribe permeated by two ideas, admira-

(1) *History of Italian Literature.*

(2) *History of Verona.*

(3) In his *Glossary*, and especially in his Notes to the text of Anna Comnena in the *Writers of Byzantine History* (Paris, 1640—50), printed at the Louvre by order of Louis XIV.

(4) *History of the Emperors.*

(5) *Historical Monuments of Germany*, from 500 to 1500, Hanover, 1826.

(6) *History of the Middle Age* (1830).

(7) *Manual of the History of the Middle Age, from the Fall of the Western Empire until the Death of Charlemagne* (Paris, 1857).

(8) *Introduction to the Life of Charles V.*

tion of Roman greatness and hatred for all religion." (1).

It is false that the Middle Ages were pre-eminently times of ignorance; that, as some have not hesitated to say, men had lost the faculty of reasoning. In this epoch flourished Abélard, Dante, Albert the Great, Thomas of Aquin. It is true that the hunting and soldiering barbarians at first disdained the peaceful triumphs of letters, and regarded the fine arts as a disgraceful inheritance of the people they had conquered; that, for a time, even the olden subjects—of the secular order—of Rome lost taste for the sublime and the beautiful. But then science found a friend in the sanctuary and in the cloister: and the clergy preserved, as a sacred deposit, the traditions of literature and art. As for moral science, have modern times surpassed Anselm, Lanfranc, Peter Damian, or Peter Lombard? As for practical science, do we know much more than did our medieval ancestors? We will mention a few of the improvements and inventions which we owe to these compassionated men.

I. The paper on which we write (linen) is, according to Hallam, an invention of the year 1100 (2); cotton paper was certainly used in Italy in the tenth century. II. The art of printing, or rather the *press*, was invented in 1436, either by Lawrence Coster, a chaplain in the Cathedral of Harlem, and a xylograph printer, or by the artisan Gensfleisch, called Guttenberg (3); but printing by hand was done in the tenth century. III. That music may be now called a science is due to Guido of Arezzo, an Italian monk, who, in 1124, determined the scale, hitherto uncertain.

(1) Abp. Martin Spalding, in his valuable Lecture on *Literature and the Arts in the Middle Ages*, regards Hallam and Maitland as superior to all other English writers on this period, but he well remarks that, compared with the labors of Muratori and Tiraboschi, "their works, learned and excellent as they are in many respects, are but pigmies." *Miscellanea*, vol. i., c. 4.

(2) Casiri, drawing up a Catalogue of the Escorial Library, says that most of its Mss. are of rag-paper, calling them *chartaccos*, in contradistinction to the membranous and cotton ones. At No. 787, he cites the *Aphorisms of Hippocrates*, *Coder an. Chr.* 1100, *chartaccus*, and does not deem it remarkable. Peter of Cluny, in a treatise against the Jews, speaks of books made from the shreds of old cloths.

(3) The Abbé Le Noir, in his adaptation of Bergier's *Dictionary*, analyzes the known facts concerning this invention, and thus concludes: "Coster, we believe, invented and first employed movable types. Guttenberg came across Coster's plans, perfected them, and with invincible patience endeavored to execute them on a grand scale. But, constantly needing funds, he was compelled to put himself in the hands of an adroit banker, Faust, who played upon him the trick he himself had practised on Coster, appropriated the invention, and gathered the profits."—The *Chronicles of Feltre* say that Pafflo Castaldi, a humanist of that city, taught his disciple Faust, in 1436, the use of movable types. Stereotyping, now the perfection of printing, was known and practised by Coster, though he knew not, of course, any way of casting the plates.

His *solmisation*, or the use of the *ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la*, was signified by means of the words of the first verses of the Vesper Hymn for the feast of the Baptist (1). Ughelli, in his *Sacred Italy*, proves that, in the ninth century, the Italians used pneumatic organs. iv. In the twelfth century, the mariners of Amalfi first applied the knowledge of the loadstone to navigation, inventing the mariner's compass, thus enabling subsequent Italian navigators to prosecute geographical discovery. v. It is amusing to learn that in those days of alleged ignorance, and hence carelessness of study, one of the most important aids to study should have been invented. To enable persons of defective eyesight to read, the ancients used a sphere filled with water, but about 1285 a Pisan monk, named Salvino d'Armato, invented spectacles. In a sermon preached in Florence, Feb. 23, 1305, the famous friar Giordano di Rivalta said: "Only twenty years ago were spectacles invented; I knew and conversed with the inventor." vi. By a people's language we can surely judge of their refinement and their intellectual calibre. Now it was in these despised Middle Ages that were formed and perfected the languages of modern Europe. Humboldt may have erred when he judged that grammatical forms are not the fruit of the progress made by a nation in analysis of thought, but he rightly admitted that these forms "are results of the manner in which a nation considers and treats its language." (2). And we are asked to believe that the densest ignorance and the grossest sentiments were the portion of the times which produced the sweet and philosophic Italian, the majestic Spanish, the graceful French, and the forcible English and German tongues (3). vii. Have modern times rivalled the Middle Ages in architectural

(1) *Ut queant laxis, Resonare fibris, Mira gestorum. Famuli tuorum, Solve polluti, Labii reatum, Sancte Joannes!*

(2) *Letters on the Nature of Grammatical Forms*. Paris, 1827, p. 15.

(3) "The Latin language began to decline even in the first century of our era, and its decay corresponded to that of the Roman empire and of Roman civilization. With the irruption of the barbarians, the corruption became so extensive that the old organism perished, and the relics could not be termed a new language. Christianity took hold of this raw material, placed therein the embryonic principles of new organizations, and fecundated them with the hieratic word, performing the two duties symbolized by the oriental myths of the cosmic egg and androgynism. Thus the modern idioms were born from the material of the old, informed and organized by the religious idea and by the sacer-

skill and taste? With the exception of St. Peter's at Rome—itself a result of the *spirit* of that despised period—all the most magnificent structures of Europe, all the real triumphs of architecture, are of mediæval conception and execution. Glass windows, too, introduced only in the fourth century, commenced to present beautiful colors in the early Middle Age; and in the twelfth century the Church began, by means of those wonderful window-pictures, to reach the hearts and intellects of such of her children as, perchance, were not penetrated by the words of her preachers. VIII. The system of banking, with its convenient bills of exchange, was originated by the Italians in the twelfth century. IX. In the year 650, wind-mills were invented; in 657, organs; the Greek fire in 670; carpet-weaving in 720; clocks in 760; in 790, the Arabic numerals were introduced; in 1130, the silk-worm was first cultivated in Europe; in 1278, gunpowder was invented: engraving in 1410; oil-painting in 1415. (1).

total word. At first each of these idioms was a mere dialect, that is, a vulgar speech, rude, ignoble, private, unfit for public use and for writing, not yet possessed of a life of its own, independent of the ancient mother's. And just as the fetus becomes a man, the human animal an infant, coming out into the light and entirely separating from the maternal body, so a dialect is transformed into an illustrious language, fit to signify ideal things, through the work of noble writers who divert it from popular usage, and introduce it into the forum, the temple, the schools, and into the conversation of the learned—who develop its scientific and aesthetic powers, and who give it a being entirely distinct from its progenitrix. The first of modern dialects to run this course was the Tuscan, or, to speak correctly, the Florentine, which afterwards became the noble language of Italy, just as the Castilian and the Picard became the national idioms of Spain and of France. The Tuscan was already conceived before 1200, when Folcacchiero and Ciullo d'Alcamo dictated their rude sonnets; it was born with Dante, who first initiated the speech of the Arno into the public life of civilization and of learning, and rendered it, so far as literature is concerned, not only Italian, but European." GIOBERTI; *Civil and Moral Primacy of the Italians*, Capolago, 1346, vol. ii., p. 275.

(1). As an evidence of the intellectual decadence of the Middle Ages, it is alleged that then the science of criticism was unknown. To this Cantù replies: "I do not hesitate to assert that, of all the questions agitated since that time, perhaps not one was not raised during that period. Although the age of Leo X. believed Annius of Viterbo (a Chatterton of the 15th century) and that of the *Encyclopædia* in Ossian, the eleventh century questioned the authenticity of the *False Decretals* (of Isidore Mercator). King Liutprand and Bishop Agobard condemned trials by combat and the ordeals by fire and water, although these were upheld by prejudice, custom, and law; they also ridiculed the belief that witches produced tempests. The monk Virgilius (Ferghil) and John of Salisbury taught the correct mundane system and the existence of antipodes. Even in those days, both the spiritual and temporal rule of the Pope were attacked and defended; then war was made, by argument and by ridicule, on the abuses of monachism and on false piety; then were weighed the prerogatives of kings, and their titles to power; then were laid the foundations of civil order in such a manner as to produce the only constitutions which have long endured. Every system, dogma, and rite, found champions and opponents; and the political heresies of Arnold of Brescia and of Friar Dolcino, the philosophical ones of Origen and of Abélard, the religious ones of Photius and of the Albigenses, left nothing new for Luther and Socinus to pronounce. And what if we reflect that these rude ancestors of ours civilized half the world; that, by the translation of the Bible, modern languages were formed; that hymns were composed which have been sung by the most refined centuries; that entire nations were withdrawn from licentious and ferocious superstition? Undoubtedly, much was wanting; but deny, if you can, to Alexander the title of consummate general, because he would not have been able to conquer at Leipsic or to reduce Antwerp, or the title of poet to Homer because he was ignorant of geography and astronomy." (*loc. cit.*).

A very efficient reason for that aversion to the Middle Ages, which we may observe in most heterodox writers and in all devotees of materialism, is the fact that those days formed the golden period of monasticism—a system which is as much a part of the history of the human mind, as it is of ecclesiastical history, and which must necessarily find an enemy in the spirit of the world. Of eastern birth, and at first unacceptable to the westerns, the influence of St. Athanasius—who had studied its spirit during his exile—introduced it to Rome, and in less than two centuries it was spread throughout the empire. With the sixth century came the great monastic legislators, SS. Benedict and Columbanus; and new rules, providing every constituent of wise government, enabled the monks to survive the influence of barbarism to become the refuge of virtue and enlightenment. With the twelfth century, the world beheld an alliance hitherto deemed impossible—that of the religious state with the military profession. The genius of the age enabled the soldier to sanctify his valor, directing it against the enemies of the faith, and observing the monastic vows amid the duties and hardships of the field. The knights of St. John—afterwards styled of Rhodes, and finally of Malta; the Templars—in time degraded, but for a long period a glory of Christendom; the Teutonic Order—at first devoted to the care of the sick poor, but soon taking arms for the defence of Palestine and for the civilization of Northern Germany (1); the knights of St. Lazarus, of Calatrava, of

(1). During the pontificate of Innocent III. (1198—1216), Christian, a Cistercian monk, had introduced Christianity into Prussia, and was made bishop of that region, on his visit to the Holy See, in 1214. Returning, he found his converts relapsed into idolatry, and at war with the Christians of Culm, having already destroyed over two hundred and fifty churches. Christian preached a crusade, and erected the citadel of Culm, finally compelling the Prussians to abandon idolatry. A new revolt of the barbarians prompted the bishop to institute the Military Order of Christ; but in 1224 the knights, five only excepted, were killed in battle. Christian then persuaded Conrad, duke of Mazovia, to implore the aid of the Teutonic knights; this prince ceded to the Order all the lands it could subdue. In fifty years Prussia, Lithuania, and Pomerania were conquered. "The vow of obedience observed by these soldier-friars," says Cantù, "produced in them a discipline unknown to other governments, their wills being bound by honor and by religion. Into this sovereign Order the reigning families of Germany proudly enrolled their sons; in Prussia kings and princes served an apprenticeship to arms; respect gave strength to the Order, which soon reached the height of power, but afterwards fell into debauchery and tyranny." The last grand-master of the Teutonic knights, Albert of Brandenburg, yielded to the temptation of Luther to convert his power into a secular principality—a temptation which another Albert of Brandenburg, his kinsman and archbishop of Mainz and Magdeburg, had resisted (*Epist. Luth.* in Coehlaeus, y. 1526). He appropriated nearly all the property of the Order, united himself to the Princess Dorothy of Holstein, and divided Prussia with Poland, becoming tributary to the latter for the portion reserved to himself—thus founding the present kingdom of Prussia. Protestant writers find fault with the means taken by the Teutonic knights

St. James, of Alcantara, and many other associations, were probably the most efficient of all the human means used by the Roman Pontiffs in their struggle to preserve European civilization. With the thirteenth century came the Mendicant Orders, devoted to the combat against the errors and vices of the Albigenses and other innovators of the period. Since wealth had caused the discredit of many of the olden religious, SS. Francis and Dominick prohibited every kind of property, even in common, to their disciples; and although this severity lasted but a short time, these friars obtained and preserved, by their general virtue and zeal, the esteem of Church and State. What service did these religious render society? In the first place, agriculture, which may be styled the first of arts and the source of all real wealth, grew to be respected by our ancestors, because of the example of the monks. Fleury, speaking of the work of the monks in Germany, says: "They were useful in the temporal order, owing to the labor of their hands. They levelled the vast forests which covered the land. By their industry and their wise management the earth was cultivated; the inhabitants multiplied; the monasteries produced great cities, and their dependencies became considerable provinces. What were once the new Corbie and Bremen, now two great towns? What were Fritzlar, Herfeld, cities of Thuringia? Before the monks, what were Saltzburg, Frisengen, Echstadt, episcopal cities of Bavaria? Where were St. Gall and Kempten in Switzerland, where were such towns as St. Gall? Where so many other cities of Germany?" (1). Secondly, the monks aided the poor and the oppressed. "For a long time," says Voltaire (2), "it was a con-

vert the idolatrous Prussians. Bergier thus replies: "It is falsely supposed that the crusades and military operations of the knights were primarily designed for the conversion of the infidels. Their object was to defend Christians against the attacks, insults, and violence of idolaters; to prevent the irruptions of these, and to repress their brigandage. Where was the crime? Christianity and the natural law both prohibit private violence, but they do not prohibit nations from opposing force with force. Whether the warriors be knights or soldiers, volunteers or mercenaries, religious or seculars, the question is whether or not Christianity condemns the use of arms in every case. The knights never became preachers, and the missionaries were never armed. The barbarians were ferocious beasts, who by force were first to be made men, before any thought could be entertained of Christianizing them; the former task was for the knights, the latter for the missionaries. It is said that these means were calculated rather to disgust than to convert the barbarians, but the fact is that they were converted, and that the entire North became and is Christian . . . It is one thing to patiently suffer persecution at the hands of one's government, another to allow one's self to be killed by foreign barbarians, practising brigandage against the law of nations.

(1) *Discourse iii.*, no. 22.

(2) *Spirit and Customs of Nations*, v. iii.

solation for the human race that these refuges were open to those who wished to escape Gothic and Vandal tyranny." Thirdly, the monks cultivated letters. Outside the monasteries few persons, in the early Middle Age, knew how to write; but within these walls patient laborers were constantly at work transcribing and perpetuating such monuments of intellect as the barbarians had spared. "I declare," wrote Cassiodorus to his monks of Viviers, "that of all bodily labors, the copying of books is the most to my taste." Without this labor, and without that jealous love of their libraries which caused the monks to say that "a cloister without a library is like a citadel without weapons," we would to-day possess not one monument of ancient lore. And what praise is not due to the schools of the monasteries? In these schools were taught, generally gratuitously, not only sacred science, but rhetoric, dialectics, astronomy, grammar, and music. History, especially, owes everything to the monks, who not only preserved all records of the far past, but minutely recorded the events of their own day. In all the great monasteries, an exact and able writer was appointed to keep this record, and after mature examination, the *Chronicle* was handed down to posterity. Italy owes all knowledge of her history to her innumerable cowed chroniclers; France is a similiar debtor to Ado of Vienne, William of St. Germer, Odoric of St. Evroul, both Aimoins, and Hugh of Flavigny; England to Bede, Ingulph, William of Malmesbury, and the two Matthews of Westminster and Paris; Germany to Rhegino, abbot of Prom, Witikind, Lambert of Aschaffenburg. Ditmar, and Hermann Contractus (1). In fine, so assiduously did

(1) "The sciences termed historical have a character very different from that of the sciences regarded as pre-eminently exact. The art of materially arranging facts is, for them, only a preparation; these facts, independent of their moral signification, are nothing of themselves. . . . The documents which preserve the souvenirs of humanity have a tendency to disappear, because they refer to events not identically renewed, as are the constant works of nature. This infinite diversity engenders immense difficulties of labor: to render history fruitful, there must be a unity of action in the grouping of facts, and a unity of opinion in the judgment formed. Subordination of agents in a common direction, division of the one task among many workmen—a division proportioned to the extent of the work, are primary conditions for every great historical undertaking. All such enterprises as are very exact and very extensive have been the work of religious bodies. In these bodies alone have been found men with a spirit of self-denial sufficient to renounce the joys of personal fame. . . . Here facts speak more eloquently than argument; the Revolution, by destroying the Benedictine Order, put an end to the great records of our history. Of these works, some, such as *Christian Gaul* and the *Annals of the Order of St. Benedict*, the *Letters of the Popes*, have not been resumed (they have, since the time of Lenormant); others have been continued by the institute, but slowly and imperfectly. In confiding to the Institute the prosecution of the work of the Benedictines, and providing

the monks of the Middle Ages cultivate letters and every branch of science, that the slow progress of these, during the early portion of that period, can be ascribed only to the then existing political situation of Christendom. Intellectual culture depends, for brilliant results, on the lot of states; only when government is somewhat settled, do men turn to the Muses. Nevertheless, very many of the medieval monks would have honored the reigns of Augustus or Pope Leo X. Science can show no more devoted or brilliant disciples than Gerbert (Pope Sylvester II.), Albert the Great, or Roger Bacon. Of the first, the inventor of the wheel and weight clock, and the projector of the telescope, D'Alembert well said that he who first used the wheels and weights, would have invented watches in another age; and if Gerbert had lived in the time of Archimedes, perhaps he would have equalled that mechanician (1).

Even the early Middle Age could not have been so ignorant as we are asked to believe, since every cathedral, as well as nearly every monastery, had its school and library, in accordance with canonical enactments. Hallam admits

generously for its expenses, the State believed all had been done; despite the fixity of the academies, despite the often admirable zeal of the members, no equivalent has been found for the continuous, persevering, and multiple action of the monks. An equitable discernment has not guided the choice of editors; political considerations and momentary interest have entered into the task; and the consequence has been an unequal mass, an incoherent agglomeration of excellent and inferior volumes—and yet, there was a question merely of printing manuscripts. What would have been the result, if the Institute had undertaken the composition of great works like those of the Benedictines? I show only the exterior inconveniences of the actual organization of science; I do not push the lantern into its innermost recesses. I could have traced a deplorable tableau of the combats of vanity or of want against the councils of duty. When I see the governing powers occupying themselves with the secret vices which attack the intellectual calibre of the country; when I behold an attempt at a new organization at the base of which there is a little honor, and much security for those who devote themselves to science, then I will admit that great historical works can be produced by a lay society." LENORMANT, *Religious Association in Christian Society*, Paris, 1844, § xix. The Benedictines to whose labors Lenormant alludes were indeed posterior to the Middle Ages, but the judgments of the author are strictly applicable to their medieval predecessors.

(1) MM. Ives; Guyot and Sigismond Lacroix, in their *History of the Proletaires*, one of the most bitterly anti-Christian works of our day, are constrained to speak as follows, concerning the works of the Middle Ages: "A Benedictine monastery was a barrack for work and for prayer. But the time devoted to labor shows the special characteristic of the western monasteries. A monastery was an insurance company, and also an industrial and agricultural association. Certain works required great enterprise and a great cohesion of forces. At that time (the Merovingian period), credit did not exist; shares and stocks were unknown. But the monks established something similar. There was plenty of land, and the elements for its utilization were at hand; but men feared the desert, the swamp, and the forest, for the redemption of these was apparently above human strength. Then the monks came, like the American pioneers of our day. They selected a valley, or some propitious spot; they set to work, levelling the trees, draining the swamps, and founded an agricultural colony. All this the monks did by association. . . . They formed veritable industrial societies. . . . Among the most celebrated were the Bridge-building Friars (*Fratres Pontifices*), who daringly threw bridges over the torrents throughout Southern France. These constructed the Saint-Esprit bridge across the Rhone." Messrs. Guyot and Lacroix describe the vast possessions of the abbey of St. Germain-des-Prés, which had a radius of forty leagues around Paris (at the time of Louis le Débonnaire), and every foot of which the monks had reclaimed from the desert.

that "the praise of having originally established schools belongs to some bishops and abbots of the sixth century;" but—at least, so far as Ireland is concerned—it is certain that her schools were celebrated throughout Europe in the fifth century. As to the continent, we find the Council of Vaison recommending, in 529, the institution of free parochial schools. To cite only a few of similar decrees, there is a canon of the 3d General Council of Constantinople, 680, commanding priests to have free schools in all country places; one of a Synod of Orleans, 800, ordering the parochial clergy "to teach little children with the greatest charity, receiving no compensation, unless voluntarily offered by the parents;" one of Mentz, 813, commanding parents to send their children "to the schools in the monasteries, or in the houses of the parish clergy;" one of Rome, under Eugenius II., 826, prescribing schools in every suitable place. As to higher education, not only was it not neglected, but the most celebrated universities were founded and perfected in the "dark" ages. Most renowned were the Irish school of Bangor (Benchor)—with its thousands of scholars; and the other Irish schools founded at Lindisfarne in England: Bobbio in Italy; Verdun in France; Würzburg, Ratisbon, Erfurt, Cologne, and Vienna, in Germany. The great University of Bologna, an outgrowth of the law-school there established by Theodosius II., became so celebrated under Irnerius (d. 1140), that of foreigners alone more than ten thousand thronged its halls (1); The University of Padua frequently numbered eighteen thousand students. Famous also were the Universities of Rome, Pavia, Naples, and Perugia; of Paris; of Alcalá, Salamanca, and Valladolid; of Oxford and Cambridge; of Vienna, Cologne, Erfurt, and Heidelberg (2). And it must

(1). The University of Bologna was a corporation of scholars, who were divided into two great "nations," Cismontanes (Italians) and Ultramontanes (foreigners), each having its own rector, who must have taught law for five years, and have been a student of the University, and could not be a monk. The students elected this rector, and none of the professors had any voice in the assembly, unless they had previously been rectors. In the faculty of theology, however, the professors governed. Popes Gregory IX., Boniface VIII., Clement V., John XXII., addressed their Decretals "to the doctors and scholars of Bologna."

(2). The thirteenth century was an unfortunate one for letters in Germany. Leibnitz says that the tenth was golden, compared with the thirteenth; Heeren calls it most unfruitful; Meiners constantly deploras it; Eichorn designates it as "wisdom degenerated into barbarism." But with the fourteenth century came a change. The University of Vienna was founded in 1364; that of Heidelberg in 1386; of Erfurt, 1392; of Leipsic, 1409; Würz-

be borne in mind that in most of these establishments instruction was gratuitous; the zeal of Popes, bishops, emperors, kings, and other great ones of those times, found no more natural outlet than the endowment of these institutions. The celibacy of the clergy, well remarks Archbishop Martin Spalding, did more, perhaps, for this free tuition than anything else: "Clergymen whose income exceeded their expenses felt bound by the spirit, if not by the letter of the Canon Law, to appropriate the surplus to charitable purposes, among which the principal was the founding of hospitals and schools. The forty-four colleges attached to the University of Paris were most of them founded by clergymen." (1).

But we constantly hear that, in the Middle Ages, the clergy systematically kept the laity in ignorance; that even the nobility were so uncultivated, that in the public acts of those times it is quite common to meet the clause: "and the said lord declares that, *because of his condition of gentleman*, he knows not how to sign (his name)." Charlemagne himself, it is said, knew not how to write. But are these allegations true? In the early period of the middle ages, undoubtedly, ignorance was the lot of the warriors who became the progenitors of most of the European nobles; but when these barbarians had become Christians and members of civilized society, is it true that they generally remained in that ignorance? The learned Benedictine, Cardinal Pitra (2), has proved that in nearly all monasteries there were two kinds of schools—the internal, for the youth who wished to become religious; and the external, for the children of the nobility. And do we not know how

burg, 1410; Rostock, 1419; Louvain, 1425; Dola, 1426; Treves, 1454; Freiburg, 1456; Basel, 1459; Ingolstadt, 1472; Tübingen and Metz, 1477; Cologne, 1483. "Gerard Groot," says Cantù, "a student of Paris, founded, in 1376, at Deventer, his native place, an order every member of which was bound to help the poor, either by his manual labor or by teaching gratuitously. Very soon the order, associating thus the two passions of that day, piety and study, taught trades and writing in the monasteries which were called of St. Jerome, or of the Good Brethren, or of the Common Life; and in other places it kept schools of writing and of mechanics for poor children. To others it taught Latin, Greek, Mathematics, Fine Arts, and even Hebrew. In 1433, it had forty-five houses, three times that number in 1460; and in 1474 it established a printing-house in Brussels. Thomas à Kempis transported the system to St. Agnes, near Zwoll, where were formed the apostles of classic literature in Germany—Maurice, count of Spiegelberg, and Rudolph Langius, afterwards prelates: Anthony Liber, Louis Dringenberg, Alexander Heglius, and Rudolph Agricola." *Univ. Hist.*, b. xiii., c. 29.

(1). *Loc. cit.*, art. *Schools and Universities in the "Dark Ages."*

(2). In his *History of St. Leger*.

Abélard's retreat was filled with hundreds of young nobles zealous for knowledge? Vincent of Beauvais (y. 1250) writes that "the children of the nobility need to acquire expensive learning," and Giles of Romme says that "the sons of kings and of great lords must have masters to teach them all science, and especially the knowledge of Latin.' The nobles could not have despised learning as much as they are said to have despised it, when they were so zealous in founding schools of learning. At Paris alone, six colleges were founded by noble laymen; that of Laon, in 1313, by Guy of Laon and Raoul de Presles; that of Presles, in 1313, by Raoul de Presles; that of Boncourt, in 1357, by Peter de Fléchinel; that of La Marche, in 1362, by William de la Marche and Beuve de Winville; that of the Grassins, by Peter d'Ablon, in 1569; and that of the Ave Maria, in 1336, by John of Hubant. The following remarks of a judicious critic (1), concerning the too general opinion as to the ignorance of the medieval laity, are worthy of attention: "The researches of M. de Beaurepaire concerning public instruction in the diocese of Rouen, the *History of the Schools of Montauban* from the tenth to the sixteenth century, and several other local monographs, not to speak of du Boulay and de Crévier, show what this assertion is worth. If the middle class and the peasants knew nothing, it was because they wished not to learn, for the olden France had no less than 60,000 schools; each town had its *groupes scolaires*, as they say in Paris; each rural parish had its pedagogue, its *magister*, as they style him in the North. In the thirteenth century, all the peasants of Normandy could read and write, carried writing materials at their girdles, and many of them were no strangers to Latin. The nobles were no more hostile to letters than were the peasants; they were associated in the poetical movement of the South—as Bertrand de Born, William of Aquitaine, and Bernard of Ventadour bear witness. The first chroniclers who wrote in French were nobles (and laymen)—Villehardouin and Joinville. In 1337, the scions of the first families followed

(1). M. Louandre, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for Jan. 15, 1877, p. 452.

the courses of the university of Orleans. As to the documents which they are said to have been unable to sign, 'because of their condition of gentlemen,' such papers do not exist, and we defy the paleographers to produce one containing the alleged formula. As to another proof of mediæval ignorance, recourse is had to the crosses traced at the foot of documents of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and to the absence of signatures in those of the thirteenth; but this pretended proof cannot stand the tests of diplomatic science. In those days, acts were not authenticated by written names, but by crosses and seals. The most ancient royal signatures are of no earlier date than that of Charles V. (d. 1380).'"

As to the pretended ignorance of Charlemagne, we prefer more ancient authority than that of Voltaire (1), the author of this assertion. Now, in the *Acts* of the Council of Fisme, held in 881, we read that the bishops exhorted Louis III. to imitate "Charlemagne, who used to place tablets under his pillow, that he might take note of whatever came to his mind during the night, which would profit the Church or conduce to the prosperity of his kingdom." It was the celebrated Hincmar who, in the name of the Council, drew up these *Acts* of Fisme, and he certainly is good authority in this matter, for he had passed much of his life in the society of Louis the Compliant, a son of Charlemagne. But is not the testimony of Eginhard, son-in-law of Charlemagne, to be preferred to that of the prelates of Fisme? Sismondi, who admits the extraordinary learning of the great emperor, is so impressed by the words of Eginhard, that he concludes that this prince acquired his knowledge by oral teaching (2), as indeed, owing to the cost of books at that time, nearly all students acquired an education. We would prefer the authority of the bishops of France, headed by Hincmar, to that of Eginhard; but the two testimonies do not conflict. Eginhard writes: "He tried to write, and used to keep tablets under the pillows of his bed, so that, when time permitted, he could accustom his

(1) *Essay on Customs* in Introduction; *Annals of the Empire*.

(2) *History of the French*, vol. i., p. 318. Paris, 1821.

hand to the forming of letters ; but he had little success in a task, difficult in itself, and assumed so late in life." Eginhard admits, then, that Charlemagne had some success in his endeavors, and we know that he could form his monogram ; that, with his own hand, he transcribed the songs which recounted the exploits of ancient kings. We are therefore led to accept the interpretation of Eginhard's remark as given by the erudite Lambecius, and since that author's time, by the best commentators, that therein there is no question of writing in general, but merely of a running hand. In fine, Charlemagne could write by means of what we style square or printed letters, and few of the olden Mss. are written in any other ; he found it difficult to write the running hand, and " kept tablets under his pillow, that he might practise," that style of writing ; he could write, but he was not a calligrapher. Such is the opinion of Michelet (1), of Henri Martin (2), of Guizot (3). Since Eginhard is adduced to prove the ignorance of Charlemagne, it is well to note what this chronicler, in the same chapter, tells us about the emperor's learning. Charlemagne spoke Latin fluently and with elegance ; Greek was just as familiar to him, but his pronunciation of it was defective. He was passionately fond of the fine arts. He assembled at his court the wisest men of the day, and very soon he equalled his masters in their respective branches. He began the composition of a grammar ; he undertook a version of the Gospel, based on the Greek and Syriac texts (4). He perfectly understood the intricacies of liturgy, psalmody, the Gregorian Chant, etc. During his meals, he listened to the reading of histories ; he was especially fond of St. Augustine's *City of God*. He preferred to attend the schools he had founded, rather than any kind of amusement. He compelled his daughters, as well as his sons, to cultivate the fine arts (5).

(1) *History of France*, edit. 1835, vol. i., p. 332.

(2) *History of France*, edit. 1855, vol. ii., p. 292.

(3) *History of France, narrated to my Grandchildren*, 1872, vol. i., p. 225.

(4) Lambecius, in his *Commentaries on the Imperial Library at Vienna*, (1655), b. ii., c. 5, speaks of a Ms., explaining the *Epistle to the Romans*, corrected by the hand of Charlemagne.

(5) The monk of St. Gall, in his *Curia Eccl.*, narrates that one day Charlemagne said to Alcuin : " How happy I would be, if I had twelve ecclesiastics as learned as SS. Jerome and Augustine ! " Alcuin replied : " God made only two such, and you want twelve ? "

But were not the Middle Ages excessively superstitious? To the mind of the average Protestant, who regards the Catholic religion as composed—to a great extent—of doctrines and practices not revealed and authorized by God, the Middle Ages must appear superstitious. In those days, says Montalembert, “when love had embraced heaven and its Queen, and all its blessed inhabitants, it descended again to the earth to people it in its turn. The earth which had been assigned for the dwelling of men—the earth, that beautiful creation of God—became also the object of their fertile solicitude, of their ingenuous affection. Men who were then called learned, and perhaps justly, studied nature with the scrupulous care wherewith Christians ought to study the works of God; but they could not think of regarding it as a body without superior life; they ever sought in it mysterious relations with the duties and religious belief of man ransomed by his God; they saw in the habits of animals, in the phenomena of plants, in the singing of birds, in the virtues of precious stones, so many symbols of truth consecrated by faith (1). Pedantic nomenclatures had not yet invaded and profaned the world which Christianity had regained for the true God. When, at night, the poor man raised his eyes to the blue dome above, he saw there, instead of the Milky Way of Juno, the road which conducted his brethren on the pilgrimage of Compostella, or that by which the blessed went to heaven. Flowers, especially, presented a world peopled with the most charming images, and a mute language which expressed the liveliest and most tender sentiments. The people joined the learned in giving to these sweet objects of their daily attention the names of those whom they loved the most, the names of the Apostles, of favorite Saints, or of Saints whose innocence and purity seemed reflected in the spotless beauty of the flowers (2). . . . The birds, the plants, all that man met on his way, all that had life, had been marked by him with his faith

(1) See the *Natural Mirror* of Vincent of Beauvais.

(2) The spirit of our day has seen fit to replace the sweet memory of Mary, as cultivated in the language of flowers, by that of Venus. Among many instances may be cited the modern *Euphrasium Calceolus*, which used to be called the “Virgin’s Shoe.”

and his life. This earth was one vast kingdom of love and also of science ; for all had its reason, and its reason in faith. Like those burning rays which shot from the wounds of Christ, and impressed the sacred stigma on the limbs of Francis of Assisi, even so did the beams from the heart of the Christian race, of simple and faithful man, stamp on every particle of nature the remembrance of heaven, the imprint of Christ, the seal of love " (1). There were assuredly many instances of puerility, many acts of credulity, in the piety of the Middle Ages, and the Church took cognizance of and condemned them ; but none of these abuses of faith are to be compared to the abuses of the " philosophy " of modern times.

Sismondi, Michelet, and even Henri Martin, following in the traces of more serious but mistaken historians (2), have found a proof of the superstition of the Middle Ages in the terror which is presumed to have seized upon Christendom, at the approach of the year 1000,—the date then generally assigned, say these writers, for the end of the world. Since most men believe that this world is to come, at some time, to an end, we might ask whether the term superstition can rightly be applied to any terror experienced at the expected consummation. But is it true, as Sismondi says, that at this period, " all humanity was in the situation of a criminal who has received his sentence ; all bodily or mental labor ceased, for want of an object " (3), and as Michelet says, " The prisoner in his dungeon, the serf in his hut, the monk amid the mortifications of the cloister, entertained the terrible hope of the last judgment " ? (4). Not one of the old chroniclers speaks of such a state of mind ; nay, one of them, Thietmar of Merseburg, speaks of the year 1000 as one of enlightenment and glory (5). Let Hermann Contractus (1054), Lambert of Aschaffenburg (1077), Sigebert of Gembloux (1119), Vincent of

(1) MONTALEMBERT ; *loc. cit.*

(2) BARONIO, *Annals*, y. 1001, no. 1 ;—The Benedictine *Literary History of France*, vol. vi., in preface.—LONGUEVAL, *History of the French Church*, vol. vii.—CAUMONT, *Archæology*.—AMPERE, *Lit. Hist. of France*, vol. iii.—BERGIER, art. *World*.

(3) *Full of the Roman Empire*, vol. iii., p. 397 ; Paris, 1835.

(4) *History of France*, vol. ii., p. 132 ; Paris, 1835.

(5) *Annals of his time*, in Pertz, vol. 7.

Beauvais (1250), Rollevinck (1480), be consulted, and no indication of the supposed terrors will be found. Trithemius, who flourished in the sixteenth century, is the first chronicler to mention them (1). Certainly, Michelet adduces the testimony of the Council of Trosly, in 909; but to say nothing of this Council having been held ninety years before the supposed panic, we will let the reader judge if the fathers spoke as though they feared a near end of the world. "For us who bear the title of bishops, the burden of the pastoral charge becomes insupportable, as the moment approaches when we must render an account of the mission confided to us, and of the profit we have amassed. Soon will arrive the terrible day when all the pastors will, with their flocks, appear before the Supreme Pastor" (2). But it is said that the public documents of that time are filled with such expressions as "the terrible day is at hand," and "the end of the world approaches." To this objection, a modern critic (3) replies: "The erudition of those (4) who thus object, is a little at fault. If they had consulted special works on diplomatic science (5), they would have learned that these expressions were not invented in the tenth century; they were used in the seventh century, and hence have no connection with the terrors of the year 1000." Certainly, remarks Barthélemy (6), a merely cursory view of the religious, political, and artistic state of the world at the end of the tenth century, would show that neither sovereigns, nor clergy, nor nobles, nor people, were buried in torpor. In March, 999, Pope Gregory V. died, but no anticipation of the imminent end of the world prevented the election of a new Pontiff. In this same year, the emperor Otho III. so little thought of the coming ruin of earthly things, that he created the kingdom of Poland. Then also, king Stephen of Hungary organized his provinces, and founded bishoprics and mon-

(1) *Annals*, vol. i., y. 1000.

(2) *Council of Trosley*, y. 909, in Labbe and Mansi.

(3) The Benedictine, Fr. Plaine, in vol. xiii. of the *Review of Historical Questions*, 1873, p. 147.

(4) MICHAUD; *Crusades*, vol. i.—ESCALOPIER; *Preface on the Work of Theophilus*.

(5) WAILLY; *Elements of Palcography*, vol. i. p. 204.

(6) *Historical Errors*, vol. xiv., p. 203, Paris, 1881.

asteries ; while Adalbert of Prague was civilizing the hordes along the Vistula and the Niemen. In Spain, the patriotic Christians were trying, as of old, to reclaim their country from the Saracens, with no idea that soon any country would be only a name. At Constantinople, no thought of a coming annihilation of all earthly grandeur caused any cessation of the usual usurpations of the Byzantine throne. Finally, the numerous Councils held during the last ten years of the tenth century show that churchmen gave no heed to the few visionaries who then, as in our day, proclaimed that the career of the Church militant was about to close. We may well conclude, therefore, that the silence of contemporary authors on a fact of such importance as the panic of the year 1000, the weakness of the arguments used to uphold it, the tenor of the documents of that period, and all the general ideas we can form concerning the state of the world at that time, furnish so many reasons for believing the terrors of the year 1000 to be a myth.

The Middle Ages cannot be regarded as a starless night ; and even though they furnish nothing worthy of our imitation, there is much in them for us to learn. Then it was that were prepared those ameliorations which render modern society, in some respects, preferable to the ancient ; “that period, says Cantù,” “was one of gestation—inconvenient, certainly, but necessary, and it must be judged by its effects.” The Middle Ages commenced in barbarism ; they ended in modern civilization, which, as Guizot remarks, is merely a mixture of three elements—Barbarism, old Rome, and the Gospel. But, as Guizot did not observe, the part played by Barbarism and old Rome was comparatively small, they were obstacles rather than aids to the development of the modern Christian principle. The feudal system was barbarian ; the debasement of the lower classes was a legacy from old Rome and old Germany ; but to Christianity the Middle Ages owed the fusion of races, the abolition of personal slavery, the emancipation of women, chivalry, and the sacerdotal influence which protected the poor. The statistical researches of Dureau—

Delamalle, of Guérard, and especially of Count L. Cibrario prove that the Middle Ages formed an epoch of immense progress in public prosperity. It was then that *industry* and *commerce* founded the Communes; and so influential did the industrial and commercial classes become, that even in the thirteenth century their representatives sat in the States General of every country in Western and Southern Europe. Even then, the workingmen of Florence (*il popolo minuto*) claimed a share in the sovereignty snatched from the nobles by the wealthy bankers and manufacturers (*il popolo grasso*). The weavers and artisans of Ghent and Bruges could claim their privileges from the bourgeois with a firmness equal to that they showed in resisting the encroachments of the courts of Flanders. *Industry* certainly held a secondary place in a pre-eminently religious period, but, "though labor must be respected, devotion is a virtue. The soldier who gives his blood, and the priest who gives his entire self, occupy a more elevated plane than that of a man who hires out his muscle, and a far more elevated one than that of the manufacturer who seeks his fortune." (1).

CHAPTER II.

THE REVIVAL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE UNDER CHARLEMAGNE.

At the death of Constantine, in the year 341, the empire of the West fell to Constantine the Younger and Constans; that of the East to Constantius. In 353, Constantius succeeded to the united empires. Julian followed Constantius, and then came Jovian. Valentinian, the next emperor, ceded the East to his brother Valens in 368, and until 476 the empire remained divided. In 476, Augustulus was deposed by the Herulan king Odoacer, the entire West was overpowered by barbarians, and the Roman empire survived only in the East. However, the valor of Belisarius and Narses enabled the Byzantine rulers to revive the Western empire, and in 556 Justinian's sceptre swayed

(1) FEUGUERAU: *Is Christianity Hostile to Industry?* Paris, 1844.

over both sections. The Constantinopolitan sovereigns now exercised jurisdiction over the West until the eighth century, when their own lethargy, cowardice, and general corruption reduced their power in those parts to a mere name. We have already noticed the gradual formation of the temporal dominion of the Roman Pontiffs. (1). In the year 800, on Christmas day (2), Pope Leo III. put an end to even the nominal authority of Byzantium over the West, by placing the crown of a new Western empire upon the brow of the Frankish king Charles, now called the Great; "thus consummating," writes Cæsar Balbo, "the greatest event recorded in European history during more than a thousand years; an event which dominated history, at first in fact, and to our own days, at least in name." It is not our province to inquire whether Pope Leo III. had a "divine right" to transfer the empire of the West from the Byzantines to the Franks; whether, that is, from the fact that the Roman Pontiff, as supreme pastor of the Universal Church, is spiritual ruler over Christians of sovereign as well as of private rank, it follows that, when the interests of Christendom demand it, he can and ought to dispose of kingdoms and empires. It is sufficient for us to know that in the time of Leo III. this principle was recognized by Christendom. And no one will deny that the public weal required the change then made, even though that change had to be inaugurated at the expense of ancient and respected institutions. To say nothing of the miseries caused to Christendom by the Arians and Iconoclasts, the other evils which the Pontiffs and their subjects, both temporal and spiritual, were forced to endure, owing to the decline of the imperial power, rendered necessary a restoration of that power in the person of one who would use it with strength and wisdom. For nearly four centuries Italy had been the bleeding prey, not only of barbarians, but of her Byzantine suzerains; the Eternal City had been sacked repeatedly by the foreigner, and her streets had flowed with citizen blood, the shedding of which could have been

(1) Vol. i., chap. 40.

(2) At that time the year was calculated from Christmas day; but according to the present method of computation, the coronation of Charlemagne occurred in the year 799.

prevented by a strong and willing hand. A few months before Leo III. proclaimed king Charles the Defender of the Holy See, armed rebels had attacked the holy Pontiff during a solemn religious function, and after trying to pluck out his eyes and tongue, had left him for dead. For centuries the Byzantine emperors had trifled with the Holy See; some had even undertaken the assassination of its incumbent. The Lombards had indeed been defeated, but they waited for the Franks to recross the Alps, and then again they would pounce on their wonted prey. Any one of these reasons was sufficient to justify Pope Leo III. in trying the experiment of a new empire.

As to the ultimate utility of Pope Leo's action, even Catholic publicists differ. Whether or not the weary and soul-absorbing contest between the Papacy and the empire would have ensued, in some form or another, even though the Holy Roman Empire had never been excogitated, is doubtful; but it is certain that the struggle commenced almost with the blessing of Charlemagne's crown, and ended only in 1806, with the dissolution of the empire. That the institution was of benefit to the then nascent modern Europe, is certain. But Italy suffered much from the persistent, and too often criminal, interference of the new emperors, who were, as Cantù aptly describes them, "a heterogeneous element, which often impeded the progress of Italy, and finally degraded her" (1). Hence it is that many Italian publicists show themselves hostile to the Holy Roman Empire, in its very inception, and are disposed to blame Leo III. for want of foresight. Even the modern Neo-Guelph school, of which Cantù may be regarded, in historical matters, as the chief, frequently shows very plainly that its heart is not enlisted when it assumes the defence of Pope Leo's action. Cantù seems to regard Italy as having been "the necessary victim for European prosperity," and he calls on his countrymen to "bear the misfortune with decorum, and let those who profited by it not insult us" (2). And the great historian finds consolation in the fact that "the coming of the Northerners to this

(1) *Univ. Hist.*, b. ix., c. 16.(2) *Ibid.*

shrine of knowledge and of civil order helped to refine them." The learned Benedictine, Tosti, laments the coronation of Charlemagne by the authority of God, as Pope Leo phrased it. The Pontiff, thinks Tosti, should have said, "crowned by me," and then he would not have "made the imperial power depend on God," and his successors would not have discovered "how much exertion and how much blood it costs to make an emperor feel that between God and him there is a Pope." (1)

As to the nature of the transfer of the Western empire to the Franks, political and national predilections, as well as religious ones, have produced many and various theories. The question is very important; for upon the point of view from which we regard this transfer, will depend, almost entirely, the judgments we will form concerning the many intricate and tantalizing questions which will arise when we come to investigate the long and persistent struggle between the Church and the empire. In every conflict between the Roman Pontiff and the Holy Roman, or, as he came to

(1) *History of the Lombard League*, Montecassino, 1848.—"When Rome and Italy lost the imperial presence, the idea of the empire weakened in minds which saw no escape from misery, no civil power to quell disorder. Oppressed by the barbarians, unprotected by public authority, the Romans turned to the Pope and to the Church, from whom alone came any comfort or aid, and all were persuaded that the right of the Roman empire—in-
potently exercised by the Byzantine sovereigns, — now resided in the theocratic empire of the Pontiffs In the necessity of having some one who would actuate this power, not only the Romans, but all the peoples, assented to the Papal disposal of the imperial dignity. The Pope was the sole magistrate in Rome who was a Roman; the clergy, patricians, and people concurred in his election. Therefore, the candidates for the empire were to bow before him, the only representative of Rome When his Pontifical person had been brutally profaned, Leo III. felt that, in such times, the liberty and dignity of his office required a continuous protection by the civil power. Hence he recalled Charles to Italy, and crowned him emperor. Fatal coronation! 'Life and victory,' cried the Pontiff, 'to the most pious and august Charles, crowned by God great and pacific emperor!' And with those words began the story of Italian misfortunes. With his right hand, Leo placed a golden crown on the head of that foreigner, and although unwittingly, with his left he laid one of thorns on the brows of unfortunate Italy. Better the barbarians than an emperor! The former desolated, indeed, but they did not kill the germ of regeneration; the latter gnawed into the marrow of Italian worth, and prostrated its strength. Amid the tribulations of anarchy, Leo hoped for a refuge in the new empire; his successors found it a tyranny. Would that he had said: 'Crowned by me!' But he preferred: 'Crowned by God', and thus made the imperial power depend from God; and his successors discovered, etc Leo fancied that in the shadow of the empire he would repose as in the bosom of God; he fancied that this supreme civil power would aid the Pontiffs in their task of regenerating the world with the Gospel; he fancied that the emperors would always bow before the Papal power from which alone they held their crown, and that they would ever be docile children of Holy Church. Perhaps, when Charlemagne first felt the pressure of the diadem, he responded heartily to the Papal intentions. But that a man, crowned in such a beatitude of thirsting ambition, could long think of Pope, of Gospel, or of God, let him believe it who can! I do not think that Charlemagne ever dreamed of subjecting the Pontiff to himself, of destroying the liberty of the Church. He was a good Christian, if we shut our eyes to certain domestic and Adamitic faults. And some of his faults were not malicious; for instance, when he deputed abbot Angelbert to admonish Pope Leo 'concerning the integrity of his life, the observance of the canons, and the good government of the Holy Church of God', he was simply piously impudent That which the Pontiff imposed upon Charlemagne as a law, he and his successors termed a right; and every one knows what kind of a protector he is who forces you to accept his aid. The emperor, in order to protect the Church, had an opportunity to meddle in her affairs." *Loc. cit.*, B. I.

be erroneously styled, the German emperor, just so surely as justice was nearly always on the side of the Holy See, so surely the emperor's pretensions were founded on a false assumption as to the nature of the transfer made to Charles by Pope Leo III. The root of every controversy between the Papacy and the empire was the imperial idea, more or less veiled, that the Pontiff was a subject of the emperor; that Pope Leo III., in his own name and that of his successors, voluntarily abdicated his temporal crown, or at least sank his position as an independent sovereign into that of a mere vassal to a diadem of his own creation. A few emperors, indeed, enunciated this theory in as many words. Now this extravagant supposition could be sustained only by another, equally unfounded; that is, that when Leo III. placed the imperial crown on the head of the Frankish king Charles, he conferred on that prince merely the imperial title, and nothing else which said Charles did not already possess—that, in fine, the Roman Pontiff was not the source of the imperial right. Hence it is that, concerning this historical question, a unity of thought prevails among Gallican, courtier-theological, Protestant, and rationalistic writers. The publicists of the old Gallican school, albeit generally men of great sanctity, were excessively devoted to their monarchy, and therefore they readily espoused any theory, not radically heretical, which tended to restrain the “encroachments” of Rome. The courtier-theologians, or *aulici* (as they are styled in the schools), either from a mistaken patriotism, or for the crumbs from the imperial table, were ever prompt in so shaping both religious and historical doctrine as to countenance almost any pretension of the crown. Protestants and free-thinkers naturally advocate any theory that will lessen the power or diminish the prestige of the Holy See. Chief among the apologists of imperial autocracy, and more or less followed by all of that ilk in modern times, is Mathias Vlacich, generally known as Flaccius Illyricus (1), against whom

(1) This author was born (1530) in Istria, and hence his surname of Illyricus. He became a professor of theology at Jena, but is best known as the originator, and one of the four principal authors of the famous Protestant work, the *Centuries of Magdeburg*. The other “Centuriators” were Lejeudin, Fabert, and Wigand, but all worked under the supervision of Flaccius.

Bellarmino wrote his valuable dissertation on the *Transfer of the Empire from the Greeks to the Franks*. Among Catholic writers who, with some modifications, agree with the Illyrian in this matter, are Thomassin (1), Francis Feu (2), Bossuet, and Alexandre. Bossuet admits that Charlemagne received the empire in the year 800, but contends that he derived his right from an election by the Roman people. Alexandre is careful to concede that "Charlemagne did not receive from Leo III. merely an empty title. He received a most ample dignity, corresponding to the sublimity of that title." We shall take Bellarmine as our guide in refuting the theory advanced by these authors; and in order to show that it was solely by the authority of the Roman Pontiff that the empire was transferred from the Greeks to the Franks, we shall first adduce the testimony of competent historians, and that of Pontiffs and princes who were well acquainted with their own rights.

Paul the Deacon, a friend of Charlemagne, after a narration of that prince's subjugation of the conspirators Paschal and Campalus, adds: "As a reward to Charles, Pope Leo crowned him emperor in the church of St. Peter" (3). Cedrenus (y. 1070), a Greek historian, says: "Legates came from Charles to Irene, demanding her hand, after Pope Leo had crowned him at Rome" (4). Zonaras, another Greek author (y. 1118), says: Charles having been crowned by Leo, and acclaimed as emperor of the Romans, the Franks became all-powerful in Rome (5). These authors make no mention of the Roman senate or people as having been instrumental in the advancement of Charles. Eginhard, son-in-law and chancellor of Charlemagne, speaks still more plainly: "Charles was so averse, at first, to the title of Augustus, that he declared that, although the day was one of festival, he would not have entered the church, if he had been aware of the Pontiff's intention" (6). The *Annals of the Franks* say: "Pope Leo placed a crown upon the head of Charles, and the Romans cried: 'Life and victory to Charles, crowned by God great and pacific em-

(1) *Discipline*, pt. III, b. 1, c. 29.

(2) *Laws*, q. 4, art. 4.

(3) *Roman Affairs*, b. 23.

(4) *Life of Constantine and Irene*.

(5) *Ibid.*

(6) *Life of Charlemagne*.

peror of the Romans !' ” (1). The reader will observe that the Romans acclaimed Charles as crowned by God, and that they did not call him emperor until after the coronation (2). Witikind of Corbie, writing in the beginning of the tenth century, says of Otho II., who was crowned in 969 : “ Although he was already anointed as king, and designated as emperor by the blessed Apostolic (Pope) ”. Here Witikind indicates the essential difference between the Holy Roman Empire and the kingdom of the Germans, or of the Franks, as the case might be. A confusion of these institutions is too often made, and while one may pardon it in a tyro in historical matters, it is inexcusable in a professed publicist. To name and instal the king of the Franks or the king of the Germans, was an affair of the Frankish or German electors : to name, or at least to confirm and crown the emperor of the Romans, was the right of the Roman Pontiff. This distinction is enunciated by Liutprand writing in the days of Otho I. (962-973) ; by Hermann Contractus, a contemporary of St. Henry (1014-1024) ; by Duodechin (1200), continuator of Marianus Scotus ; by Lambert of Aschaffenburg (1070). Otho of Frisingen (1146) must have had every opportunity to learn the nature of the imperial tenure, for he was related in the second or third degree to the fourth and fifth Henry, to Conrad, and to Frederick I. Now this author never gives the title of emperor to his grandfather, king Henry IV., until after his nomination by the anti-Pope Guibert, and then he declares that Henry “ was forcibly, rather than lawfully, elevated ” (3). According to bishop Otho, therefore, ardent imperialist though he was, only a legitimate Pope could make a legitimate emperor. Lupold of Bamberg (4), Æneas Sylvius (5), Platina (6), Trithemius (7), and a host of other writers, prove the strength of our position.

But what was the opinion of the early emperors on this matter ? When Charles the Bald contended with his brother Louis, king of the Germans, for the empire, he rushed

(1) Y. 801.

(2) Nothing but the acclamation of the already crowned emperor is attributed to the Romans by Aimon (820), Addo of Vienne (860), or Rhegino (908).

(3) B. vii., c. 11.

(4) Preface to *Rights of the Empire*.

(5) *Compendium of Blondus*.

(6) *Life of Leo, III.*

(7) *Catalogue of Writers*.

toward Rome, to receive the crown from Pope John VIII. According to Cuspinian, Rhegino, and Marianus Scotus, Louis endeavored to prevent this journey, even sending an army to intercept Charles, and when the latter had beaten this army and had gone on to Rome, Louis took his revenge by devastating the French border. Now if Charles and Louis had regarded the Papal action as a mere ceremony, why did the one so strenuously labor to prevent it, and why did the other take such pains, spend so much treasure, and run such risks for himself and dominions, to secure it? The emperor Albert (1298) most earnestly, but vainly, besought Pope Boniface VIII. to declare the empire hereditary in his family (1). Henry VII. (1308), formerly count of Luxemburg, begged Pope Clement V. to confirm his election. (2). Louis IV., excommunicated and deposed by Pope John XXII., (1324), constantly endeavored to secure the good graces of that Pontiff and of his successor, Benedict XII. Frederick I. (1154), speaking by the mouth of the bishop of Bamberg, begged of Pope Adrian IV. "to be promoted by him to the height of empire." The following passage of Albert Krantz (3), who wrote shortly before the Lutheran movement, illustrates the mind of the Redbeard on this subject: "The Pontiff tried, by condescension, to mollify the insolence of the Germans; he came to the royal camp with a retinue worthy of a Supreme Pastor. The king hastened to meet him, and is said to have held the stirrup, as the Pope dismounted, and taking him reverently by the hand, to have conducted him to the royal tent. The bishop of Bamberg then delivered these words of the king: 'Apostolic Pontiff, as we have long ardently desired an interview with your Holiness, so we now joyfully enter upon it, giving thanks to God, the giver of all good things, who has led us to this place, and made us worthy for your most holy visit. We wish you to know, reverend father, that the entire Church, collected from all parts for the honor of the kingdom, has led her prince to your Blessedness, to be promoted by you to the

(1) *Chronicle of Albert of Strashburg.*(2) *Conrad Vercer's Life of Henry VII.*(3) *Saxon History*, b. vi., c. 16 and 17

height of empire. He deserves this by his nobility, prudence, and fortitude; by his fear of God, by the love of Catholic peace which reigns in his heart, and by a not ordinary devotion to the Holy Roman Church. You witness his reverent reception of your person; how he has prostrated himself before your most holy footsteps. Therefore, venerable father, so act toward him, that what is now wanting in him of the fulness of imperial power, may be supplied by the munificence of your Blessedness'.

When they had sat down, the Pope said: 'When the princes of the olden time came to ask for the crown, they were wont to allege some great deed to call for the good will of the Church.thus Charles, by crushing the Lombards; Otho, by repressing Berengarius; the last Lothaire, by restraining the Normans; merited to receive the imperial crown. Similarly, then, let the most serene king restore to us and to the Church that province which is now usurped by the Normans; we, then, will readily perform our part.' The princes then answered that, because of the great distance and the present weak condition of his troops, the king could not invade a great province. 'Let the Pontiff bless the king; he shall not repent of being the first to confer a favor; for when the princes shall have returned to their own dominions, they will return with their king at the head of more powerful forces, and will perform the Church's wishes.' The Pope then yielded, promising to grant their request." But even the Byzantine sovereigns recognized the Roman Pontiffs as the authors of the modern Western empire. When Michael Curopalates made peace and alliance with Charlemagne, he took care to have the treaty ratified by Pope Leo III. (1) When Emmanuel Comnenus heard of Barbarossa's contest with the Holy See, he twice offered Pope Alexander III. an immense sum of money, a large army, and even a union of the schismatic Greek Church with that of Rome, providing that the Pontiff would confer the Western empire upon him and his successors of Constantinople. (2). When the empire became vacant by the death of Albert, Philip the Fair of France resolved

(1) ADO of Vienne, *at year* 812.

(2) BLONDUS, PLATINA, and NAUCLER.

upon urging Pope Clement V. to restore the Holy Roman empire to the French monarchs. Hearing of this, and wishing not to offend Philip, the Pontiff wrote to the electors, pressing them to hasten their choice, and, if possible, to elect Henry of Luxemburg. (1). Philip and the electors, therefore, were of the opinion that the Holy See could transfer the empire from the Germans to the French, just as it had been previously transferred from the Greeks to the French, and from these latter to the Germans.

That the Roman Pontiff was the source of imperial authority, is also shown by the actions and sayings of the Pontiffs. When the sons of the emperor Louis had deposed their father, and had taken his wife Judith from him, Pope Gregory IV. ordered the restitution of both throne and spouse (2). This he would not have done, had he not held that the empire was a dependency of the Holy See. When Charles the Bald endeavored to depose the emperor Louis the Younger, Pope Adrian II. threatened him with excommunication; Charles was much vexed, but he obeyed the Pontifical mandates (3). Pope Adrian IV., writing to the bishops of Germany, says: "The empire was so transferred from the Greeks to the Germans, that the king of the Germans cannot be called emperor and Augustus until he is consecrated by the Roman Pontiff, who promoted Charles, and gave him the great name of emperor." (4). When the Greek ambassador urged Pope Alexander III. to unite the two empires, the Pontiff replied (5) that he would not reunite what his predecessors had purposely separated. Innocent III., writing to the duke of Thuringia, says: "We recognize, as we ought, the right and power of electing a king, to be afterwards promoted to the empire, in those princes to whom we know, from law and ancient custom, that the right belongs; especially since that right and power were given by the Apostolic See. which, in the person of the magnificent Charles, transferred the Roman empire

(1) VERCER.

(2) This is proved by Paul Æmilius, Marianus Scotus, Rhegino, and Aimoin. Falsely, therefore, Sigebert asserts that Gregory IV. conspired with the sons of Louis against that emperor.

(3) AIMOIN; b. v. 24 and 27.

(4) AVENTINE *Annals of the Bavarians*, b. iv.

(5) PLATINA; *Life of Alexander III.*

from the Greeks to the Franks." Clement V., in the Fifteenth Gen. Council (1311), issued a decree concerning the oath taken by the emperors to the Pontiffs, which commences as follows: "The Roman princes, professing the orthodox faith, and venerating with prompt devotion the Holy Roman Church, whose head is Christ our Redeemer, and the Roman Pontiff, the vicar of the same Redeemer, have not deemed it unworthy to bow their heads to the same Roman Pontiff, from whom proceeds the approbation of the person who is to be located on the height of imperial power; (nor did they deem it unworthy) to bind themselves to him, and to that same Church which transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Germans, and from which Church was derived, by certain of their princes, the right and power of electing a king, to be afterwards made emperor: as is all shown by ancient custom, renewed in latter times, and by the form of oath inserted in the sacred canons." Pius II. (1460), writing to the sultan Mohammed II. (1), and exhorting him to become a Christian, promises him a just title to his dominions in the East: "We will call you emperor of the Greeks and of the East, and you will rightly possess that which you now occupy by force, and retain injuriously. . . . as our predecessors, Stephen, Adrian, and Leo, incited Pepin and Charlemagne against the Lombard kings, Astolphus and Desiderius, and having freed the empire from tyranny, transferred it from the Greeks to the liberators, so we will use your aid in the needs of the Church, and will return a favor received."

Alexandre relies greatly upon the fact that in the creation of the new Western Empire the Greek sovereigns were despoiled of no provinces; that, in fine, the Pontiff gave to Charles no dominions which he had not already in his power. This assertion is true, to some extent, (1) but the conclusion that Alexandre draws, namely that the Pontiff

(1) *Epist.* 396.

(1) We say that Alexandre's assertion is true, only to some extent. While Charlemagne, before his coronation, was lord of Gaul, Germany, Pannonia, and a small part of Italy, he did not possess Spain, the Apulia, Calabria, Sicily, Illyria, Africa, and other provinces of the Western Empire. We say nothing of Britain, for that province had been long independent, and as for his real possessions, none of them were his by Cæsarean right; some belonged to him by royal, others obeyed him only by patrician right. By the translation of the empire, however, Charlemagne obtained over his old dominions the right of emperor

did not, "properly speaking, transfer" the empire from the Greeks, is incorrect. Until Pope Leo III. saluted Charles as emperor, the claims of the Greek sovereigns to their ancient Western dominions were, at least, in abeyance; the foreign conquests of the Frankish king were held only by the armed hand. But when the Frankish monarch was proclaimed emperor of the West, those claims were consigned forever to the realm of history, and public law regarded Charles as their inheritor. Flaccius especially insists that "by right and by force Charles had seized the Western empire, before Leo crowned him it is certain that Charles held the Western empire for more than twenty years before that Leonine—I had almost said, vulpine—coronation." But why, for twenty years, did Charles not don the imperial crown? Why do all historians date his empire from that Christmas day, when Leo III. and his subjects saluted him "Emperor of the Romans"? Simply because, down to that day, the empire lay with the sovereign of Constantinople. Some of the arguments adduced by the Illyrian apologist of German imperial autocracy are amusing. Thus, relying upon a passage of Lucius Florus, who wrote under Trajan, and who states that the Pharsalian victory of Cæsar was due to certain German cohorts, he asserts that the Roman empire of the Germans commenced rather at that time than with the coronation of Charles: "You may truly say that the empire was not acquired by German valor merely in the time of Charlemagne, for no one doubts that the Roman empire was born and founded at the battle of Pharsalia, fought by Julius Cæsar against Pompey. For there, says Lucius Florus, *six* German cohorts suddenly sent the numerous cavalry of Pompey flying to the mountains, destroyed many of the archers and light troops, and finally routed the veteran Pompeian legions, thus being, as all historians testify, the beginning

and Augustus, and acquired, besides, a right to all the other territories of the old empire which had been usurped by others. And, what was of no small moment in those days, upon the emperor devolved all the titles, honors, and prerogatives of the old Cæsars, so that, as emperor, he took precedence of all other sovereigns, even though, as often happened, they were more powerful and far richer than himself. Again, we must remember that the imperial power was founded much more on opinion than on the incumbent's possessions. As Cantù remarks, Barbarossa, with a very limited patrimony, became very powerful, while Francis II., with an extensive inheritance, could not gain the empire.

and front of this victory." In this unmitigated nonsense, one cannot tell which to admire the most, the logic or the falsehood. The logic is as sound as would be that of a Frenchman who would claim a French empire over these United States because very many French regiments (not a few cohorts) fought for our independence. The assertion is false, for Appianus of Alexandria (1) and Dion Cassius (2) carefully enumerate the peoples represented in Cæsar's army at Pharsalia, and while mentioning Italians, Gauls, and Spaniards, say nothing of Germans. Appianus says that Cæsar placed his great reliance upon the Italian troops, and Cæsar testifies (3) that he relied upon certain *three* cohorts, and had foreseen their value in the battle; comparing, therefore, Appianus and Cæsar, we would conclude that the decisive stroke at Pharsalia was made by Italian valor. Again, Cæsar, the abbreviator of Livy, Plutarch, Paterculus, Lucan, Tranquillus, Eutropius, Orosius, and many other ancient writers, who carefully treat of the celebrated campaign against Pompey, make no mention of the Illyrian's Germans (4). We only introduce this ridiculous item that the reader may conceive some fair idea of the calibre of this chief of the Centuriators of Magdeburg. With the same purpose we quote the brilliant argument with which he would ascribe the foundation of the German empire to Arminius: "Under Augustus, the Germans captured two eagles from the Romans, in a most just war. Among other historians, the same Lucius Florus says: 'The army being destroyed, the Germans took two eagles from the Romans, and yet retain them.' These insignia, obtained by valor and by right of war, the German empire yet uses in protestation and defense of its right against all adversaries When, therefore, the Roman priest and other rivals of the empire wish to know its origin and right, let them contemplate that glorious ensign of the double-headed eagle." Bellarmine has the patience to examine this effusion at some length, but we will simply observe that Flaccius himself, in another place, (5) ascribes

(1) *Civil War*, b. ii.(2) *Histories*, b. xlv.(3) *Civil War*, b. iii.(4) BELLARMINE, *loc. cit.*(5) *Cent.* ix., c. 16.

the origin of the double-headed eagle to the empire having been divided into the Eastern and Western.

Alexandre asserts that, long before the coronation of Charles, the Romans had sworn allegiance to him. That the Romans promised fidelity to Charles in his capacity of Roman Patrician or Defender of the Roman Church, just as Stephen V. caused them to swear fidelity to Louis the Pious, is true. But it is false that by this oath the Romans recognized Charles as their sovereign. From the year 754, as we have seen, when treating of the origin of the Pontiffs' temporal dominion, the Popes were *de jure*, as they had long been *de facto*, kings of Rome and its territories. In the treaty or *pactionis fœdus* made by Pepin with Pope Stephen III. at Quiercy, that monarch acknowledged the high dominion of the Holy See over the Papal States, "*no power being reserved, within the same limits, to us and to our successors, unless only that we may gain prayers and the repose of our soul, and that by you and your people we be styled PATRICIAN OF THE ROMANS.*" This Patriciate, which was afterwards accorded to Charles, constituted the titular a defender of the Roman Church, but implied no supreme authority in the dominions of the Pontiff. Mabillon (1) gives us the formula according to which princes were accustomed to create Patricians: "We give thee this honor that thou mayest render justice to the churches of God and to the poor, and give an account thereof to the Most High Judge." Then, says the formula, the emperor (or other sovereign) puts a mantle upon the elect, and places a ring on his right fore-finger, and a golden circlet on his brow, and dismisses him. This formula certainly indicates no other power than that of Defender. That the Patriciate implied no other power, and that the oath taken by the Romans to Charlemagne regarded fidelity to him in his capacity of Defender, and did not imply in him any authority superior to that of the Pontiff, may be also gathered from the epistle sent to Leo III. by Charles, after the death of Adrian I., and from the course afterwards pursued by Leo. Sending Angilbert to Rome, Charles writes to the Pope that he had communi-

(1) *Bened. Ann.*, b. xiii., n. 2.

cated to that ambassador "all that will seem necessary to you or to us, in order that, after consultation, you may determine what will be best for the exaltation of the holy Church of God, or for the stability of your honor, or for the firmness of our Patriciate. For, just as I made a compact with the predecessor of your Paternity, so I wish to establish with your Blessedness an inviolable agreement of the same faith and charity, so that the apostolic benediction of the holy advocates of your Apostolic See, God's grace giving it, may everywhere follow me, and that the most holy Roman See, God granting, may be ever defended by our devotion. It is for us, with the aid of the divine piety, to everywhere protect the Holy Church of Christ from Pagan incursions, and to defend it with arms from the devastation of infidels." Eginhard tells us, in his *Annals*, that then "through his legates Leo sent to the king the keys of the Confession of St. Peter (1) and the banner of the Roman city, with other gifts, and he asked him to send one of his chief nobles to Rome, who would bind the Roman people by oath to fidelity and subjection to him. For this purpose, was sent Angilbert, abbot of the monastery of St. Richerius." Speaking of this correspondence, Pagi justly observes: "Charles obtained what he wanted from the Pontiff, namely, the confirmation of his Patriciate, and the title of Defender of the Roman Church; not, however, the dominion of the city, which he did not seek, and about which there had been no question in the agreements with Adrian." (2) With reference to the oath of fidelity to king Charles, Flaccius says: "All historians, even the most favorable to the Popes, testify that Leo, immediately after his election, sent to Charles a legation with the keys of St. Peter, which are the Papal insignia, and the banners of the city, with eagles; and that he requested, according to the Synod of Adrian, his own confirmation, and that some one should be sent to bind the Romans to Charles by oath. This was a sign of extreme subjection. And when a dissension arose

(1) The meaning of this is that the keys had been laid upon the tomb of the Apostles. On several occasions of emergency, the Popes performed this ceremony, when praying for assistance to the great ones of the earth. *Epist. Greg.*, b. vi., n. 23.

(2) See Gentili's *Origin of the Patricians*, and Bianchi's *Power and Policy of the Church*.

between the Pope and the Romans, the Pope fled to Cæsar as to his superior ; then also the Romans sent their accusers, so that both parties testified that he was their legitimate judge and lord. How despicable therefore is the vanity of these Papists who pretend that the slaves and chattels of Charles transferred the Roman empire to the same Charles, and that they feudally bound him as a vassal to themselves, so that now they compel the Cæsars to fealty, and even force them to most foul kisses of their feet." In another place (1), however, the same polite Illyrian says that Leo asked Charles to send some one to Rome to bind the Romans to allegiance, not to Charles, *but to Leo himself*. Then it was that, without the knowledge of the Senate, Leo sent to Charles the keys (the Papal insignia) and the eagle (the Roman imperial insignia), and when afterwards Angilbert came to Rome, he compelled the Romans to swear fidelity to Leo. (2) There was every reason why the Romans should promise allegiance to their Pontiff; there was none for such a promise to Charles. How could the Frank king exact or receive such an oath, unless he was prepared to violate the pact of Quiercy, whereby Pepin swore, for himself and successors, to claim no jurisdiction in the Papal dominions, but to be more than content with the style of Patrician? But, says the ingenious and ingenuous Flaccius, "A dissension having arisen between the Pope and the Romans, both appealed to Charles as their lord and judge." These two terms are found in no *Annals* of the time, as applied, even implicitly, by the Pope to Charles ; but the royal Chronicler, Otho of Frisingen, (3) who was well versed in the history and spirit of the empire, says that Charles came to Rome, after the terrible conspiracy of 799, not to judge Leo, but to punish the malefactors ; that Leo was judged by no one, but purged of imputed crime by his own oath.

We will not attempt to prove that Charlemagne did not receive the empire directly from God, or by hereditary right, or by donation from the Greeks ; the curious reader may consult Bellarmine, who spends much time in evincing

(1) *Cent.* viii., c. 10.(2) *Annals of the Franks.*(3) *B.* v., c. 30.

each of these points. But we will proceed to consider the theory of Bossuet, according to which the Holy Roman empire owed its origin to the Senate and People of Rome. Sigebert, Blondus, Lupold, Æneas, Vincent of Beauvais, and Onofrio Panvini, are adduced in support of this assertion. Sigebert lived three hundred years, the other cited authors from five to seven hundred years, after Charlemagne; their testimony, therefore, is not so conclusive as that of the contemporary writers whom we have already quoted in defense of our own position. But these six authors prove nothing against us. Sigebert and his follower, Vincent of Beauvais, attribute to the Roman people no other part than that of applause, in the coronation of Charles. Blondus merely asserts that the Romans prayed Leo to make Charles emperor. Lupold simply repeats the words of Vincent and Sigebert, but he also says: "Pope Leo, having considered all the good and worthy reasons for the transfer of the empire from the Constantinopolitan emperors to the Frankish kings, . . . the Romans acclaiming and requesting, anointed and crowned Charles as emperor and Augustus, by which anointing and coronation the said transfer was made." (1) And Lupold denies what he is alleged to believe, for, speaking of the opinion of some who said that the Roman people could make laws for the empire, and even transfer it, he says (2): "This answer, saving a better judgment, does not please me. For at the time of the said transfer, and even for a long period before it, the empire was not with the Romans, but rather with the Greeks; nor is it to-day with the Romans, but with the Germans. There is no reason, therefore, why the Roman people, at the time of the transfer, should have had, or why they should now have, a greater right to transfer the empire than any other people possess." As for Æneas Sylvius, we have already seen, in the epistle which he wrote, as Pope Pius II., to the Sultan Mohammed II., that he held that his predecessors had transferred the empire to the Franks. Onofrio alone then, who lived seven hundred years after Charlemagne, can be adduced in support

(1) *Rights of the Empire*, c. 4.(2) *Ibid.*, c. 12.

of the theory that the Roman Senate and people transferred the empire to the Franks. But, as Roncaglia, after Bellarmine, well observes, the Roman Senate and People very seldom indeed conferred the imperial dignity; the Cæsars nearly always were elevated, either by succession, by the reigning emperor, or by the soldiery. It is not likely that, at a time when the S. P. Q. R. were less than a shadow, they would have dared to elect an emperor, or that the world would have more than smiled at the puerility (1). The following passage from a letter (2), written by Louis II., great-grandson of Charlemagne, to Basil the Macedonian, who had complained because Louis was styled emperor, not of the Franks, but of the Romans, will farther illustrate our subject: "Your Fraternity is surprised because we are called emperor of the Romans, and not of the Franks. But you ought to know that, unless we were emperor of the Romans, we could not be emperor of the Franks. We received this title and dignity from the Romans, for the Frankish princes were at first kings, and afterward those only were styled emperors who had been anointed with the holy oil, by the Roman Pontiff, to that end . . . If you blame the Pope for his action, you must also blame Samuel, who rejected Saul, whom he had anointed, and hesitated not to consecrate David as king."

CHAPTER III.

THE FABLE OF THE POPESS JOAN.

The story of the female Pope constitutes one of the most delicious morsels ever offered for the delectation of the credulous children of Protestantism. The Centuriators of

(1) Onofrio names only three emperors as chosen by the senate, viz., Nerva, Maximus with Balbinus, and Tacitus. As to Nerva, Onofrio cites Dion Cassius in proof, but Dion says no such thing. Aurelius Victor, in some of his codices, says that Nerva was proclaimed by the army, and Eutropius ascribes his elevation to the prefect of the prætorium. As for Maximus and Balbinus, elected indeed by the senate, against the will of the troops, the soldiers derisively called them "senatorial emperors," says Herodian, *b. 8*, and put them to death. Tacitus was chosen by the senate, but because the soldiers called for him. So necessary was it, in fact, for the election of an emperor to be acceptable to the army, that St. Jerome, in his *epist. 85 to Evagrius*, says that the troops made the sovereign-

BELLARMINE, *loc. cit.*
 (2) BARONIO; *year 871.*

Magdeburg thought that such a disgraceful episode ought to convince the world that God wished to show that Rome had forfeited her rights (1); that, in the words of Calvin (2), the Pope was no longer a bishop. Among other notable Protestant authors who insist that the Popess was a reality, we may mention Spanheim, Leufant, and Desvignolles. (3). But many Protestants of celebrity advise the rejection of the fable; e. g., Blondel (4), Leibnitz, Bayle, Casaubon, Jurieu, Basnage, Burnet, and Cave. Æneas Sylvius (5) seems to have been the first Catholic polemic to undertake a refutation of this story. The task was also assumed by Florimond de Rémond (6), Onofrio Panvini (7), Papire Masson (8), Bini (9), Aubert Miræus (10), Leo Allatius (11), Labbe (12), Bellarmine (13), Baronio (14), Parsons (15), Alexandre (16), and many others cited by Labbe (17).

Who was the first to publish to the world the story of the female Pope? Anastasius the Librarian, triumphantly reply the friends of the fable—Anastasius, an officer of the Papal court, and a contemporary of the Popess. But it is very strange that this contemporary, a resident of the Papal palace, should introduce so extraordinary a narrative with an *on dit*; we would suppose that such a witness would be able to speak of what he himself had seen and heard. But the fact is, Anastasius does not speak of the female pope. The Protestant Bayle thus deals with this alleged testimony: "If we were to find that one and the same manuscript informed us that the emperor Ferdinand II. died in 1637, and that he was immediately succeeded by

(1) *Cent.* IX. c. 20.

(2) *Instit.*, b. iv., c. 7, § 23.

(3) Mosheim does not defend the truth of the story, but he asserts that "during five centuries there are six hundred testimonies to this extraordinary event; and until the Lutheran Reformation, no one deemed the story incredible, or ignominious for the Church." *Cent.* IX., p. 2, c. 2.

(4) *Investigation of the question whether a woman sat on the Papal throne between the reigns of Leo IV. and Benedict III.* (Amsterdam, 1649.)

(5) *Epist.* 130, to Cardinal Carvajal, dated Aug. 2, 1451.

(6) *Refutation of the Popular Error concerning the Popess Joan*, c. iii., no. 4.

(7) *Notes to Platina's Lives of the Pontiffs.*

(8) *Bishops of the City of Rome.*

(9) *Notes to Councils.—Lives of Leo IV. and Benedict III.*

(10) *Notes to Sigebert.*

(11) *Refutation of the Fable of the Popess Joan.*

(12) *Cenotaph*, etc.

(13) *Rom. Pon.*, b. iii., c. 24.

(14) *Annals*, y. 853.

(15) *Three Conversions of England*, p. ii. c. 5.

(16) *Cent.* IX., *diss.* 3.

(17) *Eccl. Writers*, vol. i., p. 837 (Paris, 1664).

Ferdinand III., but that, nevertheless, Charles VI. succeeded Ferdinand II., and reigned for more than two years, after which Ferdinand III. was chosen emperor, we would insist that one and the same writer could not have penned all this—that copyists must have injudiciously joined things written by different persons. Only a crazy or a drunken man would tell us that on the death of Innocent X. he was at once succeeded by Alexander VII., and that Innocent XI. became Pope immediately after Innocent X., reigning more than two years, and being succeeded by Alexander VII. Yet such is the absurdity of which Anastasius the Librarian would have been guilty, had he written what is found concerning the Popess in some of the MSS. of his work. We must conclude, therefore, that another hand than his added the passages concerning this woman” (1).

The Centuriators of Magdeburg adduce Marianus Scotus (d. 1086) as an authority for the story of Joan. At the year 853, they assert, this author says: “Pope Leo died on the Calends of August, and he was succeeded by the woman Joan, who reigned during two years, five months, and four days.” But, we ask, did Marianus really make this assertion? If he made it, is his authority of sufficient force to nullify the arguments which, as we shall see, militate against the fable? It is by no means certain that the quoted testimony is from the pen of Marianus Scotus. According to the editor of Krantz’s *Metropolis* (Cologne, 1574), the best codices of Marianus do not contain this passage (2); and the learned Benedict XIV. advances most stringent reasons for his belief that the passage is an interpolation (3). Again, it is very curious, if not suspicious, that only the modern propagators of this tale adduce the authority of the Irish chronologist; indeed, down to Martin the Pole, who wrote two centuries after Marianus, all historians make Benedict III. the immediate

(1) *Dictionary*, art. *Popess Joan*.

(2) Leo Allatius observes that the Frankfort printers carelessly omitted this note of the editor;—Florimond de Rémond (d. 1602), writing on the supposed testimony of Marianus, says: “Chronologies are special victims of the marginal notes of their readers; since there are in them, quite frequently, hundreds of omissions, these are supplied by the first comer, and often he makes great blunders. Do not we ourselves comment, again and again, on the Chronologies of the learned Pontac and Génébrard, because of their omissions or fancied defects? If one of these annotated MSS. should fall into the hands of a printer, how easily he would accredit the work of the glossarist to the author.”—*Loc. cit.*, c. 5, no. 3.

(3) *Canonization*, b. iii., c. 10, no. 3.

successor of Leo. IV., thus leaving no room for the female who is said to have reigned "two years, five months, and four days;" which certainly shows that they were unacquainted with the passage of Marianus. But of what authority is Marianus? His frequent blunders should cause us to hesitate in accepting his unsupported assertions; still more care should we exercise ere we receive as true such things as become dubious under light from other sources. Alexandre gives many instances of anachronisms on the part of Marianus, but we shall notice only one, which is in connection with the present question. In the year 854, which, according to the quoted passage, ought to be the second of the Popess, Leo IV. founded the city of Leopolis, twelve miles from Centum Cellæ. In the following year, the emperor Louis visited Pope Leo IV. at Rome, and the Pope died soon after, on the 16th Calends of August. The entire period, therefore, which Marianus is said to assign for the Pontificate of Joan, was spent by Leo IV. in the Papal chair (1). The third argument in favor of the existence of the Popess is taken from Martin the Pole, penitentiary to Pope Nicholas III. This author died in 1270, that is, a hundred and eighty-four years after the death of Marianus, and four hundred and twenty-five years after the election of Benedict III. He is said to tell us that Joan was English by birth, but of German origin; that, during a solemn procession, she gave birth, when mid-way between St. Clement's and the Colosseum, to a child; that ever after the Pontiffs always went to the Lateran by another street, because of this hideous memory. St. Antonine, archbishop of Florence, praises the *Chronicle* of Martin, and says (2): "After this Leo, Martin put in his *Chronicle* Joan, by birth an Englishman, who sat in the chair of Peter two years, five months, and six days, and at his death, the Papacy was vacant for one month. This Pontiff, says Martin, is reported to have been a woman, who, when yet a young girl, was taken to Athens in male attire, by her lover; there she made such progress in learning, that her equal was not to be found, and when she

(1) ANASTASIUS the Librarian, *Life of Leo IV.*

(2) *Chronicles*, p. *ii.*, *tit.* 16, c. 1, § 6.

afterwards lectured at Rome, she had great professors among her disciples. Being of great repute in the city, for both science and integrity, she was made Pope after Leo, but became pregnant by a servant. Ignoring the time of her delivery, she was one day going from St. Peter's to the Lateran, when she was taken in labor between St. Clement's and the Colosseum, and was delivered in the street. Dying in the child-birth, she is said to have been buried on the spot. As the Pope, in going to the Lateran, always avoids this street, many say that it is because of this detestable thing. (This Pontiff) is not put in the Catalogue, on account of the sex."

So far as St. Antonine is concerned, he shows that he places no confidence in the story, for he says: "If the report is true, we may cry out with Paul, 'O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God; how incomprehensible are his judgments!' It is said that a monumental sculpture was erected in the street where this took place, but Vincent, in his *Historical Mirror*, and John Colonna, say nothing about it." As for the testimony of Martin the Pole, we must observe, first, that he merely gives a rumor, and that he writes four centuries after the supposed event. Again, is it certain that Martin was the author of the alleged testimony? Suffrid, who caused Martin's *Chronicle* to be printed, at Antwerp, in 1584, observed that it had been greatly interpolated, and he also noted that the various codices greatly differed, and that in the Tongerlœnsian MS. the narration about Joan is put in an appendix, not in the body of the work. But the very words of the story, as said to have been written by Martin the Pole, betray the hand of an interpolator, and manifest an ignorance which renders the whole narration unreliable as evidence. Joan is said to have been taken, when yet a girl, to the schools of Athens, and to have there acquired a great reputation. Now, where were the famous schools of Athens, in the ninth century? What was the condition of Athens? As far back as the year 420, Synesius of Ptolemaide wrote (1): "There is now nothing splendid in

(1) *Epistle* 35.

Athens but the celebrated names of places, just as, after a sacrifice, nothing remains of the victim but its skin. Wandering around, you may gaze upon the Academy and the Lyceum, and the Portico which gave name to the sect of Chrysippus. The proconsuls have taken away the artistic productions of Thasius. In our day, Egypt teaches, she who received the seeds of wisdom from Hypatia. Athens was once a city, the home of learned men; now it is occupied only by apiarists." The schools of Athens were afterwards, to some extent, revived, but not during the supposed student-life of Joan. Cedrenus and Zonaras inform us that the emperor Michael III., after he had removed his mother Theodora from the government, allowed the Cæsar Bardas to restore the Athenian gymnasia, but Theodora was not relegated to private life until 856, while Joan is said to have died in that year. Equally absurd is the statement that Joan's talents caused her, a stranger, to be chosen Pontiff. It is certain that for many centuries the custom had obtained of raising to the papacy only a priest or deacon of the Roman Church, one trained, as it were, in view of such a contingency. A departure from this rule would scarcely have been made without grave reasons, and none such could be conjectured as subsisting in the case of Joan. Ridiculous indeed is the assertion that the supposed Pontiff gave birth to a child during a solemn religious function. If it can be believed that stupidity was so rampant, so universal, in the Roman court, that the sex and condition of this person could so long remain hidden, exposed, as every Pontiff must necessarily be, to the scrutiny of prelates, ministers, courtiers, physicians, chamberlains, and servants, we cannot believe that so successful an impostor, and so arrant a knave, would have possessed so much asininity of mind as to subject herself, at such a time, to the risks of a processional walk from the Vatican to the Lateran. Again, in this very mention of the procession to the Lateran, the interpolator of Martin's *Chronicle* betrays himself. He says that the Pontiffs avoid the street that was fatal to Joan, when they proceed to the Lateran. It is certain that the Popes did not commence to inhabit the Vati-

can before the reign of Boniface IX., who mounted the throne in 1389. (1)

The friends of this fable also adduce the testimony of Baptist Platina (d. 1481), who, having given the story almost in the supposed words of Martin, whom he cites, says that "there are those who say that, to avoid a similar error," the junior deacon investigates the sex of the newly elected Pontiff (2). Platina also speaks of a ceremony in which the new Pontiff is seated in a chair, "according to some," for this purpose, but says that it is his belief, however, "that the seat is prepared, that he who is raised to so eminent a position may know that he is not God, but a man, and subject to the necessities of nature; whence the name of *stercoraria* is given to the seat." To this argument, we may allow Platina himself to reply: "What I have written is commonly rumored, but the authors are uncertain and obscure; I have given the reports briefly and simply, lest I might seem to obstinately omit that which nearly all affirm. Let us then, in this matter, err with the crowd." These words do not imply any great faith in the story of Joan. As for the chair, which some think so eloquent, Bel-larmine (3) thus explains the matter: "We know from the *Sacred Ceremonies*, b. i., sect. 2, that in the Lateran Basilica there were three stone seats on which the new Pontiff was placed at his coronation. The first was in front of the entrance to the Church, and was common and miserable; in this the Pontiff was seated a short time, to signify that he was about to leave a humble for an exalted station, and then was sung from *Kings*, B. I., c. 2: 'He raiseth up the needy from the dust, and lifteth up the poor from the dunghill; that he may sit with princes, and hold the throne of glory.' And for this reason that seat is called *stercoraria*. The second seat was of prophecy, and was in the palace itself, and the Pontiff was placed thereon, in sign of his taking possession; there he received the keys of the Lateran palace. The third seat was not far from

(1) ONOFRIO PANVINI, *The Seven Churches*.

(2) "*Pontificem ipsum dum primo in Sede Petri collocatur, ad eam rem perforata, genitalia ab ultimo diacono, attractari.*"

(3) *Roman Pontiff*, b. iii., c. 24.

the second, and was similar to it; when he was seated here, he returned the keys to the giver, probably that, by such ceremony, he might be reminded of death, which would soon give his power to another. Of a seat for the investigation of sex, there is no mention whatever." (1)

Sigebert of Gemblours (2) furnishes another argument to the propagators of this tale. In his *Chronicle* he is said to assert: "It is reported that this John was a woman, that she was known by one alone of her servants, and that, having conceived by him during her Pontificate, she was delivered. Some, therefore, do not number her among the Pontiffs." Again we are treated to a "report," but even this shadow of an argument is of doubtful authenticity. In the MS. of Gemblours, edited by Miræus, the quoted passage is wanting. Vincent of Beauvais (3), who, in treating of this period, transcribes Sigebert's text, word for word, does not give the slightest reference to any female Pontiff. Again, the quoted words do not tally with the following statement of Sigebert: "Benedict (III.) was the 102d Pontiff of the Roman Church. Being dethroned by a conspiracy of the wicked, the Papacy was invaded by Anastasius; but Anastasius was deposed by the legates of the emperor Lothair, and put in prison, while Benedict was honorably restored." We shall prove that Benedict III. succeeded Leo IV. in 855, in a few days after the latter's death. According to Sigebert therefore, as our adversaries would understand him, either Joan was Pope at the same time as Benedict III., or her reign must be accounted for by deducting more than two years from that of Leo IV. Sigebert, however, assigns eight years to Leo IV. (4).

(1) Blondel says that this ceremony was abolished at the accession of Innocent VIII.

(2) Sigebert, a monk of Gemblours, was a contemporary of Gregory VII., and died in 1112. He was a bitter enemy of this Pontiff, and hesitates not to lie, whenever his zeal for the imperial interests is excited. His *Chronicle* extends to 1111, and was continued by Robenus de Monte down to 1210. Among his writings are two books on *Illustrious Men*, in which company he ranks himself, and gives a detailed account of his works.

(3) Vincent, bishop of Beauvais, a Dominican friar, died in 1250. His *Historical Mirror* treats of events down to 1244. It was continued by an unknown author down to 1494.

(4) Alannus Copus tells us that Molanus assured him that he had read the MS. of Gemblours, and that it contained nothing concerning the Popess. He was certain, he added, that, if this MS. was not the original of Sigebert's work, it was at least a copy of that original. *Dialogues*, I, c. 8. (Antwerp, 1573).—The Protestant Spanheim admits that the passage of Sigebert, as found in the Paris edition of 1513, is a parenthesis which can be cut out without entailing any injury on the narrative or the author's chronological calculations. He also avows that the questioned passage does not occur in the MS. of Leyden, which bears the date of 1154. *The Female Pope*, p. 52.

Proof for the existence of the Popess is also sought in a certain statue, representing a woman and infant, which was erected in memory of this fatal event, say our credulous adversaries, and was finally thrown by some Pontiff into the Tiber. Is it likely that the Popes would have allowed the erection of a memorial, to perpetuate the remembrance of so disgraceful an event? But the fact is, there was once a marble group, of evident antiquity, in the very street leading to the Lateran, and it was removed by Sixtus V. (1585-90), when that street, like many others, was widened and straightened. But in that group the most vivid imagination could find no indication of a design to represent the female Pontiff. It represented two persons indeed, but not a woman and infant; one figure was that of a man, thought by antiquaries to be of a Pagan priest, preceded by a well-grown boy, probably his attendant minister. (1). But there was once a statue of the Popess in a church at Sienna, and it was removed by order of Pope Clement VIII. (1592-1605), as we are informed by Baronio (2), who was the intermediary between the Pontiff and the Grand Duke on the occasion. The existence of this statue may show the prejudices or ignorance of the Siennese, but as a positive argument it is valueless. in the face of the many contrary and more weighty reasons which militate against the fable.

Having examined the arguments adduced by the propagators of this story, we now proceed to show, by the testimony of contemporary and closely following authors, that Pope Benedict III. immediately succeeded to Leo IV., and that hence the two years and more of Pontificate, on the part of Joan, are an impossibility. Lupus, abbot of Ferrières, writing to Benedict III. (3), praises the virtues of his predecessor Leo, and hopes that they will be imitated by

(1) In his *Table Talk*, Luther says: "In a great street, that which leads to St. Peter's, I have seen with my own eyes the statue of a woman, clothed with the Papal insignia, and holding a child in her arms. The Pope never goes by that way It is of that Agnes, born at Mayence, sent to England as cardinal. thereafter recalled to Rome, crowned Pope, as successor to Leo IV., in 857, and delivered of a child in the street in which her image is erected Truly, I am astonished that the Popes allow it to remain; but it is there as a miracle of God, who strikes them with blindness."

(2) *Epistle to Florimond de Rémond*, given by this author in his *Table of the Popess Joan*, c. 22.

(3) *Epistle* 103.

the new Pontiff. Here there is no suspicion of an intervening Popess. Ado of Vienne (d. 875) writes of the emperor Lothair: (1) "Resigning his temporal kingdom, he entered the monastery of Prumia; having taken the tonsure, and become a monk, he died in the year of our Lord 855, and the thirty-third of his empire, being there reverently buried by the brethren. . . . The Roman Pontiff Gregory died, and Sergius was ordained his successor; he having departed, Leo succeeded; this Pope dying, Benedict was placed in the Apostolic See, Lothair being already dead. . . . Pope Nicholas, a most religious man, died, and was buried in the vestibule of St. Peter's, not far from the remains of Benedict. Now Adrian succeeded in the order of bishops." Thus we learn from Ado that Leo IV. was succeeded by Benedict III., just after the death of Lothair, and we know that this death occurred on September 28, 855. To Benedict succeeded Nicholas, to Nicholas Adrian; where then was there room for Joan? Anastasius the Librarian informs us that Leo IV. died on July 17, 855, and that Benedict III. was installed on Sept. 29th of the same year. Where then are the two years of Joan? Hincmar of Rheims tells us (2) that he had sent messengers to Pope Leo IV., to beg for a certain privilege, and that, while on the way, they heard of that Pontiff's death, but nevertheless proceeded to Rome, and obtained the boon from the new Pope, Benedict III. Here again we find no interval for Joan's two years of Pontificate. Before the news of Lothair's death reached Rome, as we gather from the document itself, Pope Benedict III. issued a Diploma granting certain privileges to the monastery of Corbie. (3). As Lothair had died two months and twelve days after Leo IV., and this document speaks of him as yet living, it follows that Benedict succeeded Leo, at the furthest, in three months from the latter's death. Joan's two years of reign are again missing. Pope Nicholas I., immediate successor of Benedict III.,

(1) *Chronicle*, y. 855.

(2) *Epistle* 26.

(3) This Diploma begins: "Benedict, Bishop, Servant of the Servants of God, etc. Written by the hand of Theodore, Notary and Archivist of Holy Roman Church, in the month of October, 4th Indiction. Perfected on the Nones of October, by the hand of Theophylactus, seal-bearer of the Apostolic See, in the reign of Lothair. etc."

writes : (1) "Leo, Pontiff of the Apostolic See, who knew the desire of Hincmar, was taken from this life ; and when that Apostolic man, Benedict, of holy memory, had succeeded him in the Pontificate, the reverend Hincmar again prepared his arms, etc." There was therefore no Popess between Leo and Benedict. Photius, the father of the Greek Schism, a most bitter enemy of the Roman See, and yet a most learned man, would not have omitted to make capital out of the career of the Popess Joan, winding up, as it is asserted to have done, with so extraordinary a termination, had he known of it. Such an event could not have escaped his knowledge, for at the time it is said to have happened, Photius was secretary of state to the emperor Michael III. Now this learned, cunning, and vindictive schismatic, in a book written by him when his bitterness against Rome was fully developed, (2) distinctly enumerates the successors of Leo IV., down to that day, Benedict, Nicholas, John, and Adrian, without a hint of so acceptable an interregnum as that of a Joan would have been to his rebellious heart. Metrophanes of Smyrna, scarcely less bitter than Photius in his hatred of Rome, bears the same testimony. (3). The same is given by Stylianus, bishop of the Euphratesian Neo-Cæsarea, in the Epistle sent to Pope Stephen VI. by him and the confederated Catholic bishops of the East. In the first year of the Pontificate of Pope Formosus (891), Photius having been finally deposed, and peace been restored, for a time, to the Eastern Church, there was affixed to the main entrance of St. Sophia's basilica a Breviary or Synopsis of the Eighth General Council, in which the following passage occurs : "Down to this day, Photius has been openly condemned for forty-five years, by Pope Leo (and all the Popes) down to Formosus. For eleven years he was anathematized, while a secular and a layman, because he communicated with the excommunicated Gregory of Syracuse ; for other thirty-four years, after he had received holy orders, he was also anathematized. Popes

(1) *Epistle 46.*

(2) *On the Procession of the Holy Ghost, against the Latins, b. 1.* When Photius wrote this treatise, he had been many years an intruder in the patriarchal throne of Constantinople, and was fully and finally committed to the Schism.

(3) *Divinity and Procession of the Holy Ghost.*

Leo, Benedict, and Nicholas had condemned Gregory for various reasons. Both because of his other crimes, and because he had received orders from Gregory, Photius was anathematized by nine Roman Pontiffs, Leo, Benedict, Nicholas, Adrian, John, Marinus, the other Adrian, Stephen, and Formosus." Here we find the Church of Constantinople dividing the forty-five years which elapsed between the beginning of Leo's reign and that of Formosus among nine Pontiffs, whose names are given. Where will the patrons of the fable locate the two years and more of Joan? (1).

Pope Leo IX. (1049—1054), writing to Michael, patriarch of Constantinople, reproached that diocese in a manner which he would not have adopted, had he known that his own Pontifical chair had been contaminated as some Protestants would have us believe. His reproach is no other than that the clergy of Constantinople had raised a woman to the patriarchate: (2) "We would not wish to believe what public rumor hesitates not to assert, that the Constantinopolitan church, ignoring the First Chapter of the Council of Nice, has promoted eunuchs to her Patriarchal chair, and that once she even placed a woman in it. Even though the horror excited by so abominable a crime, so detestable a wickedness, did not prevent us, fraternal benevolence would cause us to doubt it. Nevertheless, when we consider your indifference to Canonical censures, in promoting eunuchs and mutilated persons, not only to the clerical state, but even to the episcopacy, we are of opinion that this may have happened."

(1) We may add the following testimonies as to the immediate succession of Benedict III. to Leo IV. The Synod of Tulle, y. 859, writing to the bishops of Brittany. The Roman Council of 863 (in Muratori, *Italian Writers*, vol. ii., pt. 2). Two contemporary catalogues of the Roman Pontiffs (in the *Prolegom.* to the *Lives of Anastasius*, vol. ii., pts. 18 and 20, edit. Vat.). The *Annals of Weingarten* (in the *Historical Monuments of Germany*, vol. i.). The *Annals of Würzburg* (*ibid.*, vol. ii.). A Catalogue of the Pontiffs compiled in 1648 (in Eccard, *Corp. Hist. Mid. Age*, vol. ii.). The *Annals of Einsiedeln* (in Pertz, *Monum. Germ. Hist.*, vol. v). The *Chronicle of Hermann Contractus* (in Pistorius, *German Writers*, vol. i.). The Catalogue of Pontiffs to the reign of Honorius II. (in Muratori, *loc. cit.*). A *Chronicle of St. Denis* (in Bouquet, *Collection of Historians of the Gauls and of France*, vol. viii. Not one of these works furnishes posterity with any trace of the alleged Popess.

(2) Bellarmine thinks that perhaps this remark of Leo IX. gave rise to the fable of Joan. "As there was a rumor that a certain woman had been made patriarch of Constantinople, after a while the name of the place was omitted, and people talked of a female "œcumenical" patriarch; then some persons, who hated Rome, asserted that the woman had been the Pope of Rome; probably the report (in its new dress) arose about the time of Martin the Pole." *Roman Pontiff*, b. 3, c. 24. This idea is not incredible, for, as Bellarmine says, "the Centuriators of Magdeburg insert more incredible things. Martin only said that this woman was an Englishwoman, of Mentz origin, and the Centuriators tell us her name was Gilberta; they say her father was an English priest, and that she was raised as a monk at Fulda, and wrote books on magic." Whence this information?

Summing up what has been observed in this matter, we have shown, firstly, that Marianus Scotus, who is, according to the propagators of the fable of Joan, the first recorder of the tale, is not undoubtedly in its favor; that there is good reason to suppose that his works have been interpolated; that, granting that he did narrate the story, his authority is not great enough to justify us in rejecting, in his favor, the many positive arguments which militate against the truth of the tale. Secondly, we have seen that the Chronicles of Martin the Pole and of Sigebert have been certainly vitiated: that St. Antónine and Platina are unfavorable to the story, and that they simply record it as said to have been told by Martin. Thirdly, we have proved that the fable cannot be incorporated into history because of any reasons deduced from the examination theory, or from the existence of certain statues said to have commemorated the disgraceful death of Joan. Fourthly, we have shown that the story bears intrinsic marks of its own falsity. Fifthly, we have adduced the testimony of contemporary and closely following authorities, who all agree that the Pontificate of Benedict III. immediately succeeded that of Leo IV., and that therefore, after Leo, there could not have been, on the part of Joan, "a reign of two years, five months, and four days." But it may naturally be asked, what could have given rise to this tale of a female Pontiff? Erudite men have been able only to conjecture. Mosheim, as we have said, admits, in an affectation of impartiality, that the story is certainly not well founded. But he says it must have owed its origin to some extraordinary event which happened about that time, that it is incredible that for five succeeding centuries, a number of historians should narrate the affair, in almost the same language, if it was entirely destitute of foundation. We have seen that what he regards as incredible has not occurred. As for this "some extraordinary event" which must have happened, according to Mosheim, the reader may rest assured that there happened, in the Middle Ages, few, if any such, that were not recorded by the indefatigable, though often injudicious, chroniclers of the time. The science of criticism was not

well developed in those days, and the chronicler was generally so ambitious for material, that he put into his annals whatever he read or heard, historical facts or monastic gossip. No event, sufficiently "extraordinary" to give origin to such a story as that of Joan, would have been unacceptable or too prurient for insertion, as experience will show the reader, if he gives some time to the perusal of these monuments. (1). John Aventinus, (2) derives the story of Joan from the career of John IX. (898—900). Theodora, mother-in-law of Albert, prince of Etruria, who then was powerful in Rome, procured the election of this Pontiff, and as she always exercised much influence over him, the story went around, says Aventinus, that a woman was Pope of Rome. Onofrio Panvini (3) thinks that the fable originated among the Romans, who detested the vices of John XII. (956—964), and who styled his mistress Joan the real Pontiff of Rome. The opinion of Bellarmine we have already given. Baronio (4) deems the easy-going course of John VIII. in the matter of Photius the origin of the story. Leo Allatius finds its source in the *Annals of the Franks* and the *Chronicle* of Sigebert, where is described the condemnation, in the time of Leo IV., of a certain Thiota of Mentz, a pretending prophetess, etc. (5)

We will close this chapter by citing the opinions of two celebrated Protestant polemics, than whom modern heresy has produced no more able, or more bitter, foes of the Roman Church—Jurieu and Blondel. The former says: "I do not think that we are very much interested in evincing the truth of this story of the Popess Joan. Even though the Papal See had been surprised into accepting for its head a woman, believing her to be a man, it would not, in

(1) "But this is a foible of Protestants: when there is question of a fact favorable to the Roman Church, the most convincing proofs will scarcely persuade them; but if there comes up an event which is injurious to Catholicism, the weakest probabilities will engender their confidence in it; if they dare not affirm it, they must have the consolation of being doubtful about it. This disease is common to all incredulists."—BERGIER, art. *Popess Joan*.

(2) *Annals of Bavaria*, b. 4.

(3) *Notes to Platina*.

(4) *Annals*, y. 879.

(5) In the year 1845 Bianchi-Giovini published a *Critical Examination of the Acts and Documents relating to the Fable of the Popess Joan*, in which taking up the story from its first appearance, he carefully weighed all the authorities for and against its truth. Good critics opine that he so exhausted the subject, and so evidently manifested the absurdity of the tale, that no one will ever again presume to seriously adduce it. The reader will find much information concerning this question in the *Notes* of Gennarelli to the edition of the *Diary of Burckhardt*, published at Florence, in 1854. See the part on *Innocent VIII.*, p. 82, note i.

my opinion, have suffered much. The advantage we might draw from such a fact would not compensate us for the great trouble we would have to prove it. In fact, I find, from the manner in which the tale is narrated, that it gives more honor to the Roman See than that See merits. It is asserted that this Popess had made excellent studies; that she was learned, able, and eloquent; that her many gifts won for her the admiration of Rome; that her election was unanimous, although she had appeared among the Romans an unknown foreigner, without any friends, or any other support than her own merit. I contend that much honor is given to the Roman See by the supposition that it promoted an unknown young person, merely because of personal worth." (1) Blondel remarks: "Many have tried to redeem the romance of Marianus from the suspicion accruing to it from the silence of all authors of the two following centuries, by supposing that the writers who lived during the period from 855 to 1050 refrained from narrating the story, because of the shame it heaped upon them. They preferred, it is contended, to change the records of the Papal succession by an affected silence, rather than to contribute, by noting an odious truth, to preserve the execrable memory of a woman who had dishonored the Holy See. But those authors who lived at Rome, such as Nicholas I. and Anastasius the Librarian, would have been foolish indeed, if they had deemed it possible, by their silence, to bury a disgrace which is supposed to have so astonished, scandalized, and angered the Romans, that they could be appeased only by perpetuating their just indignation with the erection of a commemorative statue, with an appropriate arrangement of their processions, and with the use of hitherto unknown, and very indelicate, ceremonies." (2)

(1) *Apology for the Reformation*, vol. ii., Jurieu agrees with Florimond de Rémond, when this author says (*loc. cit.*, c. xi., no. 5) that "even though this misfortune had befallen the Church, since the woman was elevated by deceit, and by so parading an apparently holy life as to blind everybody, the crime was hers and not of the electors, who were in good faith, and cannot be charged with any part in the fraud."

(2) *Loc. cit.*, p. 78

CHAPTER IV.

THE GREEK SCHISM : ITS FIRST STAGE UNDER PHOTIUS, AND
THE EIGHTH GENERAL COUNCIL.

At the death of the emperor Theophilus, in 841, the Byzantine throne was occupied by the empress Theodora as regent for, and, according to the will of Theophilus, co-sovereign with, their son Michael III., then only six years of age. Theodora immediately restored the images to the churches and ejected the Iconoclast John from the patriarchate. To her son Michael she assigned as tutors two worthy patricians, Manuel and Theoctistus, whose aid she also used in the administration of the government. During the fourteen years of her reign the empire prospered greatly, but in the year 855 the intrigues of her brother Bardas deprived her of power and started the series of events which were destined to ultimately prove the ruin of the empire, as well as a serious injury to Christendom. Bardas may rightly be called the father of the Greek schism. A difference having arisen between Manuel and Theoctistus, Bardas profited by it to secure his own advancement. Manuel foresaw the storm, and retired from the court. Theoctistus was not so fortunate. Having rebuked Bardas for many crimes, among which was that of incest with his daughter-in-law, his death was the consequence of his zeal. Bardas soon became all-powerful with the emperor, and as Theodora's severe piety and inflexible justice were too great a check upon the passions of the youthful prince, he gave a ready ear to Bardas' suggestion that she should be relegated to private life. Fearing even worse than deposition, Theodora convoked the Senate, rendered an account of the financial state of the empire, lest her administration should be calumniated, and abdicated the throne. Not satisfied with this, Bardas persuaded Michael to force his mother to take the veil, saying that she might otherwise marry again and raise a progeny which would some day claim the sceptre. The aid of Ignatius, who had succeeded Methodius in the

patriarchate, was besought in vain ; but Petronas, another brother of the empress, was amenable to Bardas' scheme, and he found some wretched ecclesiastic who cut the hair of Theodora and her daughters, and invested them all with the monastic habit. Bardas was now made *Curopolates*, and soon afterwards Cæsar. (1). Henceforth he was real master of the Byzantine empire, the nominal sovereign passing his time in debauchery, spending the immense sums which the prudence and economy of Theodora had accumulated. (2)

Ignatius, who at this time was patriarch of Constantinople, was a son of the emperor Michael Rangabes (811-813). Made a eunuch by order of Leo the Armenian (813-820), and confined in a monastery, lest he should claim the throne, he voluntarily became a monk, and in time an abbot. Celebrated for his virtues, he attracted the attention of Theodora, and on the death of Methodius, in 847, was by her influence raised to the patriarchal chair. Under his administration everything prospered, and it was plain that the holy Methodius was worthily replaced. But his zeal soon made Ignatius obnoxious to Bardas. Enraged at the episcopal rebuke for his incest, and convinced, by the refusal to violate the canons in the case of Theodora's monastic investiture, that Ignatius would never be a mere courtier-prelate, the *Curopolates* compassed his downfall. About this time a certain crazy adventurer, named Gebo, advanced a claim to the throne, asserting that he was a son of Theodora, and quite a number were found to adhere to him. When he was captured and deprived of eyes, hands, and feet, his followers soon disbanded. Bardas now came forward, accusing Ignatius of having been an instigator of the conspiracy. The credulous Michael was easily influenced, and the patriarch was banished to the isle of Terebinthus. Here he was waited upon by several of Bardas' episcopal and patrician friends, and vainly urged to resign his see. (3). Several unworthy prelates, under the

(1) The dignity of *Curopolates* corresponded to that of "Master of the Palace" in the West, although in the Byzantine court it never was associated with the real power which often accrued to the possessors of that title under the Merovingian kings. The title of *Cæsar* gave the bearer a rank second only to that of the sovereign, and was generally associated with so much of real power, that the Cæsar was regarded as a kind of lieutenant of the emperor.

(2) NICETAS, CEDRENUS, and ANASTASIUS the Librarian.

(3) *Idem*.

leadership of Gregory of Syracuse (1), now held a species of synod, pretended to depose Ignatius, and elected as patriarch a layman, named Photius, then first secretary of state to the emperor. Photius was of a patrician family, a grandson of St. Tharasius, and, besides his secretaryship, held the post of first Sword-bearer. He was wealthy, learned, ambitious, and unscrupulous; in fine, a ready-made instrument for the use of Bardas. In six days the new patriarch received the monk's tonsure, the Lectorate, the Subdiaconate, Diaconate, Priesthood, and Episcopate. These events occurred in the year 857. That most of the bishops who voted for Photius were influenced by fear, is evident from the words of his friend, Metrophanes of Smyrna, who, writing to the patrician Manuel, said: "All the bishops of the province of Constantinople met together and anathematized Photius, declaring him deposed in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and conspiring together, they devoted themselves to eternal pains if they ever recognized Photius as patriarch." So long as Ignatius lived, Photius was uneasy. Hence he persuaded the emperor that the unfortunate patriarch was conspiring against the throne, and new persecutions were set afoot, not only against Ignatius, but against all who refused to communicate with the intruder. (2). A synod was also held in 859, in the imperial church of the Blachernal, and the deposition of Ignatius was confirmed. A few bishops, not lost to all sense of religion, met, in answer to this conclave, in the church of St. Irene, and declared Photius an intruder, asserting; furthermore, that he had promised, when nominated patriarch, to always regard Ignatius as the legitimate incumbent, and himself only as a vicar.

Photius now came to the conclusion that he would never

(1) Gregory had been tried and convicted for sedition, schism, and other crimes, and deposed from his see of Syracuse, by Ignatius, who, as patriarch of Constantinople, was his superior, Sicily being at that time in the obedience of the Eastern empire. Ignatius, however, requested of Pope Leo IV. a ratification of the procedure, which the Pontiff postponed, to give time to Gregory to make a defense. Ignatius afterwards sent to Rome a copy of the papers in the case, and Pope Benedict III. confirmed the sentence. In spite of all this, Gregory retained the insignia of his office, thanks to the protection of Bardas.

(2) Among other torments to which Ignatius was subjected, was his confinement in the sepulchre of Copronimus, where he would have died from the stench and from starvation, had not a faithful adherent bribed the guards to open the doors. He was often beaten nearly to death, and his teeth were knocked from his jaws. Basil, who had been Prefect of the Archives under Ignatius, had his tongue cut out, because he used it in defence of his patron.

enjoy his new dignity in comfort, unless he could obtain the sanction of the Roman Pontiff. Accordingly, he sent to Rome a legation composed of two bishops, and Arzabir, the imperial Sword-bearer. Most cunningly did these gentlemen fulfil their commission. Having presented to Pope Nicholas some very costly gifts in token of homage from Michael and Photius, they put on the veil of piety, and begged the Pontiff to send legates to Constantinople, in order that, by the authority of the Holy See, ecclesiastical discipline might be strengthened, and a final blow be given to Iconoclasm, then threatening to again raise its head. In the letters of Photius, the Pope was told that Ignatius, worn out with age and disease, had resigned his see, and was now residing in a monastery, loved and venerated by all, from the emperor down; that he (Photius) had been chosen patriarch by the unanimous voice of the bishops, and that he had been compelled by the emperor to assume the dignity. (1). Pope Nicholas I. then sent as legates to Constantinople the bishops Rodoald of Porto and Zachary of Anagni, who were charged with the enforcement of the decrees of the Seventh Council on the image question, and instructed "to investigate the cause of the patriarch Ignatius, and to refer it to the true and thorough judgment of the Apostolic See." The legates were ordered to communicate with Photius, "as with a layman," as we learn from the intruder himself. (2). The Pontiff sent letters to the emperor and to Photius. Writing to Michael, he disapproved of the deposition of Ignatius, as done "without the advice of the Roman Pontiff;" he condemned the elevation of Photius, as a violation of the Canons of Sardica and of the decrees of Popes Celestine I, Leo I, Gelasius, and Adrian I.; he ordered that Ignatius should be brought before the Papal legates in full Synod, that an investigation might be held as to the causes of his deposition; he insisted upon due honor to images; he ordered the restoration of the patrimonies of the Roman Church in Sicily, which had

(1) NICETAS, *Life of Ignatius*; PHOTIUS, *Epistle to Nicholas I.*, in Baronio, *ŷ.* 859; ANASTASIUS, *Preface to 8th Council*; STYLIANUS, *Epistle to Stephen VI.*; METROPHANES of Smyrna, *Epistle to Manuel*.

(2) *Epistle I., to all Catholics.*

been alienated by Leo the Isaurian. This epistle bears date of Sept. 25. 859. In his letter to Photius, Pope Nicholas refuses to recognize that prelate's uncanonical elevation.

Upon their arrival at Constantinople, the Papal legates were confined to their quarters for a hundred days, being allowed to communicate with no one unprovided with an imperial permission; threats of starvation, exile, etc., were also made, if they did not recognize the legitimacy of Photius' installation. History shows us that, as a general thing, Pontifical ambassadors have exhibited a courage and fidelity worthy of their high position, but Rodoald and Zachary were of the few who, at various times, have ignominiously betrayed their trust. Yielding to the combined influence of fear and bribery, they promised to favor the cause of Photius, and in 861 a numerous Synod was held, at which, although the legates were present, the emperor really presided. The intruding patriarch caused a mutilated version of the letters of Pope Nicholas to be read, and then, in the name of the legates, Ignatius was ordered to appear before the Synod. The holy patriarch was on his way, dressed in the robes appropriate to his dignity, when he was threatened with death if he appeared before the prelates in any other guise than that of a monk. Thus he accordingly presented himself, and was immediately assailed by the emperor with a torrent of invectives. Seated upon a wooden bench, he was allowed to speak with the legates. Asking them if they had no letters to him from the Pontiff, he was informed that "there were none; they had been sent, not to a patriarch, but to one who had been condemned by the Synod of his own province, and that they were prepared to settle all things according to the Canons." To this Ignatius retorted: "Then first remove the adulterous one; if you cannot do so, you are no judges." The legates pointed to Michael, and replied: "He orders us." The unfortunate patriarch was then besieged by the officers of the palace, who vainly urged him to yield up his claims. Cited before the Synod, he refused to acknowledge it as his judge, and appealed to the Pope, saying: "I do not

acknowledge such judges ; I appeal to the Pope, and will willingly bow to his decision." He then desired the bishops to read the Decree of Pope Innocent I. in the case of St. Chrysostom, in which that holy doctor's restoration to his diocese was ordered as a preliminary to any judgment ; he also quoted the 4th Canon of Sardica, " If any bishop be deposed, and he declares that he has a defense, let no one be substituted in his place, until the Pontiff of the Roman Church shall have decided in the matter." Urged again and again to appear before the Synod, and being told that there were many witnesses who would swear that his election had been uncanonical, Ignatius answered : " If I am not archbishop, thou art not emperor, nor are these bishops ; for you were all consecrated by my unworthy hands and prayers." Seventy-two witnesses now came forward and swore that Ignatius had been thrust into the patriarchal chair by the secular power ; only one bishop, Theodulus of Ancyra, tried to defend the victim, but he was stopped by a blow which caused his blood to flow. Then was read the Apostolic Canon which declares that, " if any bishop obtains a church through use of the secular power, let him be deposed," and a decree of condemnation was passed against Ignatius. The ceremony of degradation was then performed, the pallium and many other patriarchal ornaments being placed upon, and then taken from, the unfortunate by one Procopius, a subdeacon whose vices had caused his suspension. As this minister of injustice pronounced the word " unworthy " at each removal of insignia, the treacherous legates and all the episcopal sycophants echoed the opprobrious term, and Photius had triumphed. But the hatred of Bardas was not yet appeased, and if Photius could not compass the death of the patriarch, he was bound to have, at least, his resignation. Ignatius was conveyed to the tomb of Copronymus and there subjected to torture. After two weeks of racking, whipping, and starvation, an attack of dysentery nearly ended his life. As he lay inanimate upon the stones, a certain Theodore, a creature of Photius, traced a cross with the patriarch's hand upon a clean sheet of parchment, and took the sheet to his master.

Photius then wrote above the mark: "I, the unworthy Ignatius of Constantinople, confess that I have usurped the throne of this church, not having been legally chosen, and that I have acted the tyrant." But this document gave no security for the future; accordingly, the two conspirators resolved to adopt that plan of mutilation so commonly used by the Byzantine rulers toward all from whom they anticipated danger. Orders were given to pluck out the eyes and cut off the hands of their victim, but when the executioners entered his mother's apartments, to which he had been taken, they found them empty. Ignatius now fled from place to place, pursued by the imperial emissaries, who had orders to kill him on sight as a disturber of the empire. But God protected him, and when a forty days' earthquake had thoroughly convinced the Byzantines of the divine displeasure, a pardon was proclaimed for Ignatius, and permission accorded him to live in his old monastery (1).

In the meantime there had arrived in Rome a faithful friend of Ignatius, the archimandrite Theognostus, who presented to Pope Nicholas, in the name of the patriarch, a full account of his own and his church's calamities. This document commences: "Ignatius, oppressed by tyranny, etc., to Our Most Holy Lord and Most Blessed Ruler, the Patriarch of all the Sees, the Successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, the Universal Pope Nicholas, and to all his Most Holy Bishops, and to the entire Most Wise Roman Church." And it finishes with this appeal: "Do thou, Most Holy Lord, show to me the bowels of thy mercy, and say with the great Apostle: 'Who is weak, and I am not weak?' Look upon thy predecessors, the patriarchs Fabian, Julius, Innocent, Leo, and, in fine, all who have manfully fought for the faith and for truth; imitate them, and arise in vindication of us who have suffered these things." The legates Rodoald and Zachary now returned to Rome, but merely reported that Ignatius had been deposed and Photius confirmed. There came also to the Pontiff an ambassador from the emperor Michael, in the

(1) These facts are recorded by Nicetas; by Theognostus, in the book inscribed to Pope Nicholas I. and all the bishops of the West; in the *Epistles* of Nicholas I., nos. 7, 8, and 9; and by Anastasius, in *Preface to 5th Council*.

person of his secretary Leo, charged with the task of delivering to his Holiness an account of the proceedings of the Photian Synod, and of obtaining its confirmation.

The Pontiff soon discovered the prevarication of his legates, and having called a Synod, he declared, in the presence of the imperial secretary, that he had never, and never would, consent to the deposition of Ignatius; as for the legate Zachary, he was deposed from the priesthood, while Rodoald, then absent in France, would be tried at a future time. Leo was then dismissed with letters of the same tenor to Michael and Photius. In his letter to Photius, the Pontiff is careful to address him as though he were a layman, for, although his consecration was valid, it was illicit. He inscribes the document "To the most prudent man, Photius," and after descanting upon the authority and primacy of the Holy See, which Photius himself then acknowledged, he refutes the arguments adduced by the intruder in justification of his uncanonical election, and declares that Ignatius is the legitimate patriarch of Constantinople. This epistle is dated March 18. 862, and on the same day the Pontiff issued a letter to all the patriarchs and bishops of the East, prohibiting any recognition of Photius as patriarch. These letters of Pope Nicholas infuriated the emperor, and he dispatched to Rome his Sword-bearer, with a very disrespectful epistle to the Pontiff, urging more strongly than ever the recognition of the usurper. The result of this embassy was the appearance of a Papal letter, still more exhaustive in its arguments against Photius. Nevertheless, the intruder prospered under the protection of Michael, and when his great patron, Bardas, had been put to death for supposed conspiracy, he was sufficiently wily to make the emperor believe in his fidelity, and to render that protection more solid than ever. In the year 866 the madness of Photius culminated in an "excommunication" of the Roman Pontiff; and in an *Encyclical* to all the patriarchs of the East, he adduced, in justification of his rebellious attitude, the following accusations against the Latins. They fasted on Saturdays. They observed the first week of Lent in a glut-

tonous manner, namely, drinking milk, eating cheese, etc. They imposed the yoke of celibacy upon their priests. They denied to priests the right of administering Confirmation. They taught that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son. In the year 867, Photius held another Pseudo-Synod, composed of the bishops of his faction and of impostors who called themselves legates of the other patriarchs. He repeated his anathema against Pope Nicholas I. and sent the *Acts* to the emperor Louis II., promising him the Byzantine throne, if he would procure the deposition of the Pontiff. But Photius now experienced a great reverse of fortune.

In the year 867, the emperor Michael associated his quondam chamberlain, Basil, with himself in the government. This prince, however, soon excited his monarch's displeasure, and his tenure of life became uncertain. Therefore he seized the opportunity afforded by an imperial debauch, and assassinated Michael. (1). The day following, he ordered the removal of Photius from the patriarchal palace, and his seclusion in a monastery.(2). Ignatius was then, after nine years of persecution, restored to the patriarchate. Basil immediately informed Pope Nicholas of his exertions for the well-being and liberty of the Church, and that his impartiality might be evident, he sent to Rome not only the metropolitan John of Syleum, on the part of Ignatius, but also the metropolitan Peter of Sardina, to defend the cause of Photius. He also begged the Pontiff to send legates to Constantinople, that an end might be put to all ecclesiastical turmoils. Ignatius also wrote to the Pope, consulting him as to the course to be pursued with reference to those who had become schismatics under Photius. In this letter, Ignatius gives the following mag-

(1) According to Liutprand, *b. i., c. 1*, a celestial vision induced Basil to perform great penance for this crime.

(2) Among the effects of Photius, the imperial officers found two elegantly bound Mss. One contained the *Acts* of the Pseudo-Synod held against Ignatius, and seven pictures, illustrating the same, painted by Gregory of Syracuse. The first represented the holy confessor receiving a beating, and was inscribed "The Devil." In the second he was seen covered with spittle, and styled "The Beginning of Sin." The third showed him dethroned, with the epigraph "Son of Perdition." In the fourth he was depicted in chains and condemned to exile, with the motto "Avarice of Simon Magus." The fifth calumniated him as "He who extols himself above all that is called or worshipped as God." In the sixth he was condemned to death as "The Abomination of Desolation." The seventh pictured him being dragged to the scaffold under the name of 'Anti-Christ.' The second MS. was a copy of the documents sent to the emperor Louis II.

nificent testimony to the reverence of the Greek Church of his time for the See of Peter: "For the cure of the wounds and ills of the human body, the medical art furnishes us with a great number of physicians; but for the members of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of our God the Saviour, there is only one chosen and universal physician, namely, your Fraternal and Paternal Holiness, constituted by the Supreme and Most Powerful Word of God, when He said to Peter, the supreme and most holy Prince of the Apostles: 'Thou art Peter, etc.' And these blessed words were not addressed to the Prince of the Apostles, simply as conferring a private privilege, but through him they were directed to all the Pontiffs of the Roman See, his successors. Wherefore, in the past, whenever heresies and corruptions came into existence, the successors in your Apostolic See always extirpated such tares and noxious growth; and now, your Blessedness, worthily using the power received from Christ, crushes the enemies of truth, and him who, like a robber, enters the fold of Christ by the window With the physician's hand of holy and Apostolic authority, you cut him off from the body of the Church; and pronouncing us innocent, who have been so oppressed by his wickedness, you have, like a most loving brother, restored us to our church." When the legates of Basil arrived in Rome, they found that Pope Adrian II. had mounted the throne. Having presented their letters, they witnessed, in a Roman Synod, the confirmation of the deposition of Photius and of Ignatius' restoration.

To remedy the evils produced in the East by the schism of Photius, Pope Adrian II. convoked the Eighth General Council, which met at Constantinople, Oct. 5, 869. Before, however, we treat of this subject, it is better to finish our historical sketch of the career of Photius. During ten years of exile, this wretched man was able to do little more, in the way of furthering his ambition, than meditate and plot. Ignatius was restored by a sentence of an Œcumenical Council, was protected by the Roman Pontiff, and enjoyed the favor of his sovereign. The cunning of the schemer, however, was great, and by means of friends at court he was

constantly informed of everything which might be turned to his advantage. Having learned that Basil was exceedingly sensitive on the subject of his lowly origin, he excogitated a means of gratifying the imperial vanity, trusting to thereby mount in time to the point of his ambition. He invented a genealogical table, by which it was shown that Basil was descended from Tyridates, a famous king of Armenia. (1). The hospitality of the palace was now extended to Photius, and he was appointed governor of the imperial princes. But his influence over Basil was not strong enough to bring about the deposition of Ignatius. He therefore simulated repentance for the past, and earnestly besought the patriarch to restore him to the active priesthood. Ignatius, however, would not yield, and then the daring of Photius and the weakness of the emperor became manifest. Photius put on the patriarchal insignia, and he presumed to hold ordinations in the imperial chapel. The death of Ignatius now occurred (878), and the usurper again seized the patriarchal throne. Many of the suffragan bishops were already of his faction ; some others he won by promotion or by money, while the few who refused to recognize his jurisdiction were turned over to the mercies of Leo Catacalus, the prefect of the guards. He pretended that the ordinations of Ignatius were null and void, and as such, he repeated them ; he restored to their sees all the bishops whom Ignatius had suspended. (2). At this time, the Apostolic legation at Constantinople was held by the bishops Paul of Ancona and Eugene of Ostia. Faithful to their trust, they refused even to admit Photius to communion : hence the infatuated Basil sent legates to Rome to try the constancy of Pope John VIII., then in the sixth year of his Pontificate. Photius also sent to Rome his creature, Theodore Santabarenus, whom he had made metropolitan of Patras, as bearer of a letter in which it was declared that Photius had

(1) By the connivance of Theophanes, one of the imperial chaplains, this table, adorned with many prophetic descriptions, was placed in the Palatine Library. Theophanes then pretended to discover it, and telling Basil that it greatly interested the imperial family, he declared that only one man in the empire was sufficiently erudite to interpret it. That man was Photius and he was immediately summoned to the palace. Here his intrigues were greatly aided by Theodore Santabarenus, a monk addicted to necromancy, but reputed a saint by Basil.

(2) These facts are gathered from Nicetas' *Life of St. Ignatius*, and from the *Epistle of Stylianus* to Pope Stephen V.

been forced by the bishops and by the emperor to accept the patriarchal dignity. This letter bore the signatures and seals of all the metropolitans, those of the faithful prelates having been procured by Peter, the imperial secretary, under pretext that the document was connected with the purchase of some ground for the patriarchate. (1). The result of this mission to Pope John VIII. was the restoration of Photius, to be effected, however, under certain conditions. In speaking of this action of Pope John VIII., Alexandre does not hesitate to say that by it "was rescinded the resolution of the Eighth Council never to receive Photius, to which resolution John himself, then archdeacon, had subscribed, before the universal Church," and that by it "John now gave up his name to everlasting reproach." That this harsh judgment is also unjust, a calm consideration of the facts in the case will conclusively show. Basil asserted that Photius was repentant; that his confirmation would give peace to the church of Constantinople; that such confirmation was desired even by those who had been ordained by Ignatius and Methodius. These assertions were apparently corroborated by the forged signatures to Photius' letter. Again, the general conduct of Basil had caused Rome to regard him as meriting well of the Church; hence if he could be gratified in justice and with honor, prudence suggested a compliance with his wishes. Finally, Ignatius was now dead, and no one claimed the see in opposition to Photius. (2). In his answer to Basil, *Epist.* 199, the Pontiff says that he hearkens to the emperor's prayers, "without any prejudice to the Apostolic statutes, or any relaxation of the rules of the fathers; yea, rather resting "upon their authority;" and after quoting instances of prudent yielding to circumstances, on the part of his

(1) NICETAS, *ibid.*

(2) Nor should it be forgotten that Pope John relied upon the Greek fleets to protect the coasts of the Campagna and Tuscany from the Saracens. It is remarkable that while even Baronio blames Pope John VIII for his restoration of Photius, the furious Gallican De Marca (*Priesthood and Empire*, b. iii., c. 14) thus excuses him: "Ignatius having died, the often condemned Photius recovered his see through the votes of the Eastern bishops and the good will of the emperor Basil; but that restoration could not have been complete without the approval of the Apostolic Chair. Wherefore John VIII., besought by the emperor to consult the peace of the Church, ceded to necessity, and, influenced by the example of Leo, Gelasius, Felix, and an African Council, who all thought that in some emergencies rules might be modified, he freed Photius from anathema, with the consent of the other patriarchs, and allowed him to retain the patriarchal throne, on condition that he would beg pardon before the coming Council. The agreement of the emperor, the other patriarchs, and a full Eastern Synod, frees John from blame."

predecessors and certain Synods, he grants the request of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, of all the metropolitans, bishops, priests, and of all the clergy of Constantinople, who remain of the ordination of Methodius and Ignatius; and receives as co-minister in the episcopal office the same Photius, *if, according to custom, he begs mercy in a Synod.* We, upon whom, according to the Apostle, rests the care of all the churches, not wishing that there should any longer remain cause of dispute in the Church of God, absolve this same patriarch from all ecclesiastical censure; and with him, all the bishops, priests, clerics, and laymen against whom the censures of the divine judgment have been pronounced; and we decree that he receive the Constantinopolitan see principally because, by this act, all will witness an instance of Apostolic mercy." When the imperial ambassadors departed from Rome, they were accompanied by the legate Peter, cardinal of the title of St. Chrysogonus, with instructions to arrange, in union with two other legates already at Constantinople, but in accordance with what had been decreed at Rome, the affairs of the distracted patriarchate. Peter arrived at his post in November, 879, and in an interview with Photius handed him the Papal letters of instruction. The schemer then requested permission to retain the documents for a short time, that he might have them translated into Greek, for the use of the coming Synod. The legates assented, and it was afterwards found that the imprudent concession had furnished an opportunity for an interested mutilation and interpolation of the Papal instructions. Among other alterations, Photius erased the clause in which he was ordered to throw himself on the mercy of the Synod. He also inserted a condemnation of the Eighth Council, held ten years before, against his schism, and an abrogation of all the decrees issued against himself by the Pontiffs Nicholas I. and Adrian II. Armed with this new weapon, Photius now held that famous Synod which the schismatics afterwards styled the Eighth Œcumenical. The conclave met in the church of St. Sophia, and was attended by 380 prelates, and by the whole imperial family. The Papal legates were also on

hand, but, like their unfortunate predecessors in the time of Pope Nicholas, they had been corrupted. Photius, therefore, had things his own way. Although his own cause was in question, he was allowed to preside, the legates assenting to everything proposed by the usurper, and saying nothing of the Pontifical mandates. After a solemn restoration of Photius to the patriarchate, and an excommunication of all who would not communicate with him, the Pseudo-Synod issued a number of canons, to give the affair more of a conciliary appearance. Photius wished much to have the "Latin doctrine," as he called it, of the *Filioque*, condemned, but fearing lest the Papal legates would be incited to something like a resemblance of their duty, and thus render null all of his proceedings, he deferred his overt act of heresy to a more propitious time. (1)

The three Papal legates returned to Rome immediately after the Photian "Eighth Synod," and simply reported that peace was restored to the Constantinopolitan church, and that the emperor would send a powerful fleet to protect the Italian coasts from the Saracens. But the letter of Photius, admitting that he had not asked pardon of the Synod, caused Pope John VIII. to suspect that his commands had been evaded in more ways than one. Hence he commissioned the cardinal Marinus, who was destined to succeed him in the Papacy, and who had been one of the presidents of the Eighth Council, to return to Constantinople for the purpose of investigation, instructing him to rescind all which he might discover to have been unjustly or illegally done by the former legates. Marinus did his duty. The frauds of Photius were made manifest, and therefore his old condemnation by the Eighth Council was revived. The olden zeal of Basil for the good of the Church had been greatly modified by his intimacy with Photius, and he was made furious by the apostolic intrepidity of Marinus. He forgot the respect which all rulers owe to the law of nations, and even that which every Christian should show to the representative of Christ's vicar. The legate was thrown

(1) Six weeks after the Pseudo-Synod, while at an assembly of bishops in the *Triclinium* of the Blachernal palace, the emperor asked Photius for a Profession of Faith, and received one made up of the definitions of the first seven Councils, with a declaration that nothing should be added to them.

into prison, and for thirty days his constancy was tried, but the only result was an exhibition of firmness which was a glorious offset to the scandal caused among the vacillating Greeks by the weakness of his predecessors. When Pope John VIII was informed of the treachery of his legates, and of Photius' usurpation, he immediately confirmed the condemnatory sentences of Nicholas I. and Adrian II., and added his own anathema. Pope Marinus, who succeeded John VIII. in the year 882, confirmed the acts of his predecessor in reference to Constantinopolitan affairs, and the infatuated Basil dared to retort by asserting that Marinus was not a legitimate Pope, since he had been bishop of another see, and could not abandon it. It was during the reign of Marinus that Photius wrote to the schismatic patriarch of Aquileia his famous Epistle attacking the Catholic dogma on the Procession of the Holy Ghost.(1). During the Pontificate of Adrian III. (884—85), Basil again vainly sought from Rome the recognition of Photius. In the year 889, Leo, surnamed "the philosopher" on account of his erudition, succeeded his father Basil on the imperial throne of Byzantium, and with his advent came an end to the first stage of the Greek Schism. The Papal Chair was then occupied by Stephen VI. (885—91), one of whose first acts had been a brilliant and solid defence of the actions of his predecessors in the Photian matter, against the insolent attacks of Basil. The letters of Stephen produced a deep impression on the mind of Leo, and he immediately ejected Photius from the patriarchal palace, appointing instead his own brother Stephen. Having recalled from exile all the bishops and priests who had been the victims of Photius, Leo addressed them: "Having sought the truth, our authority, which is from God, has ejected that wicked man Photius from the patriarchal chair and has stopped your persecution. Nor shall we compel you, in any way, to unwillingly communicate with him; we rather request of your piety that you communicate with our brother, that there may be but one fold. If, however, you do not wish to communicate with my brother, without

(1) BARONIO, year 883.

first consulting Rome, which has condemned Photius, and because my brother was ordained deacon by him, let us together write to the Pontiff that he may give absolution from the anathema pronounced against those ordained by Photius." Letters were accordingly sent to Pope Stephen VI. by Leo and by Stylianus of Neo-Cæsarea, in the name of the Greek bishops, begging the Pontiff to remove the censure from all who were worthy of pardon. After due consideration, the Holy See sent legates to Constantinople, in 891, with instructions to recognize the patriarch Stephen and to remove all censures from such as they would deem worthy of lenient treatment. From this time history is silent with regard to Photius. Manuel Calecas (1) contends that he died in the communion of Rome. Certain Greek schismatic writers (2) have asserted that he re-communicated with the Latins, when these "had recanted their errors." But these authors are sufficiently refuted by the Breviary or Synopsis of the Eighth Council, affixed in 891 to the doors of St. Sophias' Basilica, and quoted by us in the last chapter.

The Eighth General Council now demands our attention. That this assembly possessed the first requisite of œcumenicity, namely, convocation by the Supreme Pontiff, is proved by the Epistle of Pope Adrian II. to the emperor Basil, read in the first Session: "We desire that a numerous Council be celebrated at Constantinople through the industry of your Piety; at which Council our legates will preside, and having examined into the causes of men and their crimes, they will give to the flames all the copies of the impious Pseudo-Synod (the Photian Eighth) which must be surrendered by all who have them." And in the Preface of the Eighth Synod, sent to Adrian II., we read: "Having sent, with your Apostolic authority, your vicar and epistolary decretals, you commanded a Synod to be held at Constantinople, etc." That the Papal legates, namely, Donatus, bishop of Ostia, Stephen, the bishop of

(1) Calecas was a Greek orthodox author of the fourteenth century. His principal work, directed against "The Errors of the Greeks," was translated into Latin by order of Martin V.

(2) MICHAEL ANCHIALIS, *Dialogue with Emmanuel Comnenus*; MAXIMUS MARGUIN, *Dialogue of a Greek with a Latin*. See the work of Leo Allatius on the *Perpetual Agreement of the Eastern and Western Churches*, b. ii., c. 6.

Nepi, and Marinus, the deacon, presided over the Council, is evident from the *Acts*. The first Session commences : "Being assembled, Donatus and Stephen, bishops, and Marinus, the deacon, holding the place of Adrian, archbishop of the senior Rome, and Ignatius, archbishop of Constantinople, the younger Rome ; and the Vicar of the Orient, Thomas, metropolitan of Tyre, holding the place of the see of Antioch, etc. The most holy vicars of the senior Rome said : 'Therefore let us put all hesitation out of your hearts, and let us certify to you by word and by deed that we shall dispose all things as has been commanded unto us. We have, then, letters to the emperor and to the patriarch, and if you order, let them be read.'" Again, the Papal legates are first named, speak before all others, and are the first to subscribe to the decrees.

The Eighth General Council, also styled the Fourth of Constantinople, was opened on Wednesday, the 5th of October, 869, in the second year of Pope Adrian II., and third of the emperor Basil, and its sessions were held in the basilica of St. Sophia. In the First Session, the Papal legates were asked to manifest the nature of their commission, and as they deemed the question rather insolent, they hesitated to answer. Then the Patrician Bahanes informed the legates that no contempt of the Apostolic See was meant by this request, but rather a precaution, on account of the prevarication of Rodoald and Zachary, the legates of Nicholas I. The legates therefore replied : " We have in our hands a letter sent to the emperor by the most holy Pope Adrian, who has also given us power to so order all things according to what the blessed Pope Nicholas established for the holy church of Constantinople, that we may so arrange and strengthen them, that no one will be able to combat them, and that we may confirm what the most holy Adrian has commanded. For he has inherited the labors of him to whose honors he has succeeded ; for this, God placed him in His Church. Behold the letter of the holy Pope Adrian. If you wish, let it be read." After the reading of the Pontifical letter, the legates ordered a reading of a Papal document, to which all who wished the com-

munion of Rome were obliged to subscribe. It contained a condemnation of all heresies, and an anathema against Photius ; also a declaration that the subscriber accepted all that Pope Nicholas I. and Adrian II. had done in the cause of Ignatius and Photius. In this document, which was signed by the entire Council, the following passages are noteworthy : “ For we must not forget the words of our Lord Jesus Christ : ‘ Thou art Peter, etc.’ This saying has been proved by events, because in the Apostolic Chair the Catholic Religion has been preserved immaculate, and holy doctrine ever held. Therefore, not wishing to be separated from the faith and doctrine of this See, and following the Constitutions of the rulers of this holy Apostolic See, we anathematize the Iconoclasts and all heresies ; we anathematize also Photius, etc.”

The Second Session was held on the 9th of October. It being announced to the fathers that certain bishops were waiting without, who, having been ordained by Methodius or by Ignatius, had joined the Photian ranks, they were told to enter the Synod. Having begged pardon for their transgressions, they were addressed by the legates : “ We receive you, according to the command of our most holy Pope Adrian, on account of your avowal of repentance.” They then replied : “ And we reverence you, and acknowledge you as our judges, and we will accept your judgment as from the Person of the Son of God.” Having then subscribed to the document issued by Rome, and read in the first Session, the penitents were admitted to seats in the Synod, but were ordered not to exercise their functions until the following Christmas, the intervening period to be spent in penance.

The Third Session was held on the 5th of the Ides of October. The fathers invited Theodolus of Ancyra and Nicephorus of Nice to subscribe to the Roman *Definition*, but they refused. It having been discovered that Theodore of Caria, one of those lately forgiven, had been one of Photius’ accomplices in anathematizing Pope Nicholas I., his case was reserved to the Pontiff. The epistle of Pope Adrian to Ignatius was read, and declared “ canonically written and full of justice.”

The fourth Session was held on the 3d of the Ides of October. The bishops Zachary and Theophilus, of the Photian faction, were presented by certain patricians, but when urged to sign the Pontifical *Definition*, they declared that both they and Photius had been received by Pope Nicholas I. on the occasion of a mission which they had undertaken for the usurper to that Pontiff. The legates therefore caused several epistles of Nicholas to be read, and then it was demonstrated that these schismatics lied. Urged again to subscribe to the *Definition*, they replied: "We wish to hear nothing about it." By order of the legates, they were shut out of the Synod.

The Fifth Session was held on the 13th of the Calends of November. Photius was summoned by means of laics to the Council, but when he was introduced, and asked whether he would receive the decrees of Nicholas I. and of Adrian II., he remained silent. Urged to reply, he answered: "God hears me, even when I am silent." Pressed again, he replied: "Jesus also was condemned when silent." Elias, vicar for the patriarch of Jerusalem, then ascended the pulpit and energetically contended that his church had never recognized Photius, concluding by exhorting him to repentance. The legates also urged the unfortunate man to repentance, that he might merit lay-communion. Pressed also by the patrician Bahanes, he answered: "My justification is not in this world," and then sank again into an obstinate silence. He was therefore dismissed from the Council.

The Sixth Session was held on the 8th Calends of November. The emperor Basil asked the bishops who yet adhered to Photius if they would at last yield to the decision of the Church, but they impudently answered that the judgments against their leader were null and void. Zachary of Chalcedon now arose, and in a discourse which was a tissue of sophisms where it was not mere baseless assertion, endeavored to sustain the cause of the baffled intruder. Metrophanes of Smyrna then dissected the remarks of Zachary, and refuted them, point by point. After an exhortation to penitence addressed to the recalcitrants by Basil, seven days of delay were granted them.

The Seventh Session was held on the 4th Calends of November. Photius and Gregory of Syracuse were brought to the Synod and questioned as to their willingness to accept the Papal Definition. The only reply of Photius was: "May the Lord preserve our holy emperor many years!" Urged again by the legates, he answered that they had more need of repentance than he had. Finally, the Synod pronounced anathema on Photius, "the courtier and invader; the secular, neophyte, and tyrant; the condemned schismatic, adulterer, and parricide; the inventor of lies and perverse dogmas; the new Judas and new Dioscorus; anathema on all his followers and sympathizers, etc."

The Eighth Session was held on the Nones of November. All the writings of Photius against the Pontiffs, and the *Acts* of his Pseudo-Synods, were thrown to the flames. Basil of Jerusalem and Leontius of Alexandria, whose names Photius had inserted among the subscriptions to his Pseudo-Synod, as legates of their respective patriarchs, then anathematized the writings against Pope Nicholas. Many metropolitans were then asked if they had signed the decrees of the Photian Synod, and they answered that the signatures, which purported to be their own, were forgeries. Several Iconoclasts were then reconciled to the Church, the emperor kissing them after their abjuration.

The Ninth Session was held on the day before the Ides of February of the new year. Joseph, archdeacon of Alexandria and legate of Michael, the patriarch of that see, then explained that his bishop was prevented by the Saracenic domination from travelling; that he had obtained for Joseph an appointment as commissioner of exchange of captives, in order that he might attend the Council in his name. Michael was so isolated that he knew nothing of the merits or demerits of Photius, but he suggested that he and Ignatius might rule the diocese of Constantinople in common. The Alexandrian legate, having read the *Acts* of the previous sessions, solemnly accepted them in the name of his patriarch. There were then introduced certain perjurers, among them the consul Leo, who, compelled by Photius and the emperor Michael, had sworn falsely against

Ignatius on the occasion of his mock trial. They confessed their crime, anathematized Photius, and received a canonical penance.

In the Tenth Session, held the day before the Calends of March, there were edited 27 canons, of which the following are the principal. The 1st decrees that all canons of the Church are to be observed as "Second utterances of God." The 2d orders the observance of the decrees of the Pontiffs in the Photian matter. The 3d accords to the images of Christ, of His Mother, and of the saints, the same honor as is given to the Book of the Gospels. The 5th puts a check on the growth of the pestilent crop of courtier-bishops, by ordering that no one shall be made a bishop unless he has been ten years a cleric, and allows no dispensation to be ever given in the case of a courtier candidate. The 6th segregates Photius even from lay-communion, on account of his forgeries of episcopal signatures. The 11th anathematizes the doctrine of a dual soul in man, taught by Photius. The 12th condemns all undue interference of the secular power with ecclesiastical preferments. The 13th prohibits the elevation to high ecclesiastical dignity in the church of Constantinople of any one not belonging to the clergy of that see, and excludes from that body the domestic clerics of princes and nobles, thus putting another check on the courtier-clergy and giving a safeguard to the integrity of the patriarchal chair. The 14th rebukes the want of respect for their office shown by those bishops who are ever ready to pay court to the rich and powerful, especially to princes; condemns their dismounting from horseback, etc., in order to salute the great ones; and their practice of standing among the gentlemen-in-waiting, while the grandees are eating. The bishop who thus forgets his dignity is suspended from communion for one year; the prince who permits such fulsome obsequiousness suffers for two years. The 15th prohibits any alienation or mortgaging of ecclesiastical property, and declares it null. A monastery erected by the funds of a diocese belongs to that diocese. The 16th anathematizes those who ridicule the sacred offices or officers. The occasion of this canon was the conduct of

the emperor Michael, who permitted his Protospatarius, Theophilus, to mimic the patriarch for the amusement of the court, saying: "Theophilus is my patriarch, the Cæsar Bardas has Photius, and the Christians have Ignatius." The 19th condemns those metropolitans who go about among their suffragans, living at their expense, under pretext of visitation. The 25th condemns all the bishops, priests, etc., who pertinaciously adhere to Photius, and deprives them of all hope of restoration. After the promulgation of the canons, the Council issued a *Definition of Faith*, anathematizing all heresies, and condemning Photius and his followers. In subscribing to the conciliary decrees, the Papal legates came first, and wrote: "I, . . . , holding the place of my Lord Adrian, Supreme Pontiff and Universal Pope, and presiding over this Holy and Universal Synod, have promulgated, subject to the will of the same illustrious Ruler, everything above recited, and have subscribed with my own hand." The vicars of the patriarchs write: "I, . . . , receiving this Holy and Universal Synod, and agreeing with, and defining, all that has been decided and written, have subscribed." The emperor Basil and his sons do not define, but consent and venerate: "Basil, Constantine, and Leo, ever August, in the Christ of God faithful princes of the Romans and great Emperors, receiving this Holy and Universal Synod, and agreeing with all it has defined and written, have subscribed." When all the bishops had subscribed, the Council issued a Synodical Epistle to all the bishops and faithful of the Church, giving an account of the crimes of Photius and of all proceedings against him. An Epistle was then addressed to Pope Adrian II., begging a confirmation of the Council, which was immediately granted, as is shown by the Pontiff's letter to Basil, which was read at the end of the *Acts*.

We now again approach a question which we have frequently had occasion to encounter, that of the amenability of a Pontifical judgment to a conciliary juridical examination. The author of the *Defence of the Declaration*, etc., and with him, Alexandre (1), contends that the actions of the

(1) *Cent. xv.*, *diss.* 4, *n.* 26.

Eighth Council plainly prove that the prelates deemed the conciliary authority superior to that of the Pontiff. They cite the 21st canon, "If a General Council is in session, and there is any doubt or controversy, even about the holy Roman Church, an investigation and a solution of the question should be had with due reverence; audaciously, however, sentence should not be passed against the Supreme Pontiffs of the Senior Rome." Again, the bishops were asked whether they would receive the letters of Popes Nicholas and Adrian. But it can be easily shown that the fathers of the Eighth Council, far from critically examining the Papal definitions, willingly and at once obeyed the injunctions of the Holy See; that, in fine, all that was effected in that Council was done because Rome commanded it to be done. In the 3d Session was read the letter sent by Basil to Pope Nicholas I., in which the emperor prays the Pontiff to predefine what was to be done in the Synod soon to be held, and after saying that some of the schismatics had fallen through fear, and others through simplicity, he adds: "We have asked, and now beg, your Paternal Holiness, to send a judgment and decree in regard to these persons. Thus, O Spiritual Father, and divinely to be honored Supreme Pontiff, hasten to the correction of our church, and give us an abundance of strength against injustice and for the attainment of truth, that is, a clean unity, a spiritual structure free from all strife and schism, a church one in Christ, and a fold obedient to one shepherd." These sentiments certainly indicate a belief in the irreformability of Papal decisions, and if it be thought that Basil's judgment proves little, we turn to the letter sent to Nicholas by Ignatius, and already quoted by us, in which the patriarch asserts that the Roman Pontiff is the divinely appointed physician for the diseases of Christ's members. In answer to this letter, Pope Adrian II., the successor of Nicholas I., says: "Your Fraternity must take care that the signatures of all of your bishops, united in Synod, be put to those chapters which were synodically promulgated by us in that Church of God where rests the holy body of Peter, Prince of the Apostles: promulgated for the aboli-

tion of the profane Synods held in Constantinople by Photius. . . . and let them be carefully deposited in the archives of each diocese."

Could Pope Adrian have used this language, if he, at least, did not hold that the Pontiff was superior to a Council? But let us see what the conciliary *Acts* evince. When, in the 1st Session, the patrician Bahanes requested the Papal legates to show their mandatory letters, they at first resisted, saying that "until now they had never heard that the vicars of the elder Rome were questioned by anybody," which elevated language does not imply much of subjection toward the Synod. In the same Session was read the Papal *Definition* sent by Adrian, and which all were obliged to sign as a preliminary to any recognition. In that document was written: "For we must not forget the words of our Lord Jesus Christ: 'Thou art Peter,' etc. This saying has been proved by events, because in the Apostolic Chair the Catholic Religion has been preserved immaculate, and holy doctrine ever held. Therefore, not wishing to be separated from the faith and doctrine of this See, and following the constitutions of the rulers of this Apostolic See, we anathematize the Iconoclasts and all heresies; we also anathematize Photius, etc." In these words the infallibility of the Pope is clearly enunciated, for heresy is condemned principally because of the *Constitutions* of Rome. In this same *Definition*, signed by the entire Synod, the subscriber promises to observe "all which is herein established; we will observe it according to the ordinance of your decree, receiving that which it receives, and condemning what it condemns, especially the aforesaid Photius. . . . With regard to our most venerable patriarch Ignatius and his followers, we follow, with our whole heart, what the authority of your Apostolic See has decreed, and venerate it with religious devotion. . . . because, as we have said, following the Apostolic See in all things, and observing all its *Constitutions*, we hope to merit to be in the one communion which that Apostolic See offers, and which is the true and complete solidity of the Christian religion." When such are the sentiments of this *Definition*, it is plain that the fathers of

the Eighth Council did not deem their body superior to the Pontiff, when they used the phrase cited by our adversaries, "The book presented by the holy Roman Church has been read, and pleases all." The examination, that is, like all of those of which we have treated in the cases of the Dogmatic *Definitions* read in other Councils, was not juridical, but informatory. In the 2d Session, when there arose a question as to the treatment of the schismatics, the Papal legates declared that Pope Adrian had ordered that they should not be received to penance until they subscribed to the Pontifical *Definition*, and they asked the delinquents: "Are you willing to obey the orders of the most holy Pope Adrian?" And when, in the 3d Session, the archbishops of Ancyra and Nice refused their signatures, pardon was denied them. The conduct of the legates would have been arrogant in the extreme, and the Eastern bishops would have resisted them, had the mind of the Synod been such as our adversaries would have us believe. In the 4th Session, two of Photius' faction, who had been his legates to Pope Nicholas, asked admission to the Council. The Papal representatives at first opposed their entrance, saying: "We cannot rescind the decision of the holy Roman Pontiffs; that is contrary to the canons." And when they were admitted, it was only that "the just judgment of the holy Roman Church might be more manifest." The fathers said: "Let the legates enter, but we do not call them to a dispute, but only that they may hear the epistle of the most blessed Pope Nicholas." In the 5th Session Photius was asked "whether he received the judgment of the holy Roman Pontiffs;" and in the 6th, the legates told the emperor that he should not speak to Zachary of Chalcedon, because he had been condemned by Rome. In the 7th Session, when Photius entered with the pastoral crozier, the legates took it from him, because he had no jurisdiction. In fine, throughout the Council, everything was done because of the previous decision of Rome.

The 21st canon does not favor the theory of conciliar superiority. At first sight, indeed, it would seem that only *audacious* examinations into Papal decisions are discouraged.

But how is it that the Papal legates made no opposition to this canon, if, as is asserted, it allowed a conciliar discussion of Pontifical judgments? They well knew that such procedure was foreign to the ideas of the Holy See; they knew that, a short time before the Council, Pope Nicholas I. had declared that the value of a Council depended upon its approbation by Rome; they knew that the first See claimed the right to judge all others, and the prerogative of being judged by none; they knew that this very Eighth Council had not objected to Pope Adrian's assertion, read in the 7th *Session*, that the Pontiff was subject to no judgment, unless for heresy, and then only with his own consent. And yet they did not oppose the canon. But let us hear the words of Popes Nicholas and Adrian. Rebuking the arrogance of the emperor Michael, Pope Nicholas says that "The Roman Church confirms the Councils by her authority, and guards them by her moderation. Hence, certain of these have lost their value, because they had not the approbation of the Roman Pontiff." And he adduces instances, such as the "Robber-Synod" of Ephesus, (431) where bishops and patriarchs could not constitute a legitimate Council because of the opposition of the great Leo, and then continues: "Since, according to the canons, the decisions of inferiors are to be referred to greater authority, to be confirmed or annulled, it is plain that the judgment of the Apostolic See, the authority of which is the highest, cannot be revised by any one, nor can any one pass judgment on its decision. For the canons have willed that from every part of the world appeals should be made to Rome, but from her no one can appeal." And Pope Adrian II., in his 2d *Allocution* to the Council, declares: "We read of the Roman Pontiff judging the bishops of all churches, but we read of no one ever judging him. For although the Orientals pronounced anathema upon Honorius after his death, it is to be observed that he had been accused of heresy, for which alone one may resist one's superior, or reject his depraved utterances; but even in this case, the patriarchs and bishops cannot pronounce sentence, unless the authority of the Pontiff of the first See has been obtained." Considering,

then, these declarations of the Holy See, and the consent of the legates to the 21st canon, we must suppose that the meaning of the ordinance was that, in case of a question about the Roman See, a Council should reverently consult the Pontiff, but "not audaciously pronounce sentence."

CHAPTER V.

THE ADDITION OF THE CLAUSE "AND FROM THE SON" TO THE CREED.

In the General Council of Ephesus, one Charisius, a Philadelphian priest, having brought to the fathers a *Profession of Faith* which was redolent of Nestorianism, the following decree was issued: "No one is allowed to offer, write, or compose any other Faith than that which was defined by the holy fathers congregated at Nice in the Holy Ghost. And whoever shall dare to compose another Faith, or to present it to converts to the truth from paganism, Judaism, or any heresy, shall be deprived of their sees if they are bishops, of their standing if they are clerics, and if they are laymen, they shall be subject to anathema." The same decree was repeated by the Council of Chalcedon in its *Definition of Faith*. Among the excuses given by Photius for his schism, and repeated by Michael Cerularius when he re-inaugurated a separation of the Eastern and Western Churches, was the assertion that the Latins had violated this prohibition by adding the words "and from the Son" (*Filioque*) to the clause of the Constantinopolitan *Creed* which expresses the Procession of the Holy Ghost. Traces of this dispute between the Latins and Greeks are found as far back as the Synod of Gentilly, held in 767. It was agitated in the Synod held at Aix-la-Chapelle, under Charlemagne, in 809, and has been renewed at every effort made for a healing of the schism, notably in the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1215), in the Second of Lyons (1274), and in that of Florence (1439). In theological language, when we speak of the origin of the Divine Persons, we say that the Son comes

from the Father by "generation," and that the Holy Ghost comes from both by "procession" (1). In the *Symbol* drawn up by the Second General Council, the First of Constantinople (381), it was simply stated that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father. But the faith of the Church being that the Son also is a source of origin to the Spirit, the clause "and from the Son" came to be added in the *Definitions of Faith*, and often in the *Symbol* or *Creed*. We know that the Sixteenth General Council (Florence) finally and definitively approved of the addition, as a necessary test of orthodoxy; but we cannot lay the finger on the date, place, or circumstances of the first use of the questioned clause. It occurs in the *Creed* recited by king Ricardo in the Third Council of Toledo, in 589; in the *Exposition of Faith* of the Fourth of Toledo, 633; in the *Creed* recited in the Eighth of Toledo, in 653, and that Synod tells us that this *Creed* was then read at Mass throughout Spain. In the Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Fifteenth Councils, held at Toledo, in the years 681, 683, and 688, the addition occurs in the *Creed*. It was also read in the Synod of Forli, held in 791, by Paulinus, patriarch of Aquileia. In the year 809 the ambassadors of Charlemagne conferred with Pope Leo III. about the clause.

The Greek schismatics have always fallen back for defense upon the prohibitory canon of Ephesus, and that their interpretation of it is correct, they try to prove by various ancient testimonies. Thus they adduce St. Cyril of Alexandria (2), saying: "We in no way permit any one to attack that Faith, or *Symbol of Faith*, which was issued by the holy Nicene fathers. For it is not allowable to us, or to any one else, to change even one word there placed, nor do we allow one syllable to be passed over, mindful of the saying: 'Do not cross the limits placed by the fathers.' For they did not speak of themselves, but of the very Spirit of God the Father, who proceeds indeed from Him;

(1) Both generation and procession are, in the Trinity, eternal, for the Son and the Holy Ghost are co-eternal with the Father. Both are necessary, not contingent, for necessity of being is an attribute of the Divinity. Both the Son and the Holy Ghost are inseparably united to the Father, though really distinct from Him; hence, in the Trinity, both generation and procession have nothing in common with the philosophic conception of "emanation" of spirits.

(2) *Epistle of John of Antioch.*

the Spirit, however is not foreign to the Son, for so commands the nature of the Essence." They also cite the commands of the Council of Chalcedon, as declaring that the *Creeeds* of Nice and Constantinople are sufficient, and prohibiting any additions to these. And lest they should be told that here only such addition is meant as would involve an alteration of meaning, the schismatics quote the following words, pronounced when, in the Second Session, the fathers of Chalcedon had been asked for a *Profession of Faith* plainly agreeing with, but verbally differing from, the *Symbols* of Nice and Constantinople: "No one makes another *Exposition*. We do not try, nor do we dare, to present one. For the fathers have taught, and their teachings are preserved in writing, and we can say nothing further. . . . this we all say, that what has been explained is sufficient; it is permitted to make no other *Exposition*. . . . Let the sayings of the fathers be held.' And, further, contended the Greeks, even Pope Vigilius (1) anathematized those "who presume to teach or explain, or to give to the saints of the Church of God, any other *Symbol*" than the Constantinopolitan. And Pope Agatho, in an Epistle to the emperor, read in the Sixth General Council, declares: "We preserve those doctrines of the delivered Faith which have been regularly defined by our holy Apostolic predecessors, and by the five venerable Councils; desiring, and being studious of one principal good, namely, that in what has been regularly defined nothing be withdrawn, changed, or added, but that it be preserved the same in meaning and in word." Finally, the Seventh General Council, after its *Definition of Faith*, exclaimed: "We preserve the laws of the fathers; we anathematize those who add or withdraw anything." Such were the arguments adduced in the Council of Florence by the famous Mark of Ephesus, to whom, more than to any other one man, is due the perpetuation of the Greek schism.

In defending the propriety, nay, the necessity of the use of *Filioque*, better arguments cannot be used than those adopted by Andrew, archbishop of Rhodes (2), who, in

(1) *Epist e to Eutychius of Constantinople.*

(2) Sometimes styled "archbishop of Colossus," to distinguish him from the Greek metropolitan of the island.

the 6th Session of the Florentine Council, thus pressed his adversary. The insertion of the clause "and from the Son" in the *Creed* is not, properly speaking, an addition, but an explanation. The phrase "and from the Son" was already implicitly contained in the "from the Father." If every explanation constitutes an addition, then there have been many additions made to the Scriptures, for the Nicene fathers inserted the word "Consubstantial" in their exposition of the Scriptures, and nevertheless Gregory of Nazianzen, writing to Oledonius, denies that any addition was made (1). The fathers of Constantinople added to, or explained, what those of Nice had written; these latter had not said "of all things visible and invisible," nor had they used the phrase "true God of true God," nor that styling "the Holy Ghost the Lord and Life-giver." Notwithstanding these explanations, the fathers of Constantinople did not think they had made any "additions" to the *Creed* of Nice. Again, where the Nicene Council said, "Born of the Father," that of Chalcedon said, "Consubstantial to the Father, according to the Deity, and Consubstantial to us, according to the Humanity," for such explanation was made necessary by the Eutychian heresy. And even Mark of Ephesus, when he was asked why the Ephesine prelates made mention only of the *Nicene Creed*, ignoring apparently the Constantinopolitan, gave as a reason that "they are one and the same"; therefore, even according to this schismatic leader, an insertion made in the *Creed* for the sake of explanation is not, properly speaking, an addition. Now, that the clause "And from the Son" is simply an explanation of that "from the Father," Andrew of Rhodes proved by many testimonies of Greek fathers. Again, the authority of the Church is and will be always the same as it was in the beginning, and if it was ever permitted to the Church to add new words and phrases to the *Creed*, for the sake of more efficaciously contradicting new heresies as they arose, that is allowable now, and ever will be. In the

(1) "We have not added, and we could not add, anything to the Faith which the holy fathers of Nice put forth in condemnation of the Arian heresy; but we hold and will hold that same, more clearly explaining what was less fully declared concerning the Holy Ghost. For as yet that question had not been moved."

7th Session, the archbishop observed that, as everything belonging to any science is implicitly contained in the principles of that science, so, though not explicitly, the *Creed* implicitly contains the entire doctrine of Christianity. No heresy has yet been born, or can be excogitated, which is not implicitly condemned in the *Creed*. As the Nicene Council issued its *Creed* as a basis of Faith, it was necessary that it should be affected by no change; in sciences, conclusions may be affected, principles never. But the Gospel contains the perfect doctrine, and yet both the Greek and Latin fathers have explained it. The Council of Chalcedon implied a future necessity of explanatory additions to the *Creed* when it said that "for a full knowledge and confirmation of religion, it might suffice, etc." It did not say "it suffices," for the advent of new heresies renders it incumbent upon the Church to make new explanations.

The great Bessarion, then archbishop of Nice, having forcibly opposed the use of the disputed clause, though he did not deny the doctrine, was refuted in the 10th Session by John, bishop of Forli. There are three kinds of addition to the *Creed*, said this prelate; the first adds what is contrary, the second what is different, the third what agrees with the subject treated. The first is the addition of error, *e. g.*, if one were to say that the Holy Ghost proceeds from no one. The second is an addition made by the rash, who are fond of modes of expression unknown to the Church, *e. g.*, if one were to style the Father a geometer, the Son an astronomer, the Holy Ghost an arithmetician. The third is the addition of Catholics, *e. g.*, as when they say that the omnipotent Father is eternal, the consubstantial Son is co-eternal, the proceeding Holy Ghost is breathed forth. The clause "and from the Son" is not contrary to the one "from the Father," nor does it import any different idea; it agrees with it. Hence, as the *Apostles' Creed* was not violated at Nice by the insertion of the clause declaring the procession from the Father, so the *Nicene Creed* was not violated in after-time when the Church indicated by express words her faith in the procession also from the Son. **An ecclesiastical ordinance, concluded the bishop of Forli,**

must be understood according to the mind of its promulgators. and the 1st Session of the Ephesine Council shows us that the fathers designed merely to prohibit any addition to the *Symbol* which would be contrary to the Nicene doctrines. The bishops said : " Let the *Exposition* of the Nicene fathers be read, that we may compare the discourses on faith with it ; let those be received which agree with it, and let those be rejected which differ from it." Then the *Nicene Creed* was read, and afterwards the epistle of St. Cyril to Nestorius ; the fathers found them concordant. Then the epistle of Nestorius to St. Cyril was read, and the Council pronounced it contrary to the *Symbol* of Nice. It is evident, therefore, that the Synod of Ephesus did not intend to command the rejection of any and every other exposition of faith, but only such as were contrary to received doctrine.

In the Eleventh *Session* of the Council of Florence cardinal Julian Cesarini illustrated this subject by an account of the circumstances in which the objected decree of Ephesus was issued. Charisius, a priest of Philadelphia, had complained that one James, a Nestorian emissary, had attacked his doctrine ; and the *Profession of Faith* of Charisius and that of James, which had been written by Anastasius and Photius, two disciples of Nestorius, were both read to the Council. That of Charisius was found to be according to neither the *Symbol* of Nice nor that of Constantinople (1), and yet, after the passing of the decree of prohibition, when the Council condemned the Nestorian document, no mention whatever was made of the *Profession* of Charisius. The Council did not intend, therefore, to condemn a different Exposition, providing it agreed with the *Symbol* of Nice. The same Cesarini also drew the attention of the Greek synodals at Florence to the conduct of the Council of Chalcedon in reference to the decree of Ephesus. The reader will remember that after the condemnation of Eutyches, in 448, by a Constantinopolitan Synod held under Flavian, the heresiarch appealed to Pope St. Leo the Great ;

(1) In the Exposition of Charisius were wanting the words " those who say : ' there was a time when He was not,' " which are found in the Nicene *Symbol*. But it contained the clause " And in the Holy Ghost, consubstantial to the Father and to the Son," which is wanting in both the Nicene and Constantinopolitan *Creeds*.

but knowing that he could expect no support from the Holy See, he prevailed upon Theodosius to convoke the "Robber-Synod" of Ephesus, in 449, in which, in defiance of the remonstrances of the Papal legates, he was declared orthodox. In this assembly, Eutyches professed the *Nicene Creed* and, as we read in the *Acts*, he said: "This is the faith of the fathers, and in it I wish to live and die." But, as the Nicene Faith was confirmed by the Council of Ephesus, and this latter prohibited the profession of any other Faith than that of the former Council, decreeing that nothing should be added or withdrawn, he therefore said: "I hold the right faith; Flavian, however, does not hold it, since he asserts that Christ is in and from two natures, while the *Nicene Symbol* does not say this." After this declaration of Eutyches in the "Robber-Synod," Eusebius of Dorylæum cried out in reference to the allegation of the Ephesine decree, "He lies; there is no such canon." The usurping president, Dioscorus, replied: "Why do you say there is no such canon? We have two codices, in both of which is read that it is not permissible to add anything to the *Nicene Symbol*." Then Dioscorus passed sentence of deposition against Flavian and Eusebius for their "violation of the Ephesine decree." Now, said cardinal Julian, when these transactions were narrated in the Council of Chalcedon, the fathers exclaimed: "Anathema to Dioscorus, who wickedly judged; let him this hour be condemned." Then the Council rescinded all the acts of the "Robber-Synod," declaring that Flavian had not violated the Ephesine canon, because, although the clause "from two, and in two Natures" is not explicitly contained in the *Nicene Creed*, yet it is not contrary to that *Symbol*. Therefore, concluded Cesarini, the Latins are not to be condemned for inserting the clause "and from the Son" in the *Symbol*, as it implies nothing contrary to the *Definitions* of Nice or of any other Councils.

The schismatic portion of the Greek Church has always contended that no addition to the *Creed* should be undertaken without its consent. But, as the same schismatics avowed in the Council of Florence, the Roman Pontiff is the Pastor and Doctor of the whole Church; therefore he

may define what is of faith. But even though the Pope could not define doctrines of faith without a Council, it does not follow, according to the Greeks' own principles, that they should be consulted before every addition to the *Symbol*. They admitted, in the olden days of unity, that a small number of bishops, if convoked in Council and confirmed by the Pontiff, was sufficient to pronounce in matters of faith. They used to hold that the value of a Council did not arise from the multitude or diverse nationality of its members, but rather from their connection with the Chair of Peter. The Council of Rimini was composed of 600 bishops, Greeks and Latins, or rather Easterns and Westerns, and simply because it was rejected by Rome, both East and West condemned it. The second Council, first of Constantinople, was composed of only 150 bishops, and all of them Easterns, and yet, because it was confirmed by Pope Damasus, it was received as Œcumenical. Again, even though the Pontiff were not the "bishop of the first see," but a mere patriarch, like him of Alexandria or him of Constantinople, the Greeks should not have complained of the addition of the *Filioque*. If the question is merely ritualistic, certainly the introduction of a simple rite ought not to cause a schism. If the question, however, is one of faith, we answer that it is not certain that they were not consulted; just as we do not know how or when the addition was first made, so we do not know whether or not the Greeks had anything to do with it. But even though they were not consulted, could they not remember the many instances of condemnation of heresy by particular Synods, which were nevertheless not followed by schism on the part of those who were not called? Paul of Samosata was condemned by the little Council of Antioch; Macedonius was condemned by the Second Council, in which there was not one Latin bishop; Pelagius was condemned by provincial Synods; Nestorius was condemned at Ephesus before the arrival of the Latins. And finally, the Greeks were called again and again in Council, and the question was proposed and discussed in their presence. If they were not called in the beginning, we may say with St. Augustine, who thus

answered the Pelagians who demanded a General Council, that every heresy ought not necessarily to trouble all the countries of the earth. And if General Councils were afterwards called, it was to satisfy the Greeks, not because said assemblies were necessary. St. Bonaventure assigns as another reason the small number of learned men among the Greeks of those days.

Protestant authors quite naturally blame the Holy See for its course throughout this controversy, but it is easy to show that no blame can with justice be laid at the doors of Rome. Whenever the question of reunion between the East and West has been agitated, the principal stress of argument has been laid upon the doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost. Pope Benedict XIV. (1) says the whole question may be reduced to three points: "Firstly, whether it is a dogma of faith that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son Secondly, whether, granted that it is a dogma, it was allowable to add to the Creed the clause obnoxious to the Greeks Thirdly, whether, granting these two points, it could be allowed to the Orientals to recite, during the Mass, the ancient *Constantinopolitan Creed*, that is, without any introduction of the disputed words." As for the first point, the Holy See has always taught that it is a dogma of Catholic faith that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, and that hence no one can be regarded as a Catholic who does not accept that doctrine. The second point is equally sure. As for the third, Pope Benedict shows by many examples that the Holy See has varied its instructions according to circumstances: "At times the Apostolic See has permitted the Orientals and Greeks to recite the *Creed* without the *Filioque*, that is, when it was sure that they received the first two points, or articles, and when it knew for certain that a denial of this greatly-desired favor would prove an obstacle to union. Sometimes, however, the clause was made obligatory, because it was asserted that the Holy Ghost did not proceed also from the Son, or because it was denied that the Church had the right to

(1) *Bullarium*, vol. iv., *Const.* 47, n. 30.

introduce the *Filioque*." Permission to abstain from the use of the clause was accorded to the Greeks by Gregory X., in the Council of Lyons ; by Eugene IV., in the Council of Florence ; by Clement VIII. (1); and by Benedict XIV. (2). These two last Pontiffs decreed that the permission should not be used if there were danger of scandal, or if "in any particular place, the custom of reciting the *Filioque* had been already introduced, or if it were deemed necessary to recite it as a test of right faith." In the year 1278, Pope Nicholas III., having learned that the Greeks had forgotten their promises to Gregory X., ordered that the recitation of the clause should be exacted. Martin IV. and Nicholas IV., having doubted whether certain Oriental peoples held the orthodox doctrine on the Procession, also commanded as a test that they should recite the *Filioque*. Benedict XIV. tells us (3) that "when Pope Calixtus III. sent the Dominican friar, Simon, as inquisitor into Crete, into which island many Greek refugees had come, owing to the Turkish conquest of two years before, he ordered him to be careful that said Greeks recited the *Symbol* with the addition of *Filioque*, probably suspecting that they, being fresh from Constantinople, were careless as to that dogma of faith."

CHAPTER VI.

THE FALSE DECRETALS OF ISIDORE MERCATOR.

Towards the close of the ninth century there appeared, under the name of Isidore Mercator (4), a Collection of Canons which for several centuries undeservedly enjoyed a reputation for authenticity, not only in the West, but also in the East. (5). After the Preface, this Collection gives the order for celebrating a Council, then the first 50 Apos-

(1) *Bullarium*, vol. iii., *Const.* 34, § 6.

(2) His *Bullarium*; *Const.* "Although Pastoral," vol. i., § 1.

(3) *Ibid.*

(4) De Marca (*Concord.*, b. 3, c. 5) insists that the best codices present the name as *Peccator*. But Zaccaria (*Anti-Feb.*, diss. 3, c. 3) relying upon the Vatican codex, No. 630; that of Paris, mentioned by Hardouin; the Modenese; and the authority of Ivo; reads it *Mercator*.

(5) Nicephorus (*Eccl. Hist.*, b. 4, c. 59) cites the letters of Antherus and Calixtus, although he mistakes Coelestine for Calixtus.

toleic Canons, then the Epistles of the Pontiffs from St. Clement down to Sylvester, then the Decrees of Nice, then those of other Councils, and finally the Decretals of other Pontiffs, down to St. Gregory the Great. In this Collection, four classes of monuments are to be distinguished: First, the *Genuine*, namely, the Decretals taken from the Dionysian Codex. Second, the *Supposititious*, composed by the *Mercator*, whoever he was; that is, nearly all the Epistles of the Pontiffs down to Siricius, and many of those from Siricius down to St. Gregory the Great; the *Acts* of a Roman Synod under Julius; and the *Acts* of the 5th and 6th Roman Synods under Symmachus. Third, the *Apo-cryphal*, which, though forged long before his time, this enterprising canonist placed in his Collection; Fourth, the *Interpolated*, or those which are corrupted by Isidore's additions. Thus, among the Interpolated, are to be classed the two last chapters of the Epistle of Pope Vigilius to Profuturus (by error of the copyist, written "Euterius").

In the twelfth century Peter *Comestor*, a canon of Paris, seems to have doubted the value of the Isidorian Collection, but the first writer to render its position insecure was the Cardinal De Cusa, in the fifteenth century. (1). The great Erasmus also had his doubts of its authenticity. The Centuriators of Magdeburg having spent much labor in attacking the dogmatic value of the Collection, Francis Turriano, S. J., published at Florence, in 1572, a defence of the Apostolic Canons and of the Pontifical Decretals; but his work did not help the Collection to hold the esteem of Baronio, Bellarmine, Du Perron, Sirmond, and other learned men. Anthony Augustinus, archbishop of Tarascon, proved that many passages were taken from the Theodosian Codex, which was written two or three centuries after the time of the Pontiffs to whom said passages were ascribed. In the year 1627, the celebrated Calvinist, David Blondel, published a defence of the Centuriators of Magdeburg (2), in which he displayed as much critical acumen in his arguments, as he did temerity in claiming to be the first exposé of the for-

(1) *Catholic Concordance*, b. 3, c. 2.

(2) *The False Isidore and Turriano Chastised*.

gery. The cudgels were then taken up for the *Mercator* by the Franciscan theologian, Malvasia, in a book published at Rome, in 1635, (1) and by the Cardinal Aguirre. (2). But soon there were few left to defend a cause opposed by such critics as De Marca, Lupus, Baluz, Noris, Schelestrate, Labbe, Papebroch, the two Pagi, Alexandre, Coustant, Bortoli, and the Ballerinis. In this agreement of great critics, however, justly observes Zaccaria, we should not despise the following gentle, but wise, remark of the Franciscan writer, Bianchi (3): "I know that Turriano, having well defended these ancient Epistles from a dogmatic point of view, from which they were attacked by the Centuriators, and accused of errors against faith and sound doctrine, has, on the other hand, left them exposed to the censure of sharper critics. These have noticed the puerile solecisms, the forbidden barbarisms, and the gross anachronisms, which are constantly met in these Epistles. . . . I know also that Severino Binio vainly tried to cleanse them of these stains, that they might appear to belong to the authors to whom they are ascribed. However, if we wish to judge correctly in this matter, we must observe several things. . . . Although these Epistles, as they have come to us through the Collection of Isidore, are not to be ascribed to the reputed authors by any judicious person, both because of the adduced reasons and for others, nevertheless, their indelible stains do not prove that they were all invented in later times, and that the subjects treated were not treated by those venerable Pontiffs. It is merely shown that some impostor has *interpolated* them." (4). To this day critics dispute as to the author of the false Decretals. Some say that under the name of Isidore *Mercator* or *Peccator* is hidden the identity of St. Isidore of Seville; others think that another Spanish Isidore was the author; some ascribe the Collection to Otgar, archbishop of Mentz; others again opine that it was compiled by

(1) *Messenger of Truth to Blondel*.

(2) *Collection of Spanish Councils*.

(3) *External Policy of the Church*, b. ii., c. 3, § 5, no. 1.

(4) See the erudite work of the BALLERINIS on the Collections of Canons, p. 3, c. 6, § 3, in which all the documents of the Isidorian Codex, whether genuine, spurious, or interpolated, are accurately examined. Also, MARCHETTI'S *Commentary on the History of Fleury*, and WASSERSCHLEBEN'S *False Decretals of Isidore*.

Ebron, archbishop of Rheims, assisted by Rotharius of Soisson, and the canon Wulfad; others finally deem it the work of a certain Benedict the Levite, a clerk of Mentz, who wrote some false *Capitulars* in the ninth century. Certainly, the Collection did not issue from Rome, as Febronius malignantly contended. While Charlemagne was besieging Pavia, Pope Adrian I. gave him the famous Collection of Canons, commonly called the *Adrian*, and this was simply the Collection of Dionysius the Little, with a few additions at the end. Even during the reign of Leo IV., 847-858, the Isidorian Collection was unknown, for this Pontiff, in a letter to the Britons (1), describing the Collection used in Rome, speaks only of the Dionysian. Had Isidore consulted the Romans, says Coustant, (2), they would willingly have given him access to their archives, where he would have found genuine monuments with which to enrich his Collection. Febronius quotes Barthel, chancellor of the university of Wittemberg (1762), as saying that the Isidorian Codex was foisted upon the Church by Pope Nicholas I. and was brought into Germany by Reginulph, archbishop of Mentz. Now Reginulph died in 814, thirty-two years before the Isidorian Collection saw the light. As for Pope Nicholas I., when, in 858, he had occasion to cite certain Decretals in the cause of Photius, he did not quote those of Evarist, Alexander, Sixtus, etc., (in the Isidorian,) although he did quote other apocryphal documents, such as the Synod of Sylvester, the Sinuessan, etc., from other Collections. Had he known of these reputed Decretals, and deemed them of value, he would not have failed to use them. And in his letter to Hincmar, confirming the Synod of Soissons, he shows that as yet he knew nothing of the Isidorian Codex. For, assigning the sources from which the Roman Church drew its discipline, he mentions only the Councils and Epistles found in the Collection of Dionysius. (3). However, Pope Nicholas I. was made acquainted with the Collection of Isidore, and it was through the French bishops that he learned of its existence, they having cited

(1) In *Gratian*, dist. 20, c. 1.(2) *Preface to Epist. Rom. Pont.*, n. 156.(3) *Epist.* 38, in *Baronio*, year 863.

it when it suited their convenience. "It is probable," says Zaccaria, (1), "that he (Nicholas) had a copy brought from France, and that he cited it against the bishops who alleged its authority. But he found that they rejected it when they found it favorable to the Apostolic See ; and he reasonably complains of this inconsistency. (2). And as they, in rejecting it, fell back upon the Adrian Codex, in which were wanting the authorities, he undertakes, I say with Noel Alexandre, to refute this weak reasoning, and argues with them *ad hominem*, that nevertheless they received the letters of St. Gregory and others, which were not in the Codex of Adrian. Here we must observe that this letter of Nicholas was sent to France in 865, the same year that he sent the eighth letter to the emperor Michael. And although in that letter he proves at length the prerogatives of his See against the wicked Photius, he adduces none of the Isidorian Decretals, but principally relies upon the undoubted epistles of Pope Gelasius. Why this difference in two letters of the same year? He mistrusted the authority of the Isidorian Collection, but used it against the French prelates, because they had cited it. . . . This is all that Nicholas did for the Decretals of Isidore. . . . In the language of Barthel and Febronius, this is forcing the world to accept the Decretals." (3).

With regard to the Collection of Isidore, the following things are to be remembered. First, there is nothing in it contrary to faith or morals ; otherwise, it would not have been received by the whole Church for nearly seven centuries. Second, as we have already observed, it was issued without any consent or connivance of the Roman Pontiffs. Third, the privileges of the Holy See are not founded, as modern heretics have asserted, upon it. Fourth, there is no reason for the complaint made by De Marca, Basnage, Fleury, and others, that by the introduction of this Collection the ancient discipline of the Church was abrogated, and an entirely new one adopted ; for many of Isidore's monuments are extracted from Conciliary Canons, genuine Pon-

(1) *Anti-Feb.*, diss. 3, c. 3, no. 5.

(2) *Epist.* 47, to the Bishops of France.

(3) The reader who is anxious for more information on this point will be abundantly gratified in Zaccaria's valuable work, *loc. cit.*

tifical Constitutions, and opinions of the Fathers, while the rest show the discipline obtaining before the time of Isidore. As the Ballerini brothers remark, the impostor would have been a fool if he expected his Collection to be received by men among whom he was introducing, as our adversaries assert, a new and abhorrent discipline. But no clamor was raised, no murmurs heard, because of these apocryphal Decretals, unless on account of those pertaining to the causes and judgments of bishops, of which we read something in Hincmar and in the Epistles of Nicholas I. And that which is given by Isidore with regard to these very causes and judgments is not entirely new. The canonist, therefore, did not intend to introduce a new discipline, but to establish one generally received. (1). Fifth, the discipline inculcated by this Collection did not obtain the force of law by virtue of itself, but by virtue of preceding and subsequent *Constitutions*, and by force of custom, which is quite powerful in disciplinary matters.

Protestant critics willingly admit that the Decretals of the Pontiffs contained in the Isidorian Collection, down to Siricius, are supposititious; they would gladly say the same of all the others. Centuries have passed since a Catholic author of note has defended their authenticity. Nevertheless, a brief rehearsal of the arguments by which the supposititiousness of these documents is evinced will not be out of place. The student will bear in mind that there is no question of the Epistles of St. Cornelius, which are found among the works of St. Cyprian. Nor is there any doubt about the Epistles of Julius I., which are given by St. Athanasius, in his *Second Apology*. Authenticity is vainly claimed for such Epistles as are found in the Fragments of St. Hilary (2); but the Epistles of Damasus to the Illyrian Bishops, which Theodoret records, and also the other Epistles of Damasus given by St. Jerome, are authentic. The mark of spuriousness is affixed to the five Epistles ascribed to St. Clement, to three of Anacletus, two of Evarist, three of Alexander, two of Sixtus I., one of Telesphorus, two of Hyginus, four of Pius I., one of Anice-

(1) DÖLLINGER; *Eccl. Hist.*, ep. iii., c. 4. (2) See our Chapter on Liberius, vol. i., p. 224.

tus, two of Soter, one of Eleutherius, four of Victor, two of Zephyrinus, two of Calixtus I., one of Urban I., two of Pontian, one of Anterus, three of Fabian; three of Cornelius, one of Lucius, two of Stephen I., two of Sixtus II., two of Dionysius, three of Felix I., two of Eutychian, one of Caius, two of Marcellinus, two of Marcellus I., three of Eusebius, one of Melchiades, one of Sylvester, one of Mark (supposed to be to Athanasius), two of Julius I., two of Liberius, two of Felix II. and several of Damasus. That all of these Isidorian documents are supposititious, the best critics have decided, impelled by the following reasons: First, the Pontiffs who preceded Siricius could have had no knowledge of St. Jerome's Vulgate, and these letters ascribed to those Popes frequently quote the Scriptures according to that version. (1). Second, during the first eight centuries, these documents are cited by no Council, by no Pontiff, by no ecclesiastical writer. Had they been genuine, they would not have been ignored by such writers as St. Jerome and Photius, or by such Pontiffs as SS. Innocent I. and Leo I. Third, these Epistles are silent as to the heresies of the first centuries, as to the persecutions, etc.; it is incredible that genuine works of those days would not even touch upon such topics. Very different is the tenor of the undoubted documents of that period. Fourth, these Isidorian documents are evidently compiled from epistles, decrees, and writings of Pontiffs, Councils, and Fathers of a later date than those assigned to them. Those who favored the False Decretals answered this argument with the assertion that these posterior Pontiffs, Councils, and writers were acquainted with the documents in question and cited them. But the reply is futile, for if these Pontiffs, etc., had used these documents, they would certainly have made good use of the authority of the great names they bear, and would not have kept silence, contrary to their custom, in regard to so powerful an argument in their own favor. Fifth, in the Isidorian monuments there is fre-

(1) Siricius mounted the Papal throne in 384. St. Jerome finished his version of the New Testament in 383. Of the Old Testament, *Job*, *Paralipomenon*, *Ecclesiastes*, *Proverbs*, and *the Canticle*, were not translated by him until 390; the *Psalter* and *Prophets* appeared in 392; the work was completed in 404. See UBALDINI'S *Introduction to Sacred Scripture*, sect. ii., chap. 3, § 3.

quently a sublime contempt for dates, especially as to the Consular periods, which is a strong argument against their authenticity. Sixth, there is a wonderful similarity of style in these documents, which would not be observed in the works of so many different men of different countries and periods. Seventh, the Roman Pontiffs have always been men of more than ordinary education, to say the least, but the Epistles of this Collection are not only full of barbarisms, but are couched in a style, to use the words of Alexandre, "only fit for cooks and hostlers."

It has been objected that the Church of Rome gave her formal approbation to the False Decretals, by receiving the celebrated *Decree of Gratian*, which, to use the words of Zaccaria (1), "is altogether made up of Isidorian merchandise." But it is incorrect to say that the Church absolutely follows the *Decree of Gratian*. This Collection of Canons was formed, about 1150, by no public authority, but on the private responsibility and according to the individual judgment of the great Benedictine whose name it bears. But did it receive the approbation of the Church? Some authors hold the affirmative, because it has been generally used in the schools, and because, they say, Pope Eugene III. and Gregory XIII. approved of it. Others, however, hold the negative, saying that the *Decree* is full of errors, and denying the approbation of the aforesaid Pontiffs. Of the approbation by Eugene III., Trithemius is the sole witness, and gives no authentic proof of his assertion; if that approbation had been given, it would have been prefixed to some exemplar of Gratian. As for Gregory XIII., in his letters of July 2, 1582. he declares that he took care that the *Decree* should be revised and corrected, but he does not even imply any approbation. The Roman *Ruota* (*Cor. Pegna, dec. 480*), cited by Vecchiotti (2), says "Nor did Gregory XIII. approve as legal the book of Gratian, for he only ordered it to be corrected, and to be observed." And Pope Benedict XIV. says (3): "Although it has been often corrected by the care of the Roman Pontiffs, the

(1) *Anti-Feb.*, diss. iii., c. 3, no. 7.

(2) *Institutions of Canon Law*, b. i., c. 4, § 64.

(3) *Diocesan Synod*, b. vii. c. 15, no. 6.

Decree of Gratian does not possess the strength and force of law ; rather do all agree that whatever it contains has just so much of authority as it would have had if it had never been inserted in the Collection of Gratian." It is plain, then, that the Roman Church did not become responsible for the False Decretals by their admission into the *Decree of Gratian*. The Holy See often felt the necessity of revising the famous *Decree*, and the learned corrector employed by Pope Gregory XIII., Anthony Augustinus, archbishop of Tarascon, in his work entitled *Gratian Corrected*, gives many instances where his labor was sadly needed. (1).

Speaking of Isidore's interpolations, Bianchi says that they are indicated by " a constant and ever-same inequality and incoherentness of style, met with in every case, and causing each document to appear different from itself : which certainly excites a belief that these letters were not entirely manufactured, but that, already existing, they received a new dress, according to the depraved taste of the artificer." Commenting upon this idea, Zaccaria makes the following judicious remarks : " To tell the truth, I am inclined to agree, at least in part, with this erudite writer I do not understand how, in the part of his Collection which is given to the Councils, the false Isidore is so religiously careful as to give us, saving only some interpolation, merely genuine Councils (of which we are sure, from other sources) ; only in regard to the Epistles of the Roman Pontiffs does he assume the most impudent liberty of lying There is no doubt that many monuments were in existence at the time of our Isidore, which are now lost. In his Collection is found the genuine letter of St. Damasus to Paulinus, divided into three, and mixed up with two other apocryphal ones. Why did he do this ? We must suppose that he found it so divided in the Codex of the Spanish Collection, of which he availed himself. And who does not know how many Papal Bulls and imperial privileges were preserved in the particular churches to which they were given, but which now would be vainly sought in the Roman or imperial archives ? To give an instance well suiting our argument, if

(1) Thus the very words of certain Imperial Laws in the Theodosian Code are represented as proceeding from Pontiffs who lived three centuries before the Code was issued.

Agnello had not preserved, in his *History of the Ravenna Bishops*, a certain epistle of Pope Felix IV., it would have been lost. What we have already said, is confirmed by another example. Labbe and others accuse Isidore of forging the letters of St. Damasus, St. Leo, and John III., about the vice-bishops. (1). Remember, however, that I do not deny their spuriousness. I only say that Isidore did not forge them, because not a few years before him, Pope Leo III. mentioned them, writing to the French bishops. Another example is the letter of St. Gregory the Great to Secundinus. In the MSS. it is very much altered, and is full of additions tacked on, by another hand, to the original text of the holy Pontiff. Isidore is accused of these interpolations, but wrongfully, because the same text is given by Paul the Deacon, who died in 801, long before the publication of the Isidorian Collection. From all this I think that we may plausibly assume that many of the monuments attributed to Isidore were forged or adulterated before his time I would wish that Isidore should not be charged with all these impostures, and principally do I desire that the learned would more accurately consider the compilation of Isidore, and take courage to separate what is more ancient, and perhaps authentic, from that which is his own, or certainly false."

Who was the author of the False Decretals? No author of repute any longer ascribes them to St. Isidore of Seville. As Alexandre, after the Ballerinis, observes, that holy doctor could not have been the impostor, for the Collection gives Councils of Toledo (6th to the 13th), and one of Braga, which were held after his death. That St. Isidore died in 636, the 26th year of Heraclius, we learn from his *Life*, written by his deacon, Redemptus: from Braulio of Saragossa (2); from Luke of Tay (3), and from Mariana (4). The Collection also gives the *Acts* of the Sixth General Council, which was celebrated in 681, or forty-four years after St. Isidore's death. We also read in it epistles of Popes Gregory II. and III., and of Pope Zachary, who lived

(1) *Chorepiscopi*.(2) *Catalogue of the Works of Isidore*.(3) *Book iii.*(4) *Book vi., c. 7.*

in the eighth century. Therefore Hinemar of Rheims was deceived when he asserted that "Isidore, bishop of Seville, collected the Epistles of the Roman Pontiffs from St. Clement down to St. Gregory." (1). Cardinals Bona and Cenni incline to the belief that St. Isidore was the author in question, but they base their opinion only on the testimony of Hinemar. Some critics have ascribed our Collection to some unknown Isidore, also a Spanish bishop. But it is incredible that an impostor, such as this writer must have been, would have missed the opportunity of glorifying the importance of his own church and country. Now in the Collection there are only one or two Epistles addressed to Spanish bishops. Again, down to the time of Innocent III (1198—1216) this Collection was unknown in Spain, and all of the 9th century MSS. which contain it were written in France or Germany, as is shown by the characters and other signs. The barbarisms of style also indicate that the author was a Franco-German, for impurity of diction was as common in the Rhine countries at that time as it was rare in Spain. Blondel accepts these two last reasons for believing the impostor to have been a Franco-German, a subject of Charlemagne, and adds another excellent argument. It is improbable that any resident of Spain, then groaning under the terrible oppression of the Saracens, would have been inclined, or have found the opportunity, to digest and arrange this mass of documents. Finally, there are many things in the Collection which were evidently extracted from the letters of St. Boniface, which is no slight indication that it was prepared in that part of Germany which was numbered among the Gauls. Many critics, and among them the acute Zaccaria, believe that the Collection must be ascribed to a churchman of Mentz, called Benedict the Levite, who, about the year 845, compiled three books of *Capitularies* of Charlemagne and Louis the Compliant (2).

With regard to the time when the False Decretals were given to the world, Febronius insisted that it was about

(1) *Epist.* 7, c. 12.

(2) See ZACCARIA, *loc. cit.* Also, DENZIGER'S *Opinions of Recent Critics on the False Decretals of Isidore.*

744 that Reginulph of Mentz published them, though they must have been written, he said, some time previous. But Isidore furnishes us with some Decretals of Popes Urban I. and John III., in which are found, word for word, certain sentences of the Council of Paris of 829. And Blondel observes that the impostor borrowed, here and there, many formulas and phrases from the letter of Jonas of Orleans to Charles the Bald. Since, then, this prince ascended the throne in 839, the Collection must be of a posterior date. In 841 Rabanus dedicated his *Penitential* to Otgar of Mentz, but he makes no allusion to the Isidorian Decretals. For these, and other excellent reasons, Zaccaria concludes that Benedict the Levite, under the auspices of Otgar of Mentz, (d. 847) published the Decretals about the year 846.

The innovators of modern times, whether of the Reformed, or courtier schools, have always laid great stress on the falsity of the Isidorian Decretals, and have contended that it was by their means that the power of the Holy See was greatly increased, to the detriment of, and in defiance of, the ancient discipline of the Church. To mention only a few of the leading minds by whom Protestants and other innovators are guided in their opinions on this matter, such was the theory of Wycliffe, Febronius, the Gallican Fleury, the Jansenist Egidius Witte, John Francis Budde, Mosheim, Tamburini, Villers, and Potter. Among the many authors who have triumphantly refuted this assertion, and successfully proved that all the present prerogatives of the Roman See belong to it of divine right, and were always recognized by the Universal Church, we may mention as especially worthy of consultation, besides the already cited works of the Ballerinis, Alexandre, Bianchi, Zaccaria, and Marchetti, the valuable book of Peter Ballerini entitled *Defense of the Pontifical Authority against the Work of Justin Febronius*; the *Commentary* of Blascus on this subject; the *Disquisitions on the Collections of Canons*, by Theiner; Schulte's *Manual of Canon Law*; Palma's *Lectures*; Vecchiotti's *Institutions of Canon Law*. Febronius (1) asserts that "with the help of Isidore and Gratian, the Roman court succeeded in chang-

(1) Chap. 8, § 3 and 4.

ing its primatial and patriarchal rights into a kind of ecclesiastical monarchy," and that "the Roman Church gained great advantages from the supposed Decretals." Fleury (1) says: "Of all these false documents, the most pernicious were the Decretals attributed to the Popes of the first four centuries, which inflicted an irreparable wound on the discipline of the Church, by the new maxims which they introduced regarding the judgments of bishops and the authority of the Pope." The Jansenist Witte (2) informs us that "Nicholas I., an active man, and very confident in his combat for a bad cause, defended with his whole soul the fictitious and adulterated Epistles, in which it was asserted that all ecclesiastical affairs were subject to the Supreme Pontiff, and he himself to no one; hence a man of nice discernment can perceive that this adulterated merchandise was exposed in the public forum of the Church, not without the consent of the Roman court, even though we do not call it their parent and author. After the days of Nicholas, these deplorable Decretals obtained force by degrees, because of the ignorance of those times in matters of ecclesiastical history."

The Protestant professor, John Francis Budde (d. 1729) asserts (3): "The Roman Pontiff Nicholas I., who, as the abbot Rhegino says, 'commanded kings and tyrants, as though he were the lord of the earth,' as he never lost any occasion of augmenting his power, so he took these fictitious Epistles, so to say, in both hands, and approved of them, and tried to force them upon others, especially in France." Mosheim (4) says: "In order that this new code of the Church, very different from the old one, might be more favorably received, there was need of ancient documents and records to establish it, and to defend it against hostile attack. Hence the Roman Pontiffs took care to falsify compacts, Councils, epistles, and other documents, by means of faithful agents, so that it would be believed that in the early days of Christianity the Pontiffs enjoyed the same

(1) *Discourse iii. on Ecclesiastical History.*

(2) *Augustine of Ypres Vindicated*, p. 2, c. 5.

(3) *Historico-Theological Introduction.*

(4) *History*, cent. ix., p. 2, c. 2, § 7.

power and majesty that they then arrogated to themselves. Among these fraudulent supports of the Roman power, almost the first place is held by the Decretals, as they call the Epistles of the Pontiffs of the first centuries, which a certain obscure person—Isidore *Mercator*, or *Peccator*—invented.” To all these assertions we reply with Baronio (1) that “even though these Decretals be proved false, the Roman Church loses none of her rights and privileges, since, even if these documents were wanting, those rights would be abundantly sustained by other undoubtedly genuine Decretals.” The Calvinist Blondel admits that these Decretals are made up from words and passages which occur in Canons, laws, and other writings of the fourth and fifth centuries; he grants therefore that these documents illustrate a discipline which obtained at least at that time. This admission of Blondel is noticed by De Marca, who, although saturated with Gallicanism, remarks (2), “I cannot agree with him in so atrociously attacking these Epistles, which were certainly composed from words and passages of ancient laws and canons, and of the holy Fathers who flourished in the fourth and fifth centuries.

The Ballerini brothers (3) call our attention to the end which Isidore had in view when he issued these Decretals. It was to provide for the greater security of bishops, that is, to prevent their being frequently cited in judgment by the importunate, as he himself explains in the *Preface*. If, therefore, he exalts the Apostolic See, he does so out of consideration to the bishops, who would find there a refuge from the oppressor. But, retorts Febronius, Isidore *does* glorify the Chair of Peter for this end. We must therefore show that this glorification was not unfounded, that it was not invented by Isidore. It is not our province, but that of the dogmatic theologian, to show that all the prerogatives claimed for Rome by these Decretals belong to her by divine right, but it is within our sphere to prove that the Pontiffs exercised them long before the time of Isidore, and that they did so in the face of a willingly obedient Christendom. If these Epistles produced an innovation in

(1) *Annals*, year 865.(2) *Concord.* iii., b. 3, c. 5, no. 1.(3) *Works of St. Leo*, vol. iii.

discipline, why are there no traces of resistance, why no clamorings in defense of the ancient system? The following, a few only of the many proofs which can be adduced, will show that Isidore introduced no new discipline when he inculcated the supreme jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff. From the first ages of Christianity the Holy See has been accustomed to consider the "greater causes," sent to it from all parts of the earth. An instance of this is found in the very first century, in the recourse of the Corinthians, because of their dissensions, to Pope St. Clement I. St. Cyprian (254) is judged by Pope St. Cornelius in the matter of reconciling the "fallen." The Council of Sardica (341) writes to Pope Julius: "It will be regarded as most proper, if the priests refer the affairs of each and every province to the Head, that is, to the See of Peter." Celebrated indeed is the case of the African Appeals, of which we have fully treated. In 378, Peter of Alexandria appealed to Pope Damasus, when expelled from his see by Euzoios and the emperor Valens. It was in allusion to this case that Eutherius and Elladius of Tarsus wrote to Pope Sixtus III. (432): "When of old the tares of heresy arose in Alexandria, your Apostolic See sufficed to give it the lie for all time, and to repress its impiety; to correct what needed correction, and to strengthen the world for the glory of Christ, in the time of the thrice-blessed Damasus, who is among the saints, and also in the time of other Pontiffs." In 381, Istanzius, Salvianus, and Priscillianus, condemned by a Synod of Saragossa, appeal to Rome. (1). Famous also is the appeal of St. John Chrysostom to Pope Innocent I., of which we have already treated. In 422, Perrevious, oppressed by the bishops of his province, appealed to Pope Boniface, and that Pontiff appointed his vicar, Rufus, to judge the case (2). In 430, Pope Cœlestine hears the cause of St. Cyril of Alexandria against Nestorius: "The ancient custom of the churches," writes the Alexandrian patriarch, "instructs us to refer such a cause to your Holiness." In 437, Iddua, bishop of Smyrna, condemned (according to

(1) Sulpicius Severus, *History*, b. ii., c. 48.

(2) *Epist. Rom. Pont.*, vol. i., ep. 13.

Holstein, who first edited his letter) by Proclus of Constantinople, or, (as Lupus (1) thinks), by his primate, Basil, appealed to Pope Sixtus. In 445 occurred the celebrated appeal of Chelidonius, a bishop of the province of Vienne, to Pope St. Leo the Great. Deprived of his see in a Synod presided over by St. Hilary of Arles, because he was said to have married a widow before he became bishop, and because, while yet a magistrate, he had condemned a criminal to death, he proved his innocence before the Pontiff and was restored to his diocese. We have already treated of the appeal of Flavian of Constantinople to this Pontiff. In 446, Lupicinus, a bishop of Mauritania, being deposed by a Synod, appealed to Rome, and was restored. (2). In 483, John Talaja, patriarch of Alexandria, persecuted by the ambitious Acacius of Constantinople, appealed to Pope Simplicius. In 488, the priest Solomon, unjustly degraded by Acacius, appealed to Pope Felix III. and received justice. In 531, Stephen of Larissa, metropolitan of Thessaly, degraded by Epiphanius of Constantinople, appealed to Pope Boniface II. In 535, the bishops Sagittarius and Salonius, deposed in a Synod of Lyons, went to Rome with permission of king Guntran, and appealed to Pope John III. In 590, the archbishop of Salona, Natalis, tried to disembarrass himself of his archdeacon Honoratus, who would not connive at the prelate's convivial habits and his using the ecclesiastical revenues to support his relatives. He compelled the deacon to receive the priesthood, so that he might have a pretext for appointing another archdeacon, the discipline of that day not allowing a priest to fill that office. Honoratus appealed to Pope Pelagius II., and the disputants were summoned to Rome. Natalis delayed, and when St. Gregory ascended the throne, he restored Honoratus to his archdiaconate. In this same year we find a case of African clerics appealing in the "first instance," not to a Synod, but to the Roman Pontiff. The Donatists had bribed the bishop Argentius to promote certain ones of their sect over the heads of orthodox clerics; Vincent and

(1) *Appeals, diss. i., c. 34.*

(2) *Epistles of St. Leo the Great, edit. by Balberini. ep. 12.*

Felicissimus, deacons, appealed to St. Gregory, and the Pontiff appointed the monk Hilarus as legate to settle the affair. (1). The Pontificate of St. Gregory the Great is filled with instances of appeals. (2). We abstain from adding to the list, for we have adduced enough of examples to show that, long before the appearance of the Isidorian Collection, the right of the Roman See to receive appeals, and therefore its supreme jurisdiction, was acknowledged by Christendom. Theodoret, bishop of Cyria, writing to St. Leo the Great (3), rightly speaks of the Holy See having received appeals in the days of St. Peter, for the Apostle Paul, he says, "betook himself to the great Peter for a resolution of the doubts which had arisen at Antioch about the legal conversation." St. Jerome (4) writes: "When I was assisting Damasus, bishop of the Roman city, in his ecclesiastical correspondence, and used to answer the synodical consultations of the East and the West, etc." (5).

The Jansenist abbé, Racine. (6) says that "To realize the extent of the evil produced by the False Decretals, one must reflect that they established new maxims, and caused them to be regarded as of the highest antiquity; that they enfeebled the greater portion of the Canons, and enervated all vigor of discipline. The forger, used by the demon to inflict so terrible a wound on the Church, knew that it would be too revolting if he brought forth Canons directly contrary to those universally received by the Church; he was contented, therefore, with forging those which only sweetened and enfeebled the ancient ones. But that he might succeed in his design of entirely changing the discipline, he made a flank movement, which was an infinite extension of the appeals to the Pope." In commenting upon this assertion, which is also made by Fleury and Febronius, Zaccaria (7) observes that Isidore could not have been such a simpleton as to fail to perceive that the

(1) *Epistles of St. Gregory*, b. 1, ep. 82.

(2) See ZACCARIA'S *Anti-Feb.*, p. 2, b. 3, c. 6.

(3) *Epistles of St. Leo*, vol. 1., ep. 52.

(4) *Epist.* 123, to *Ageruchia*.

(5) See BELLARMINE, *Rom. Pont.*, b. 2, c. 24; CAPPELLO'S *African Appeals to the Roman Church*; BOLGENI'S *Episcopacy*, b. 4, c. 3.

(6) *Reflections on the State of the Church*.

(7) *Anti-Feb.*, diss. iii., c. 5, no. 3.

introduction of a new discipline would injure his design of sustaining the episcopal dignity against its oppressors. Innovations generally give rise to tumult: and how great a disturbance was to be feared, if he undertook to substitute a new discipline for one established by well-known laws, and confirmed by the use of centuries and the consent of the whole Church? But there was no disturbance, no resistance against this "new discipline;" Hinemar and his partisans made some clamor, but they opposed only what pertained to the causes and judgments of bishops. And here we would notice the remark of Papebroch (1), that the doctrine contained in the False Decretals was sound, and precisely therefore the forgery was undiscovered. "In those days," says Zaccaria, "there was a lack of that critical tact which could distinguish the styles of various authors, examine dates, and compare texts; but there was (which only a heretic will deny) the discernment necessary to judge of doctrine. Therefore the easy reception of the Isidorian Collection is an invincible proof that its doctrine was not contrary to the ancient Canons." We need not sympathize therefore, with the tears of Fleury when he laments the halcyon days of the ancient Church. Erasmus was well satisfied with the discipline of the Church of his day, in spite of the False Decretals; so much so, indeed, that he must have disappointed those who were hoping that he would join the "Reformers," when he said that "if St. Paul were living to-day, he would not disapprove of the present state of the Church." (2)

CHAPTER VII.

THE EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE IN THE TENTH CENTURY.

Protestant authors have not hesitated to assert that it was only in the tenth century that the Eucharistic belief took the form in which it is now presented by the Catholic Church. The invention of Transubstantiation is attrib-

(1) *Preface in Conat. Catal. Pont.*, n. 14.

(2) Letter written in 1529 against the *False Evangelists*.

uted by Claude, La Roque, Mosheim, and a host of modern imitators, to Paschasius Radbertus, a Benedictine monk of Corbie, who died in the year 860. The innovating doctrines of Paschasius, contend these polemics, were energetically combated by Ratramn (Bertram), Rabanus Maurus, Amalarius, Scotus Erigena, Heriger, and other defenders of the primitive purity of Christian dogma; but, nevertheless, the new opinions spread during the fearful darkness of the ninth and tenth centuries, and finally were adopted by the magistracy of the Church.

It is not our purpose to enter into any details in order to show that the Eucharistic doctrine underwent no change in the tenth century; that Ratramn, Rabanus, etc., did not combat the doctrine of Transubstantiation; that there was, between these writers and Paschasius, no difference of belief as to the Real Presence, but merely a difference as to the way of explaining that Presence. Catholic polemics have clearly proved that Ratramn and all the other cited authors, with the sole possible exception of Scotus Erigena, (1) were as firm in their recognition of the Real Presence as was Paschasius himself (2); and in our remarks on the faith of the early Irish and Saxon churches we have had occasion to cite many testimonies of dates greatly anterior to the period of Paschasius, which plainly show the falsity of the assumption that this writer was the inventor of the theory of Transubstantiation. Nor is it our province to further develop this point. Nevertheless, we venture upon a few reflections. Paschasius tells the king that his book on the *Body and Blood of the Lord* was written for the instruction of the newly converted Saxon youth, and throughout the work there is preserved that even and assured tone of possession which naturally pervades a treatise, the arguments of which are contradicted by none. There is

(1) John, called Scotus Erigena, or the Irishman, seems to have been a layman; for no contemporary speaks of him as being in orders or in any religious community. He enjoyed the favor of Charles the Bald, but his wild and dangerous, and even heretical, opinions caused Pope Nicholas I. to request that monarch to remove him from the imperial court. His book on *Predestination* was condemned by the third Synod of Valence, that assembly styling it a collection of "silly little questions and old women's fables—an Irish strabout—*Scotorum pulles*." His work on *The Natures* was condemned by Pope Honorius III. The book on the Eucharist, which was proscribed at Vercelli, and is attributed to Erigena, was undoubtedly heretical, but it is not certain that he was its author. Hincmar tells us, in his *Predestination*. c. 31. that in this book it was asserted that "the Sacrament of the Altar is not the true Body and Blood of our Lord, but only a memorial.

(2) ALEXANDRE, *cent.*, IX., X., *diss.* 13.

nothing of that apodictical style, of that aggressiveness, which generally accompanies controversy, even when undertaken by the meekest of men. Would such have been his tone, if Paschasius had started with the idea of uprooting a settled belief of Christendom? And how is it that this presumed innovator, and so startling a one, was so universally respected by his contemporaries? A Council of Paris, in 846, was loud in his praises. Kings Louis, Lothaire, and Charles loaded him with favors. Engelmod, bishop of Soissons, wrote a poem in his honor, and styled him "the prop of the Church, the crest of Religion, and the buckler of Faith," saying also of him that he was "not disgraced by a lying simulation of faith, but adorned with a strength that was conscious of rectitude." Lupus, abbot of Ferrières, calls him "most beloved, and to be embraced by all good men." St. Odo, abbot of Cluny, says of his book on the Eucharist that he had collected "from the sayings of the Fathers many arguments to inculcate reverence for the Mystery, and to demonstrate its majesty; which, if read by even a learned man, will give him so much knowledge, that he will think that until now he has known little indeed of this Mystery." Would this esteem have been felt for an innovator? Are not Protestants fond of describing the miserable position at once secured for himself by any Catholic who presumes to leave the beaten track, and to follow the path of his own discovery? Again, if at the time that the young monk of Corbie commenced to write, the Christian world believed that the Eucharist was merely an image of the Body and Blood of the Lord, how can the silence of the Christian bishops and doctors of the time be explained? Paschasius himself tells us that no one openly contradicted him; only a few murmured, because, as they said, he attributed to the words of Christ more than truth warranted. In his old age Paschasius wrote to Frudegard on the Real Presence: "It is wicked to pray with all, and not to believe what is attested by truth itself, and universally received as truth. . . . And hence, although some have erred through ignorance, no one has as yet openly contradicted this, which the whole world be-

lieves and avows." Let us picture to ourselves a young ecclesiastic of our own day endeavoring to force upon the Catholic world a belief that the images of our holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., are not mere representations, but really and substantially the Pontiff himself. Is it likely that he would be esteemed for his learning and sanctity? But we would dwell a moment upon the absurdities of the theory advanced by our opponents.

We are asked to believe that during the ninth and tenth centuries the faith of the Church underwent a tremendous change, and that the ecclesiastical and literary world was so supine that it took no notice of the matter. Such indeed is the assertion made by Protestant polemics; and from among the scores of noted writers of the lethargic period, they bring forth only five who, they say, were awake; and of these five not one speaks of the doctrine in question as a new one, and only one of them attacks it. At other times, when innovations were made in a doctrine, all earth was moved against the heretic; the science of theologians, the prayers of the faithful, and, when it could be obtained, the aid of the secular power, were brought to bear against him. And here, we are told, is a new doctrine, calling on men to discredit the evidence of their senses; to regard their philosophy as a mere cobweb of flimsiness; and it triumphs! Dark indeed would be those days in which such a thing could be possible, unless, perchance, they were sufficiently illuminated by the preternatural effulgence of the genius who could excogitate and actuate such a design. However, it is in this very darkness, intellectual and moral—which, our adversaries insist, was a characteristic of the tenth century,—that we are told to find the key of the problem. Well, to convince us of the possibility of so stupendous an event, it would be necessary to show that the tenth century was darker than any nineteenth-century worshipper has ventured to depict it. We do not regard the tenth as remarkably lustrous among the Christian centuries; and before us now is a passage even of Baronio, wherein the great annalist presents it as "iron in its harshness, and barren of good; leaden in the deformity of its evils;

obscure by reason of its dearth of authors." (1). And Bellarmine admits that "no century has been more illiterate or unhappy; he who paid attention to mathematics or philosophy, was regarded as a magician by the common people." (2). But we can show that these remarks are to be taken in a comparative sense; that the tenth century was not so deficient in sanctity and learning as to render at all probable our opponents' way of accounting for the progress of the tremendous error which, according to them, was propagated at that period. Since the days of Bellarmine (*ob.* 1621), the labors of many erudite and patient investigators, especially of Muratori and Tiraboschi, have shed more light upon the condition of the Middle Ages than he enjoyed during his valuable studies. Speaking of the tenth century, Pagi says: "This century was not inferior to its successors in learning. If compared with the centuries immediately preceding and following it, it can be styled a period of ignorance only because of the relatively small number of authors it produced. But he who examines the catalogues of ecclesiastical writers will find that there flourished then many more authors than were known of in Bellarmine's time."

The tenth century produced Nilus, Romuald, Amimicus, Guido, Firmanus, and many others, "over whose venerable bodies," said St. Peter Damian, "ecclesiastical authority has caused the erection of holy altars." From the school of St. Romuald issued St. Boniface, martyr, apostle of the Russians. At this time the Germanic regions were enlightened by the labors of Udalric; Adalbert of Magdeburg; Bruno, Heribert, and Anno, of Cologne; Wolfgang of Ratisbon; Bernard and Gothard of Hildesheim; Harduit of Salzburg. Hungary can boast of St. Adalbert of Prague, apostle of her people and of the Lithuanians, and can also glory in her great king, St. Stephen. Norway points to her royal martyr, Olav. England had her Odo, Dunstan, Oswald, Ethelwald; her saintly monarchs Alfred, the two Edwards, Athelstane, Edmund, and Edgar. Spain, although groaning under the Saracenic yoke, produced SS. Gennadius of Zamora, Attilan of Asturia, Rudisind of Compostella,

(1) *Annals*, year 900.

(2) *Rom. Pont.*, b. iv., c. 12.

and the pious kings, Alphonsus the Great, Ramir II., and Weremond. France was taught by Heriveus, Adalberon, Radbod, and Gerald; by Berno, Odo, Aimard, and Odilo, abbots of Cluny; by Abbo of Fleury; and she was edified by her devout king Robert.

Italy, which suffered more from the storms of the tenth century than any other country, produced a great many literary men and cultivators of the fine arts and of science. (1). Ratherius of Verona tells us that in his episcopal see the many schools of science were frequented by throngs, and that the schools of Rome were in a flourishing condition. Atto of Vercelli took care that instruction should be given gratuitously to all, in every town and hamlet of his diocese. A Bull of Benedict IV., promulgated in 903, shows that at Pisa the schools of theology and of law were in full force. At Ravenna, Vilgard presided over a flourishing academy. When the emperor Otho I. wished to improve the schools of Germany, he brought from Novara the famous Deacon Gonzo. And were the monks doing nothing for science and literature during this tenth century? The labors of the cowled students of Bobbio alone would have sufficed to remove the reproach of sloth and ignorance from a whole nation. (2).

Certainly there was in the tenth century sufficient intellectual vigor, as well as sufficient zeal for the things of God, to preserve and transmit to posterity the treasures of faith and of science, where other matters were concerned. We cannot suppose, therefore, that in this one matter of the Eucharistic belief—one of so tremendous a nature—the clerks of that period were delinquent. These students and scribes were most diligent in their details of events. The modern critic often smiles, and sometimes he fumes, because of the indiscriminate zeal they often manifest in their greed of materials for their chronicles,—a zeal which causes no little trouble to the modern investigator. Can we suppose that these chroniclers, who apparently claimed everything and anything as grist for their mill, would have overlooked the

(1) See MURATORI, *Annals of Italy*, y. 900; and TIRABOSCHI, *Italian Literature*, vol. iii., b. 3, c. 1.

(2) See the Catalogue of Bobbio, in MURATORI'S *Antiquities*.

abundant harvest which Protestant polemics declare to have been at their disposal? Here are the "Lives" of SS. Radbod, Dunstan, Ethelwald, Bernard of Hildesheim, Remachus, Maurus of Cesena, Odilon, Romuald; other "Lives" of celebrated ecclesiastics of the tenth century; and throughout all of them you will search in vain for any hint at a late change in the Eucharistic doctrine. Here are the "Chronicle of Flodoard," found in his "History of the Church of Rheims," which gives an account of the events that happened from 919 to 966; the "Chronicle of Odoran," running from 675 to 1032; the "Annals" by Hepidan of St. Gallo, embracing the period from 709 to 1044, the "Chronicle of Hildesheim," reaching from 714 to 1138; the "History of the Tenth Century," by Glabrus Rudolphus, who died towards its end; the "Chronicle" of Hermann Contractus, extending to 1054; that of Marianus Scotus, terminating at 1083; and in all of them we find complete ignorance of any change in the Eucharistic belief of the Catholic Church, although they were all written, if not at the time, certainly shortly after, the momentous change is asserted to have been made.

If the ancient doctrine of the Church concerning the Sacrament of the Altar had been contrary to that taught by Paschasius; if he started that transformation of belief which is said to have been consummated during the tenth century; why did not Berengarius, the sacramentarian leader of the eleventh century, seize upon this fact as an invincible argument in favor of his own denial of the Real Presence? When, from the rising to the setting of the sun, all Christendom anathematized him as an opponent of the universally received belief of God's Church, why did he not reply that down to the tenth century the Church had ignored the doctrine of the Real Presence? Not once does he assert that he derived his theory from those who had taught him in his youth; not once does he even hint at the wonderful revolution discovered by Claude, La Roque, Albertin, Mosheim, and their modern imitators. All that he attempts to adduce by way of authority is comprised in some few misinterpreted passages of St. Augustine, and a

book attributed to Scotus Erigena. This significant silence would have been broken, had such a thing been possible. When, in the year 1045, Berengarius broached his heresy, there were living many whose teachers had seen the commencement of the tenth century, and who could not have been ignorant of the faith professed by Catholics at that time. Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, whose instructions Berengarius had often heard during his youth; Adelman, a companion of the future heresiarch in the school of Fulbert; Hugo of Langres and Deoduin of Liege, his friends; Gozechin of Mentz, Durand of Troars, Lanfranc of Canterbury, Guitmund of Aversa—all upbraid Berengarius as an innovator on the primitive and universally received faith of Christendom; not once do he and his answer that the tenth century saw the birth of what the Catholic polemics present as the ancient doctrine of the Church.

CHAPTER. VIII.

THE PRETENDED DEPOSITION OF POPE JOHN XII.

In the year 931, Hugh of Provence, who, a few years previously, had been proclaimed king of Italy and had been recognized as such by nearly all the northern Italians, made matrimonial overtures to Marozia, widow of Guido of Tuscany, who had usurped the sovereignty of Rome. Marozia bestowed her hand and usurped territories upon the new king, but his arrogance soon disgusted the Romans, and led by Alberic, a son of Marozia by her first marriage with Alberic of Spoleto, they attacked the mausoleum of Adrian (1) and the Provençal barely escaped with his life. Marozia was thrust into prison, and Alberic was hailed as patrician and consul by the Romans. With this dignity he assumed the sovereign rule of the city and duchy of Rome, the Exarchate and the Pentapolis having fallen into the hands of the king of Italy, Berengarius II. During the Pontificates of John XI. (a brother of Alberic), of Leo VII.,

(1) Castle of St. Angelo.

Stephen IX., Marinus II., and Agapetus II., the usurper was master of Rome. On the death of Alberic, in 956, his son Octavian, a boy of eighteen years, succeeded to his possessions, and the Papacy becoming vacant by the death of Agapetus II., he procured his own election to the chair. Fear of schism caused the Roman clergy to acquiesce, and the new Pontiff, John XII. (1), was therefore certainly legitimate. In the year 962, he conferred the crown of the Holy Roman Empire on Otho of Germany, thus reviving, after a vacancy of many years, the imperial dignity, which was destined to abide with the Germans until its final disappearance. One of the first acts of the new emperor was the restoration of the Pontifical authority in the Duchy of Rome, and the restitution of the Pentapolis and the Exarchate of Ravenna. In the midst of the festivities attending the elevation of Otho, no one seems to have spoken to the emperor of the scandals of the Roman court; but when he had begun to prosecute the siege of the fortress of St. Leo, in which Berengarius II. had shut himself, deputies came from Rome to inform Otho that the young Pontiff's life was a scandal to Christendom, and to beseech his interference. Believing the accusation to be a calumny, the emperor sent some confidential servants to the Eternal City to investigate the matter. The report proved true, and Otho remarked: "Pope John is a mere boy, and the example of good men will easily change him. I trust that a discreet admonition and some good advice will draw him from his evil ways, and then we may say with the Prophet, 'This change is from the right hand of the Most High.' We must first defeat Berengarius; then we shall paternally admonish our lord the Pope." (2). When the Pontiff found that Otho was disposed to become his rigid patron rather than an obsequious friend, he repented of having conferred upon him the imperial crown, and resolved to break his power, at least in Italy. He called to Rome the fugitive Adalbert, son of Berengarius, and openly espoused the cause of that dethroned monarch. Learning, in 963, that the Pope was influencing the princes of Benevento, Capua, and Salerno,

(1) This is the first instance of a change of name on the part of a newly elected Pope.

(2) *Continuation of Liutprand*, b. vi., c. 6.

to draw the sword for Berengarius, Otho left sufficient troops before St. Leo to maintain the siege, and marched on Rome with a large army. The Pontiff and Adalbert were not prepared for this sudden move, and fled from the city. The Romans opened the gates to Otho, and three days afterwards he assembled a Synod in St. Peter's, composed of many of the Roman clergy and several Italian bishops, to consider the cause of Pope John. Peter, a cardinal priest, testified that he had seen the Pontiff celebrate mass without communicating. John, a cardinal deacon, and John, bishop of Marni, swore they had seen him ordain a deacon in a stable. Many of the clergy declared that he had consecrated as bishop a boy of ten years, and that he frequently conferred the episcopacy for money. Fornication and incest were also proved against him. He was addicted to hunting. He had deprived of eyesight and put to death Benedict, his "spiritual father;" he had caused the mutilation of a cardinal deacon. He went abroad in full armor, and girt with a sword. When playing at dice, he invoked the aid of Jupiter, Venus, etc. He never said the Office. Otho quite naturally suspected that many of these accusations were false, and he conjured the prelates and clergy, by the Virgin Mother of God and the body of St. Peter, to not calumniate their Pontiff. The whole assembly arose, and unanimously protested that of all that had been alleged, "and of more wicked things," Pope John was guilty. The Pontiff was then summoned to answer the charges, but he refused to appear, and threatened the members of the court with excommunication. Two cardinals were then sent to summon him for the second time, but they returned without having been able to serve the citation. The court then declared John XII. deposed from the Pontifical throne, and in his place was chosen Leo, archivist of the Roman Church, and at that time a layman. Ordained and consecrated, he exercised the Papal functions as Leo VIII. After the installation of Leo VIII., the emperor remained a short time in Rome, and as everything seemed tranquil, he sent a large part of his army to join the besiegers of St. Leo. When Pope John heard of this dim-

ination of the imperial forces, he dispatched agents to Rome, who soon fomented an insurrection in his favor. At the head of his troops, Otho fought for his life, and succeeded in quelling the outbreak. He then departed for St. Leo. (1). Pope John now returned to Rome and took terrible vengeance for his expulsion. But in May, 964, he died, probably assassinated, and was succeeded by Benedict V., hitherto a deacon of the Roman Church. Otho was furious at this action of the Roman clergy, whereby his intruding Leo was rejected, and the oath taken by them in 963 ignored. He immediately besieged the city, and soon reducing it, he recalled Leo. A pseudo-Synod was then held, in which Pope Benedict was declared relegated to the rank of deacon (2); after which Otho exiled him to Germany, where he soon died. Leo, however, reigned only until 965, when his death enabled the Roman clergy to elect John, bishop of Narni, who ascended the Pontifical throne as John XIII.

That the life of Pope John XII. was abominable, seems certain from the concordant testimony of the olden writers, such as the *Continuator* of Liutprand, Sigebert, and the *Acts* of the Roman Synod held in his regard. Baronio admits that he was "most impure, and rightly detested by all good men," and speaking of his death, which the *Continuator* ascribes to a direct intervention of Satan, the learned Oratorian says, "although he was warned by God with so many and so great vexations, he would not abstain from his wonted sins, and justly merited to be at length punished by God." (3). We must remember, however, that the *Continuator*, upon whom we principally rely for information, was thoroughly devoted to the emperor Otho and

(1) This fortress soon yielded, and Berengarius was sent a prisoner into Germany. The suzerain authority of Otho was soon recognized by the Lombard princes of Benevento, Capua, and Salerno, and by the year 969 he was master of Italy, save in such territories of the Duchy of Naples, the Puglia, Calabria, and Sicily, as were disputed by the Greeks and Saracens. In 963, he had exacted from the Romans an oath of fidelity and a promise to elect no Pontiff without his or his successors' consent.

(2) Gratian, in *Dist.* 63, *chap. Synod*, gives a Constitution of this pseudo-synod in which is conceded to Otho and his successors the privilege of choosing the Roman Pontiff, and that of granting the "investiture" to bishops. Baronio proves that this Constitution is supposititious, 1st, from the falsity of a singular concession here asserted as made by Adrian I. to Charlemagne (see Alexandre's *Synopsis of Cent. VIII.* *chap. Rom. Pont.*); 2d, because it is not to be supposed that Otho, already emperor, would have been created patrician and king, as this document states; 3d, because the violators of the Constitution are not only excommunicated, but consigned to eternal flames, which style of language Leo, an archivist of the Holy See, knew well to be foreign to the usage of Rome.

(3) *Annals*, year 963, no. 25.

to the intruder Leo. His testimony, therefore, is not above suspicion. Sigebert wrote more than a century after the death of John XII., and probably derived much of his knowledge from the *Chronicle* of Liutprand and its *Appendix*. But we do not intend to write an apology for Pope John XII.; we grant that he was one of the very few wicked men who have sat in the Chair of St. Peter. Our Lord reminded us that the leaders in Israel are not personally impeccable: "The Scribes and the Pharisees have sitten on the chair of Moses. All things therefore, whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do; but according to their works, do ye not." Having succinctly narrated the events of his Pontificate, we merely propose to show that the deposition of Pope John XII. was null and void, and that therefore the intruder, known as Leo VIII., must be relegated to the list of Anti-Popes.

Many of the olden authors, especially the Germans, who were most favorable to Otho I., seem to regard Leo VIII. as legitimate. Among these are the *Continuator* of Liutprand, Sigebert, Platina, Trithemius, and Papyrius Masson. Among the eccentricities of the famous Launoy was an endeavor to uphold the legitimacy of Leo, and it is against his arguments that Alexandre principally contends in his apposite dissertation on this subject. (1). Speaking of the pseudo-Synod which pretended to depose Pope John XII., Baronio says that he "had never read of any Synod in which ecclesiastical law was more disregarded, the Canons more violated, tradition more despised, and justice more outraged." Very different from this was the impression produced by the imperial Synod on the mind of the German professor Neller (1766), whose courtier sensitiveness could perceive only the promptings and effects of religious zeal in its proceedings. However, his fellow professor in the university of Treves, Martin Bender, S. J., well refuted his arguments, as the reader may perceive by consulting Marchetti's *Critical Commentary on the Ecclesiastical History of Fleury*. (2). Baronio proves the nullity of the deposition of Pope John XII., 1st, from the fact that there was not a

(1) *Cent. X., diss. 16.*(2) *Art. 2, chap. iii., no. 99.*

sufficient number of witnesses brought against him (1); 2d, the decree was issued after only two citations of the accused, while the Canons require three, nor were there granted any delays; 3d, the Synodals demanded of the emperor what a layman could not effect, that is, the deposition of a Pontiff and the election of another; 4th, sentence, properly speaking, was not pronounced; a short speech of the emperor pretended to settle so important a matter; 5th, an assembly of bishops convoked by an emperor, without the consent of the Roman Pontiff, is not a Synod, but a mere convention possessed of no authority. As we have seen, when treating of the cause of Pope Symmachus, the Roman Synod declared that, even in the Pope's own cause, no Synod could be held unless by his consent and convocation. "The aforesaid bishops," say the *Acts*, "suggested that he who is said to be accused should himself convoke the Synod, for they knew that a peculiar power over the churches had been given to his See, firstly, by the merit and principality of the Apostle Peter, and afterwards, according to the Lord's command, by the authority of the venerable Councils." But the chief argument against the legitimacy of the Othonian decree is found in the principle that a superior cannot be judged by an inferior. The bishops of the Roman Synod just quoted declared that "the bishop of the Apostolic See has never been subject to the judgment of his inferiors." And in the *Apology* which Eunodius wrote for this *Palmaris* Synod, and which the fathers stamped as possessing Synodical authority, we read: "God has wished men to decide the causes of other men, but He has reserved the rulers of that See to his own tribunal, without question. He has wished the successors of the Blessed Apostle Peter to answer for their innocence to Heaven alone."

In the letter which Avitus of Vienne, in the name of the bishops of France, sent to the Roman Senators, complaining of the Synodal action in the case of Pope Symmachus, they not knowing that the Pontiff had consented to the

(1) Alexandre thinks that Baronio is wrong in his argument (deduced from the supposititious Synod of Sinuessa, in the cause of Pope Marcellinus) that 72 witnesses were necessary. There were really, says Alexandre, no legitimate witnesses; accusers and witnesses were the same, and no single crime was attested by more than one.

holding of the Synod, we read: "While we were anxious and fearful for the cause of the Roman Church, feeling that our State tottered when its head was attacked, . . . there was brought to us a copy of a sacerdotal decree, which the bishops of Italy, assembled in the City, had issued concerning Pope Symmachus. Although the assent of a large and reverend Synod rendered this Constitution worthy of observation, we nevertheless knew that Pope Symmachus, if he had been accused in the world, ought to have received consolation from his fellow-priests, rather than judgment we cannot easily understand with what reason or law a superior is judged by his inferiors the same venerable Synod reserved for Divine examination the cause which, saving the reverence due to it, it had rashly undertaken Which being shown, as myself a Roman senator and a Christian bishop, I solemnly call upon you that you do not less respect the See of Peter in your Church, than you do the height of power in the City. If anything weakens in other priests, it may be strengthened, but if the Pope of Rome is called into question, not merely a bishop, but the episcopate, seems to totter. . . . He who governs the fold of the Lord will give an account of his care of the lambs entrusted to him; again, it is the province of the Judge, not of the flock, to correct the shepherd."

It was in accordance with the principle that a superior should not be judged by an inferior, that St. Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, complained, in the Fourth *Action* of the Ephesine Council, of the decree of deposition issued against him by John, the inferior patriarch of Antioch; and the fathers did him justice. And because of the same principle, not on account of faith, said Anatolius of Constantinople, Dioscorus, who had pretended to excommunicate Pope St. Leo, was condemned by the fathers of Chalcedon. Since, therefore, this principle was ever held holy by the Church, a sentence of deposition pronounced against a Roman Pontiff by a handful of prelates at the bidding of a lay autocrat must be regarded as null and void. When Pope Leo III. willingly appeared before a Roman Synod,

in the presence of Charlemagne, to answer certain accusations, the bishops exclaimed: "We dare not judge the See of the Apostles, which is the head of all the Churches of God. By her and by her Vicar we are all judged; she is judged by no one—such is the ancient custom. As the Roman Pontiff discerns, we canonically obey." (1). Launoy contends that the Roman Synod held by Pope John XII. after his restoration, and in which the Anti-Pope Leo was condemned, is supposititious; but he adduces only the negative argument, that the *Continuator* of Liutprand, Flodoard, Sigebert (in the Gemblours codex), Martin the Pole, Trithemius, Platina, and a few others, do not speak of it. But the ancient Vatican codex used by Baronio in editing the *Acts* of this Synod is beyond suspicion, as is evinced by the fact that the Centuriators of Magdeburg do not question its antiquity. Launoy also argues for the legitimacy of Leo from the fact that the St. Leo who reigned from 1049 to 1054 is styled in the *Roman Martyrology* Pope Leo IX., whereas, if the Leo substituted for John XII. was an Anti-Pope, the saint of the eleventh century should be called Pope Leo VIII. Launoy has reason on his side, inasmuch as the St. Leo in question was, strictly speaking, Leo VIII. But although this error has crept into the *Martyrology*, and the usage of centuries has sanctioned the enumeration of the Pontiffs now in vogue, the consequence which Launoy would fain derive from the custom is not a necessary one. Pope Felix (526-530), the ancestor of St. Gregory the Great, is generally styled Felix IV., as the Felix who mounted the throne in 483 is called Felix III., although it is certain that the Felix denominated Second, who was illegally substituted for Liberius (355), should be expunged from the catalogue of Pontiffs. Again, if the archivist Leo was not an Anti-Pope, then Benedict V., whom the Roman clergy elected on the death of John XII., certainly was one, for Leo was yet living and claiming the Chair of Peter when Benedict was chosen. It would follow then that the nomenclature of all the Popes named Bene-

(1) ANASTASIUS, *Life of Leo III.*

dict, since that time, is incorrect. Since then, both in the hypothesis of Launoy and in our own, an error in the *Martyrology* is manifest, it cannot be adduced as a proof that its compilers regarded as legitimate the chosen of the Othonian Synod.

Matthew Flaccius, when endeavoring to prove that the Holy Roman empire was transferred from the Franks to the Germans, without the authority of the Holy See, asserts that Otho deposed Pope John XII., and that he did so in the exercise of his imperial prerogative, which was the castigation of unworthy Pontiffs. The following are his words: "As for the letter of the cardinals to Otho, it was nothing else than an accusation against John XII., a most impure man, and a petition that, having deposed him, the emperor would substitute another and better bishop or Pope in his place; which, indeed, Otho I. energetically effected, for then, as in all antiquity, the Cæsars possessed the authority to chastise impure Popes. The history of this fact is fully given by Liutprand, a writer most worthy of confidence." It is absolutely false that Otho deposed Pope John XII., and that of old it was regarded as part of the imperial duty to punish wicked Pontiffs. The Pagan emperors, indeed, put many of the Pontiffs to death; heretical and schismatic emperors, Christian only by baptism, often imprisoned, exiled, and tortured the successors of St. Peter, on account of their apostolic firmness, but the truly Catholic sovereigns always treated the Popes with veneration and submission. While innumerable testimonies can be produced to show that the first duty of the emperor was to defend the Holy See, that, indeed, such was the prime reason of his dignity, and its only reason of being, neither Flaccius nor any one of his modern imitators have produced one proof that, in the constitution of the Holy Roman empire, the emperor possessed the right to judge the Roman Pontiff, either as Pope, as king, or as man. Flaccius praises Liutprand as a reliable historian, and refers us to his chronicle in proof of many insolent assertions. But this author (1), and what is more, Flaccius himself (2), testify

(1) *B.* vi., c. 6 and 7.

(2) *Centuriators of Magdeburg*; cent. 10, c. 9.

that, guilty as Pope John seemed to be, Otho did not himself enter upon a judgment or even a trial, but called an episcopal convention at Rome, and to it submitted the cause of the Pontiff. Otho declared, says Liutprand, "let the Synod declare its judgment in this matter," and in the epistle of Otho to the Pope, given by the same historian, the emperor does not command, but respectfully entreats him to come to the Synod: "To the lord John, supreme Pontiff and universal Pope, Otho, by the divine clemency, August Emperor, together with the archbishops of Liguria, Tuscany, Saxony, and France, send greeting in the Lord. Coming to Rome for the service of God, when we questioned your sons, the Roman cardinals, bishops, priests, and deacons, and the whole people, as to your absence, and why you wished not to see us, the Defender of your Church and of yourself, they alleged against you such obscenities, as would be shameful, even if charged to play actors. And lest these accusations should be unknown to your Greatness, we will briefly describe some of them Therefore we earnestly entreat your Paternity to come, and not to hesitate in proving your innocence of these charges."

CHAPTER IX.

THE GREEK SCHISM : ITS REVIVAL BY MICHAEL CERULARIUS, AND ITS PRESENT CONDITION.

From the second deposition of Photius by the emperor Leo the Philosopher (y. 889), down to the reign of Constantine Monomachus — that is, for nearly a century and a half — the union of the Greeks with the centre of unity remained unbroken. Once, indeed, (y. 998), it had been endangered, when the patriarch Sergius, of the same family as Photius, assembled a Synod, and, having renewed all the calumnies of that schismatic against the Holy See, endeavored in vain to induce the other patriarchs to revolt (1); and the suc-

(1) Maimbourg asserts that Sergius erased the name of the Roman Pontiff from the diptychs (*Schism of the Greeks*, b. III.), but Peter of Antioch writes to Michael Cerularius (in ALLATIUS, *Consent*, b. 2, c. 1.) that the accusation is false, and that he does not know who effected the erasure. The patriarch Veccus, *Orat. II.*, confirms the declaration of the Antiochian patriarch.

cessor of Sergius, though he persistently tried to obtain from Pope John XIX. the title of Œcumenical (1), did not revenge his disappointment by rebellion. Under seventeen successive patriarchs, after the extinction of the Photian schism (2), the Greeks continued to recognize the supremacy of the Roman See, until the patriarchate of Michael Cerularius, in the year 1053. At this period, the Byzantine throne was occupied by Constantine Monomachus, whom the empress Zoe, a worthy compeer of the many murderous and adulterous sovereigns who, for centuries, defiled the throne of the great Constantine, had married in 1043. During the reign of Michael of Paphlagonia, Zoe's second husband, the relations of Monomachus with the imperial adulteress had caused his exile to Lesbos, but after Michael's death the sexagenarian princess recalled her paramour, and placed him on the throne. The reign of Monomachus was rendered infamous by his shameless debauchery, and under his supine administration the empire lost Illyria to the Servians, the Puglia and Calabria to the Normans, while nearly all its Asiatic possessions were ravaged by the Turkish conquerors of Persia. Among the favorites of the imperial debauchee was Michael Cerularius, an ambitious nobleman, who, having conspired against the Paphlagonian, had been confined in a monastery, where, although he took the monastic habit, in order to avoid further punishment, he remained a layman, that he might be in position to profit by future contingencies. The similarity of their fortunes drew Cerularius and Monomachus together, and when, eight months after the coronation of the latter, the Constantinopolitan patriarchate became vacant, it was given to the former.

For ten years Cerularius gave no sign of hostility to the Holy See; but in 1053, having gained great influence over Leo, metropolitan of Acridia, and Nicetas (Pectoratus), a monk of the great monastery of Studius, and one of the most learned men in the empire, he made his first movement toward a revival of the schism of Photius. He caused

(1) Eustathius begged that, as the Roman Pontiff was Œcumenical for the whole world, so the Constantinopolitan patriarch might be styled the same for the East.

(2) *Manual Calceas: Against the Greeks*, b. iv.

Nicetas to write a pamphlet against many of the customs of the Latins, and especially against the use of unleavened bread in the Holy Sacrifice—a usage, we may remark, which even the virulent Photius had not thought of condemning. This document was circulated throughout the Greek empire, and as some of the dioceses of the Puglia were still in the Byzantine obedience, a copy was sent to John, bishop of Trani, with an order from Cerularius to publish it throughout the West. The bishop of Trani handed the diatribe to cardinal Humbert, who was then visiting Trani, and his Eminence translated it into Latin and laid it before Pope Leo IX., then a prisoner to the Normans in Benevento. The following are the terrible accusations against the Roman, and therefore against all the Latin churches, which the profundity and sincerity of Cerularius put forth as a justification of revolt against the See of Peter.

- i. By the use of unleavened bread for the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Latins communicate with the Jews, and, furthermore, adopt an invalid matter for said Sacrifice.
- ii. The Latins eat the flesh of suffocated animals.
- iii. They shave their faces.
- iv. They fast on Saturday.
- v. They eat the flesh of unclean animals.
- vi. They allow their monks to eat meat.
- vii. They violate the Lenten fast, by permitting the use of flesh on Quinquagesima and in the first week of Lent.
- viii. They have added the clause “And from the Son” to the Creed, and they err in the doctrine as to the Holy Ghost.
- ix. They loudly proclaim, in their liturgy: “Our Holy Lord Jesus Christ, in the glory of God the Father, through the Holy Ghost.”
- x. They allow two brothers to marry two sisters.
- xi. At the time of Communion, the officiating and other clergy give each other the kiss of peace.
- xii. Their bishops wear rings, as though espoused to their churches.
- xiii. Their bishops go to war, and soil their hands with human blood.
- xiv. They immerse the subject, in Baptism, one only time.
- xv. They put salt into the mouth of the candidate for Baptism.
- xvi. They do not venerate the relics or the images of the saints.
- xvii. They do not sing the *Alleluia* during Lent.

Pope St. Leo IX. read this curious mixture

of puerilities, absurdities, and lies, a few days after he had received from Peter, the newly-elected patriarch of Antioch, a most submissive letter, begging for the confirmation of that prelate's new dignity. The holy Pontiff immediately wrote to the Constantinopolitan patriarch a lengthy and admirable reply, in which he strenuously insisted upon the God-given prerogatives of the See of Rome, and pointed out to the arrogant Cerularius the unreasonableness of some, and the absurdity of others, of his allegations against that See; he also showed how a diversity of customs may subsist, and yet the unity and essence of faith and of doctrine be not affected; drawing his attention also to the fact that, even in Rome, the Greeks were allowed—nay, even commanded—to observe their own peculiar rites and usages, since only a difference in faith, or a disobedience to the head of the Church, can rupture communion. When Cerularius had read this letter, he did not act as might have been expected, from the tone of his celebrated diatribe; perhaps he had been ordered to temporize by Monomachus, who was begging the aid of the Pontiff against the Normans; perhaps he had found too much opposition among the Greeks to his schismatic designs. Whatever may have been his reason, he addressed a conciliatory letter to the Pontiff, and St. Leo IX., anxious for the unity of the Church, sent as legates to Constantinople the cardinal Humbert, the cardinal-chancellor, Frederick, and the archbishop of Amalfi. These prelates were magnificently received by the Greek emperor, and during the following conferences, which lasted several days, the cardinal Humbert refuted the charges made by Cerularius. The monk Nicetas was convinced by the arguments of the cardinal, and having made a solemn retractation of the sentiments contained in his diatribe, was received into communion by the legates. The patriarch, however, now refused to submit, and after many efforts to overcome his obstinacy, the legates proceeded to the great basilica of St. Sophia, (Aug. 16, 1054), and there, before an immense congregation, they declared Cerularius and his followers excommunicated, and having laid the sentence upon the

high altar, they shook the dust from their shoes, and left the church, crying, "Be God our Judge!" Charged with valuable presents from Monomachus for the churches of St. Peter and of St. Benedict at Montecassino, they then departed from Constantinople. Cerularius now spread a report that the excommunication applied to the entire Greek nation, and when the mob had become sufficiently excited to warrant his supposing that the legates would be killed if an opportunity were afforded, he signified to the emperor that he was now willing to confer with them, if they would return to the city. Monomachus, however, suspected the design of the patriarch, and hurried the legates on their journey; indeed, fond of Cerularius as he had shown himself, and though he was too apt to yield to him on all occasions, this emperor did not directly abet the schism. But in a few months after the departure of the legates, Monomachus died, leaving the crown to Theodora, sister of the empress Zoe (who had died a short time before), and Cerularius became all-powerful; the efforts of the schismatics were also aided by a year's vacancy of the Holy See. The patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem did not at once join the party of Cerularius; indeed, Peter of Antioch ridiculed most of the charges made against the Westerns by the Constantinopolitan; but he could not endure the one immersion at Baptism, and the addition of "And from the Son" to the Creed; hence, in time, he joined the other patriarchs in anathematizing the Latins, and in erasing the name of the Pontiff from the diptychs. The schism thus inaugurated has endured, saving short periods of nominal and interested union, until our own day. (1).

In many minds the Russian, or, as it styles itself, the "orthodox" Church, is synonymous with the schismatic Greek Church; but it is not schismatic Greek in origin, nor is it Greek in language, polity, or government. The schismatic Greek Church is composed of those Christians who recognize the spiritual jurisdiction of the Greek patriarch of Constantinople, and is confined to the territories once embraced in the Byzantine (now known as the Otto-

(1) The remainder of this chapter appeared as an article in the *Ave Maria*, vol. xxiv., nos. 23 and 24.

man) empire (1) with its vassal (now only *quasi* vassal) states—Egypt, Nubia, etc. The Russian Church communicates with the schismatic Greek, and in spite of its own liturgy, which stoutly asserts the primacy of the Roman See, (2) agrees with the schismatic Greeks in rejecting the authority of the Roman Pontiff; but it is, in every respect, a national church. (3)

The language of the Russian Church is not the Greek, but the Slavonic; and not the vernacular, but the Old Slavonic, with which the people are not familiar. Protestants are much mistaken when, reading that the Greeks, Syrians, Copts, etc., celebrate their services in Greek, Syrian, Coptic, etc., they imagine they discover an example for their own use of the vernacular. The languages used in the rituals of these peoples are very different from those in daily use. (4). Nor do the Russians owe their conversion to the Greek schismatic church. This conversion was effected by the Roman Catholic Apostolic Church; for whether, as we learn from Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the first missionaries to Russia were sent by the Catholic Patriarch Ignatius (867), or, as Nestor asserts, they were sent by the schismatic Photius (866), it is certain that no real impression was made upon the Russian masses until toward the end of the tenth century, (5) when the Grand Duke Vladimir, called "the Apostolic," embraced Christianity; and at the

(1) In 1833 the hierarchy of the new kingdom of Greece declared its independence of the patriarch, and in 1868 that prelate recognized its autonomy.

(2) The Russian liturgical books, written in Old Slavonic, are full of such testimonies. Thus, Pope St. Sylvester is called "the divine head of the holy bishops." Pope St. Leo I. is styled "the successor of St. Peter on the highest throne, the heir of the impregnable rock." To Pope St. Martin is said: "Thou didst adorn the divine throne of Peter, and, holding the church upright on this rock, which cannot be shaken, thou didst honor thy name." Pope St. Leo III. is thus addressed: "Chief Pastor of the Church, fill the place of Jesus Christ." St. Peter is called the sovereign pastor of all the Apostles—"pastyr vladytchnyi vsich Apostolov."

(3) It recognizes no earthly authority over itself but that of the "Holy Synod," a body entirely dependent on the Czar. Originally, the metropolitan of Russia was nominated by the sovereign, and consecrated by the Constantinopolitan patriarch; but after the schism the czars began to act, more and more, as heads of the church. In 1589 the patriarch Jeremiah II. recognized Job, metropolitan of Moscow, as patriarch of Russia, and as next in rank to him of Alexandria. In the reign of Alexis Michaelovitch, father of Peter the Great, Nikon of Moscow rejected the authority of Constantinople; and in 1667, Nikon having offended Alexis, he was deposed, and the power of his successors became nominal. Peter the Great finally, in 1721, placed the government of the Russian church in a "Holy Synod," every member of which swears obedience to the Czar as "supreme judge in this spiritual assembly."

(4) ASSEMANI: "*Oriental Library*," vol. iv., c. 7, § 22.

(5) About the year 945 Olga, Olga, or Elga, widow of a grand duke (or king) of Russia, made a journey to Constantinople, and was there baptized. Returning to Russia, she vainly endeavored to convert her countrymen. But her grandson, Vladimir, having married Anna, sister of the Greek Emperor Basil II., was baptized in 988, and in a few years nearly all the Russians received the Faith. Those authors who assign the conversion of Russia to the ninth century, remarks Bergier, confuse the reign of Basil II. with that of Basil the Macedonian.

time the Greeks were in communion with Rome. The revival of the schism, by Michael Cerularius, did not much affect the Russians. Not until the twelfth century were they entirely seduced from the Roman obedience. Then, with the exception of the Church of Galicia, (1) most of the Russians ceased to be Catholics. However, at the time of the Council of Florence (1439) there were as many Catholics as schismatics in Russia. (*Bollandists* : "September," v. 41.) About the middle of the fifteenth century, a second Photius, archbishop of Kiev, extended the schism throughout the land. (2)

The following remarks of the Russian Jesuit, Ivan Gagarin, than whom the reader will find no better authority on matters concerning the Russian Church, are worthy of attention : "It was only in a very indirect manner that the Russian Church was drawn into schism. The metropolitans of Kiev depended, in the hierarchical order, upon Constantinople. When the rupture between Rome and Byzantium took place, Kiev found itself separated from the centre of unity ; but for a long time the Russians did not share the passions of the Greeks, and it may be said that, for a long period, merely a material schism subsisted between Rome and the Russian Church. But the clergy of Constantinople endeavored to imbue the Russians with their own prejudices and with their hatred of the Latins. They succeeded, and when the princes of Moscow manifested a design of attacking the independence of the Russian church, this body could rely on itself alone.

"As yet no one has written the sad and touching history of the struggle which this church, isolated from the West

1) Galicia, or Red Russia, returned to the fold of unity under Pope Honorius III. (1216-27.) The two millions of Ruthenians, as they are called, use the Slavonic liturgy, and their secular clergy may marry before receiving Holy Orders.

(2) Some authors opine that the schism of Cerularius did not affect the entire Greek empire in the 11th century. Certainly, Pope Alexander II. sent Peter, bishop of Anagni, as *Apoerisiarius* (agent, not legate) to the emperor Michael Ducas in 1071, and he continued as such for a whole year. When, in 1078, St. Gregory VII. excommunicated Nicephorus Botoniates, it was only because that prince dethroned Ducas, who was in communion with the Holy See. Pope Paschal II. sent Chrysolanus (or, as some write the name, Grosolanus, or Proculanus) as legate to Alexis Comnenus. Alexandre and Mansi hold that there was communion between the West and East for some time after the excommunication of Cerularius and his pretended retaliation of the same. It is noteworthy that Euthymus Zygabenus, who, by order of Alexis Comnenus, collected the sayings of the Fathers against each and every heresy, makes no mention of the Latins as heretics. Even in the twelfth century there were many Greeks in communion with Rome, as we learn from the many narratives of the crusades, from the *Alexias* of Anna Comnena, from the *Life of Manuel* by Nicetas Choniates, and from the letters (b. iv., nos. 39, 4) of the Venerable Peter of Cluny to the emperor John Comnenus and to the patriarch of Constantinople.

and betrayed by the East, sustained against the growing ambition of the granddukes and czars of Moscow. And, nevertheless, that history has some beautiful pages. If the Russian Church succumbed, it was not without combat or without glory. Ivan III., if not from conviction, at least ostensibly, belonged to a sect which designed to substitute Judaism for Christianity. The metropolitan of Moscow had been seduced, but the Russian Church preserved sufficient strength and independence to condemn the impure doctrines. When Ivan IV., who much resembled Henry VIII. of England, shed the blood of his subjects in torrents, and trampled on ecclesiastical authority to gratify his passions, Philip, metropolitan of Moscow, spoke to him with apostolic liberty, and sealed his remonstrances with his blood. But the church continued to lose ground, and when Boris Godounov transformed the metropolitan of Moscow into a patriarch (1588), that elevation was, in his mind, for the purpose of furnishing the czar with a willing tool." (1)

Although the "orthodox" Russians and schismatic Greeks, like the Nestorians and Jacobites, are witnesses to the antiquity of many dogmas which Protestants regard as modern human innovations, Protestant polemics ever show much sympathy for the aversion cherished by these schismatics toward the Holy See. The children of the Reformation have often endeavored to enter into communion with these separatists, but their efforts resulted, each time, only in a formal condemnation of Protestant tenets by the progeny of Photius and Cerularius. Two of these attempts at union between the Eastern and Western opponents of Rome merit attention.

In 1574 Stephen Gerlach, a Lutheran, and preacher to the imperial embassy at Constantinople, was urged by many of his co-religionists to obtain from Jeremiah II., patriarch of Constantinople, an endorsement of the "Confession of Augsburg" as consonant with the faith of the schismatics. But Jeremiah combated the "Confession" as heretical, with tongue and pen. In 1672 Dositheus,

(1) *Will Russia become Catholic?* Paris, 1856.

schismatic patriarch of Jerusalem, convoked a Synod to consider the doctrines of Calvin, and the Synodals said of the Lutheran overtures to Jeremiah: "Martin Crugius, and others well versed in the new doctrines of Luther, sent the articles of their 'Confession' to him who then sat on the throne of the Catholic Constantinopolitan Church, that they might learn whether they agreed in doctrine with the Oriental churches. But that great patriarch wrote to them—yea, against them—three learned discourses, or replies, wherein he theologically and Catholicly refuted their entire heresy, and taught them the orthodox doctrines which the Oriental Church received from the beginning. However, they paid no attention; for they had bidden farewell to all piety. The patriarch's book was issued, in Greek and Latin, at Wittemberg in Germany, in the year of salvation 1584; but before the time of Jeremiah, the entire doctrine of the Oriental Church had been more fully set forth by the priest John Nathaniel, procurator of Constantinople, in his 'Treatise on the Sacred Liturgy'; and after the said Jeremiah, this was also done by Gabriel Severus Moreanus, archbishop of our brethren of Crete, in his book on 'The Seven Sacraments of the Catholic Church.'" (1)

Another and more celebrated attempt to unite the Western innovators and the Eastern schismatics was made in the seventeenth century. Cyril Lucar, a Candiot, was sent to the University of Padua when a youth, where he studied under the famous Margunius, bishop of Cythera. After his graduation he traveled in Germany, and became infected with the new doctrines. Nevertheless, on his return to the Greeks he received the priesthood, and in time became patriarch of Alexandria. In 1621, having bribed the Grand Vizier with money furnished by the Calvinists of Holland, he was appointed patriarch of Constantinople. He began immediately to teach Calvinism; the clergy revolted; Cyril was exiled to Rhodes, and Anthimius of Alexandria was placed on the patriarchal throne. However, the intrigues of the English ambassador caused the Porte to recall Cyril, and he soon published a *Confession of Faith* of the most

(1) We have followed the Latin version of this Synod of Jerusalem (or of Bethlehem), made by an anonymous Benedictine of St. Maur, and first published at Paris, in 1676.

Calvinistic type. In 1636 the indignation of the Greeks compelled the Porte to again banish the innovator, but after three months he was once more recalled—only to be bow-stringed, by order of the Porte, in 1638. Lucar's *Confession* appeared in Holland in 1645, and was gladly welcomed by Protestants as a harbinger of their recognition by the historically venerable churches of the East; but the consequent publication of the justly celebrated *Perpetuity of the Faith of the Catholic Church concerning the Eucharist* demonstrated the fallaciousness of their hopes (1). They soon found that the Greeks admitted their agreement with Rome concerning most of the Catholic dogmas. Indeed, as soon as Lucar's *Confession* appeared in Constantinople, the author was synodically deposed, and Cyril of Berea was made patriarch. This prelate convoked a Synod in 1638, and a condemnation of Lucar was signed by the three schismatic patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, and by twenty-three bishops. Soon after, bribery and intrigue procured the patriarchal chair for Parthenius of Adrianople, who in 1642 held another Synod, which again reprobated Lucar's teachings. In 1672 Dositheus of Jerusalem celebrated the Synod already mentioned, which confirmed the decisions of the other assemblies.

In the *Acts* of this assembly we read that the Greek schismatics accused the Calvinists (whom they styled "liars, innovators, heretics, mendacious architects, apostates, who, like all heretics, are artificial explainers of Scripture and of the Fathers,") of calumniating the Orientals by the assertion that the said Orientals held Calvinistic doctrine. And this assertion was made, say the bishops, in spite of so many declarations of Greek patriarchs; in spite of the publication of the "orthodox" belief; in spite of the lucid

(1) In the five quarto volumes of which this work consists, are collected testimonies of all the Greek ecclesiastical authors who wrote after the schism of Photius; the professions of faith of many patriarchs and bishops; declarations of many Synods; the liturgies, etc., of the East. It is proved that in all ages, just as to-day, the Orientals admitted seven sacraments, and held that these produce grace; that, as now, they believed in transubstantiation; that, as now, they prayed to the saints, prayed for the dead. It is also shown that Lucar manifested, not the sentiments of his co-religionists, but his own opinions—a fact proved by himself when he proposed his doctrine as one he would like to introduce among the Greeks. In the last two volumes of the *Perpetuity*, the doctrine of the Catholic and schismatic Greek Churches is compared with that of the Nestorians, who were separated from Rome in the fifth century, and with that of the Eutychians, or Jacobites, who became schismatics in the sixth. Then follows an exposition of the belief and of the discipline of the Ethiopians, Egyptian Copts, Maronites, and of the Nestorians scattered throughout Persia and India.

treatises of many Greek doctors. Then follow eighteen chapters, in which the synodals declare that man's free-will was not destroyed by the fall of Adam; that faith alone will not justify; that there are seven Sacraments; that Baptism cleanses from original sin; that in the Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine is really changed into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ; that the saints are to be invoked as friends of God; that their images are to be venerated; that we must receive all traditions given us by the Church, which, being taught by the Holy Ghost, cannot err.

Disappointed in their hopes of union with some ecclesiastical body of comparative antiquity, the Calvinists accounted for the adverse action of the schismatic Synods by the supposition of Latin bribery. Thus, in 1722, appeared the book of Cowell, an Englishman, who tried to prove that fraud was behind the apparent agreement of the Roman and schismatic doctrines. Mosheim affects to discover, in the history of the Lucar affair, that Catholic polemics do not scruple at dishonesty when disputing with heretics. Now it is false that the Greek bishops who condemn the Western "reformers" were partial to the Latins. Cyril of Berea, like many other schismatic prelates and priests of his time, may have died, as Mosheim asserts, in the Roman communion, but the dominant spirits of the Synods in question would have rivalled a Scotch covenanter in hatred of Rome. Nectarius, an ex-patriarch of Jerusalem, composed an energetic diatribe *Against the Primacy of the Pope*; Dositheus, the president of the Synod of Jerusalem, published, in 1683, many works of Simeon of Thessalonica, in which this writer severely upbraids the Latins. Again, if these Greek adversaries of the "Reformation" were actuated by a desire of pleasing Rome, why did they, in these very Synods, so strenuously assert their peculiar dogma concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost? Finally, how is it that the Greeks, so bitter against the Holy See, so tenacious of their own distinctive doctrines, did not depose Dositheus, Nectarius, Parthenius, etc.?

From the day of her separation from Rome, the Greek

Church, once so active, has been in a state of lethargy, displaying none of that fecundity which Christ promised to His own spouse. "The prodigious ignorance and stupid superstition," says Feller, "in which the priests and people of this isolated church are involved, necessarily entail the great abuses and enormous disorders with which they are reproached. For centuries the Greeks can show no celebrated doctor, no council worthy of attention. Their latest sages—Bessarion, Allatius, Arcudius, etc.,—all belonged to the Church of Rome."

Again we call the reader's attention to some reflections by Gagarin:—

"Byzantism pretended to have for its object the exaltation and triumph of the Greek Church, empire, and nationality. It sacrificed the unity and independence of the Church to that object, and what has been the result of the conflict which it provoked? The ruin of the Greek Church, and consequently of the Greek empire and nationality. But God did not wish that this ancient and glorious church should perish. He raised up a new people, who seem to have the mission of re-establishing her in her pristine splendor. That people is the Slavic, and three-fourths of them belong to the Oriental rite, with this difference, that their liturgical language is the (Old) Slavonic. One can not avoid being struck by the contrast between the Slavonic and Greek branches of the Oriental rite. The former possesses numbers, force, vigor, while the latter exhibits only feebleness and decrepitude. Laying aside every other argument, the figures will make this difference palpable. It is estimated that all the Oriental Christians—Slavs, Greeks, Moldo-Wallachians or Roumanians, Georgians, etc.,—number about seventy million souls, of whom nearly sixty millions are Slavs. If from the ten or twelve remaining millions we deduct those who are not Greeks, we see to how small a number the Greeks are reduced. (1). Now the Slavs of the Oriental rite are nearly all subjects of the Russian Empire."

(1) By the term "Greek," Gagarin does not here indicate merely the subjects of the modern kingdom, but all of the old Byzantine nationality.

And now a few words as to the probability of a submission of the Russian "orthodox" church to the Roman jurisdiction. The czar may devoutly wish for union with Rome. If he is a statesman, he must realize that the activity and zeal of a Papal clergy would be a great check to the growth of Nihilism. The more learned and more pious of the "orthodox" clergy—too few, alas! in number—may yearn for unity. But there is one obstacle, which, apparently, neither the once powerful inclinations of a czar nor the fast-decreasing influence of a corrupt clergy can overcome. When England shall have learned the wisdom of doing justice to Ireland, there may be hope that Russia will commence to doubt the wisdom of her policy toward *her Ireland*—unfortunate, noble, and exhausted Poland. But as yet, to the average Russian mind, Poland is a subject only for the iron heel; and *Catholicism*, to this mind, means Latinism,—i. e., *Polonism*. The Russian "patriot," therefore, regards any progress of Catholicism in "Holy Russia" as a progress of Polish nationality.

Again, the Russian clergy have always systematically inculcated the idea that a reunion with Rome means the abolition of several institutions dear to the Russian heart—viz., Communion under both species, the use of fermented bread in the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Old Slavonic liturgy, and the marriage of the secular clergy. And here we must note that nothing can be more false than the idea entertained by most of the Eastern schismatics, that, whenever there has been a question of reunion with Rome, the Holy See has designed to force them to adopt the Latin rite and discipline. In refutation of this idea, Pope Benedict XIV., in his Bull *Allatæ sunt*, quotes the words of Pope Innocent IV., who cited two Constitutions of Popes Leo X. and Clement VII., in which these Pontiffs vehemently reprovved those Latins who blamed the Greeks for their observance of certain customs approved by the Council of Florence.

The same Benedict XIV., speaking of those who were laboring for reunion, resumes their obligations as follows: They should disabuse the schismatics of those errors which their ancestors introduced, in order that they might

have a pretext for withdrawing from the obedience of the Sovereign Pontiff. As an easier method of converting said schismatics, the greatest stress should be laid upon the writings of the early Fathers of the Greek Church, who are in perfect accord with the Latin Fathers. To bring the Eastern schismatics into the fold of the true Church, it is not necessary to attack their rites. On the contrary, as the Apostolic See has always insisted, they must not be urged to follow the Latin rite. And in our own day Pope Pius IX., in an Encyclical addressed to the Orientals, under date of Jan. 6, 1848, uttered the same sentiments. Nevertheless, the idea is firmly fixed in most Russian minds that union with Rome means the loss of their loved rite. This, added to the present sentiments of these minds regarding the burning question of Poland, would seem to indicate that there is little probability of a speedy submission of the Russian Church to the Holy See. (1)

CHAPTER IX.

ST. LEO IX. AND PIUS IX. -- CIVITELLA AND CASTELFIDARDO. *

In the year 1048, while the emperor Henry III. was residing at Frisingen, deputies came to him from Rome, informing him of the death of Pope Damasus II., and asking

(1) In reply to the assertion that, in spite of the declarations of many Roman Pontiffs, the Catholic missionaries have always tried to bring their converts of the Oriental rite into the Latin rite, Gagarin, *loc. cit.*, says: "It is true that in the Ottoman Empire all the Catholic Greeks, excepting the Melchites of Syria, have passed over to the Latin rite. It is also true that in Poland the Latin rite has been adopted by many Catholic families who once belonged to the Greek rite. These are facts which we do not dispute. But we insist that they prove nothing against us, and that they are sufficiently explained by causes completely foreign to the actions of the Holy See and of its missionaries. In Turkey, until the *hatti-houmayoun* of Feb. 18, 1856, all the Christians of the Greek rite were placed under the (civil) authority of the patriarch of Constantinople; and when one of them renounced that prelate's communion to enter that of the Pope, it is evident that he was exposed to vexation by that personage, who, though no longer his spiritual, was still his temporal ruler. He had only one way of escaping persecution, and that was a withdrawal from the patriarch's civil jurisdiction when he left the schismatic communion. To effect this withdrawal, he had to join the Latin rite. These few words ought to explain how, in Greece and the Archipelago, all the Catholic Greeks have been led to abandon the Greek rite. The concession made by the Sultan Abdul Mijid, on Feb. 18, 1856, deprived the patriarch of his civil authority over the co-nationals; but it has not yet been shown that the Greeks who were desirous of joining the Roman communion, and who still preferred to cling to their old rite, could do so with impunity. Let us judge, then, whether they could have done so a century or two ago. In Poland the circumstances were different, but the United Russians passed to the Latin rite because of similar influences. In the Republic of Poland there were two rites, two languages, and two nationalities. The superiority was with the Poles; and when the convert adopted the Latin rite, he assumed Polish nationality and entered the ranks of the dominant people. Does not this state of things explain the facts opposed to us?"

* This chapter appeared in the *Ave Maria*, vol. xxv., no. 22.

him to give the Church a new Pontiff (1). Henry did not hesitate to arrogate this office to himself, but nevertheless he convoked the bishops and other grandees of the empire to consult concerning an election. The assembly was held at Worms, and its unanimous choice was Bruno, bishop of Toul, a cousin of the emperor Conrad, and an Alsatian. Undoubtedly Henry would have named a German, had he not feared to irritate the Romans.

The writers of the time differ as to the conduct of Bruno when he was notified of his nomination. According to Otho of Frisingen (2), Bruno proceeded to Cluny, clothed in the Pontifical purple, and the prior Hildebrand—afterwards Gregory VII.—“immediately rebuked him, saying that it was illicit for any one to receive the Pontificate from lay hands.” And Platina says that Bruno afterwards reproached himself “because he had obeyed the emperor rather than God.” But Wibert, who was Bruno’s archdeacon at Toul, tells us that his lord declared to the assembly at Worms: “I shall proceed to Rome, and if the Roman clergy and people freely choose me as Pontiff, I will comply with your wish;” and the same is attested by St. Bruno, bishop of Segni, author of another *Life of St. Leo IX.* (3). At any rate, Bruno, accompanied by Hildebrand, whom the future Pontiff had providentially withdrawn from the solitude of Cluny, presented himself to the Romans in plain attire and barefooted, saying, “The choice of the clergy and people, as well as the authority of the Canons, is superior to any other nomination; if you do not elect me, I am ready to return to my own country.” Then, observes Otho of Frisingen, “by the advice of Hildebrand, all ancient usages were followed; Bruno was elected Pope, and was enthroned Feb. 12, 1049. In his first Synod the new Pontiff made Hildebrand cardinal deacon.

The attention of the new Pope was soon drawn to the miserable state of affairs in Southern Italy, where an enemy, scarcely less barbarous and ferocious than the Mohammedan hordes who were infesting the Greek Empire, had introduced a reign of rapine, sacrilege, and murder. The

(1) LAMBERT OF ASCHAFFENBURG; year 1049.

(2) B. vi., c. 33.

(3) See also LEO OF OSTIA, B. ii., no. 81.

first establishments of the Normans in Italy had been very feeble, but by degrees they had extended their domination over Italian barons, Greek lieutenants, and Saracen intruders. At the time of which we write, Robert Guiscard had proclaimed himself duke of the Puglia and of Calabria; and, having turned his terrible arms against the Campagna—attracted more by lust of wealth than by desire of conquest,—he had spread devastation over a hitherto fertile and opulent province, and had usurped the Papal duchy of Benevento.

Moved with pity for the oppressed populations, who, to avoid the flames which destroyed their less fortified towns, had sought refuge in the mountain fastnesses, and fearful also lest Rome itself should fall a prey to a modern Alaric, Pope Leo remembered that he was a king as well as a Pontiff, and that his sceptre was meant to protect as well as to rule his people. He called upon his own subjects and the other Italians for volunteers. The inhabitants of Ancona, of the Puglia, and of the Campagna sent their quotas to his standard; but Leo well understood that their devotion would avail little against the disciplined forces of the Norman. Therefore he requested the Byzantine emperor, whose own interests were involved, to send him some veteran troops. In his letter to the sovereign, his Holiness says: “As we are told in Wisdom, no one can change him whom God rejects, and the fool is not corrected by words. So it is with the malice of this people: every day they grow worse. Therefore, not only wishing to use my temporal resources for the liberation of the flock of Christ, but also desiring to devote myself to that work, I have thought that nothing will more manifest the wickedness of these men, or more quickly repress their obstinacy, than the use of human weapons. For I learn from the Apostle that princes do not hold the sword without reason, and that they are the ministers of the anger of God, punishers of those who work evil.” (1)

The Greek emperor answered with fair words, but no aid arrived. Then Leo journeyed into the wilds of Pan-

(1) MIGNE'S *Patrology*, vol. 143., p. 449.

nonia, where Henry III. was at the head of an army, and he besought that emperor's assistance. He obtained only five hundred veterans, but with this small reinforcement he led his army—otherwise composed of Pontifical infantry and Lombard pikemen—into the Capitanata, in June, 1053. On the approach of Leo, the Normans sent him an embassy, offering to become tributary to the Holy See; but the Pontiff would accept of no conditions short of their entire evacuation of Italy. (1) Then occurred the battle of Civitella, called by some Dragonara. The Pontifical army was nearly destroyed, and the Pope, who had watched the combat at a little distance, was captured by the victors.

Then was witnessed an extraordinary event—conquerors kneeling at the feet of the conquered. As the Pontiff, preceded by the cross, came forward to meet his captors, they prostrated themselves before him, imploring his mercy. (2). Then they conducted their prisoner to Benevento, where for the space of nine months he was honorably entertained by count Hunfrid. Profoundly afflicted at the loss of his faithful soldiers, many of whom were his own relatives and friends, Leo did not retire to his couch during the whole time of his captivity, but took his necessary sleep on the stone pavement of his chamber; he fasted beyond measure, and completely despoiled himself for the sake of the poor.

The Normans were soon glad to withdraw from their anomalous position, especially as they were surrounded by enemies—Italians, Greeks, Germans, and Saracens. Reflecting on the great advantages they would derive from the favor of the Roman Pontiffs, they not only offered peace and liberty to their venerable prisoner, but implored him to receive them as vassals to the Holy See, swearing to defend it against all enemies, in return for the Papal investiture of their conquest in the two Sicilies. St. Leo IX. readily accepted the offer, and on March 12, 1054, he departed from Benevento and arrived in due time at Rome, where he died April 19 of the same year.

The conduct of St. Leo IX. in the matter of the Norman

(1) According to Gaufridus Malaterra (*History*, B. i., 10), and Hermann Contractus (*Chronicle*) the Pontiff would have accepted the offer of the Normans; but the German auxiliaries arrogantly relied on their superior size, and thought it would terrify the enemy.

(2) SISMONDI, vol. 1., p. 359; WIBERT, "*Life of St. Leo IX.*"

usurpation of his territories has been severely criticised; even St. Peter Damian reproved him for appealing to the temporal sword. However, history tells us of no Pope who voluntarily surrendered any portion of the patrimony of St. Peter because of a scruple to adopt material force in its defence. If Julius II. was the only Pontiff who himself led his troops to battle, many others have, from time to time, called renowned warriors to the service of the Holy See; and these *Gonfalonieri*, or captains of the Church, as they were styled, held their commissions as the most honorable that their profession could afford them. In 1084, Robert Guiscard¹, once the foe of St. Leo IX., was called by St. Gregory VII. to defend Rome against Henry IV. of Germany. In 1370, Louis I., of Hungary, aided Urban V. against the Florentines. Martin V. created the great Sforza *Gonfaloniere* of the Church. Frederick Malatesta fought for Pius II., Paul II., and Sixtus IV.; Robert Malatesta served the last named Pope, and when mortally wounded received the Sacraments from the Pontifical hands. Under St. Pius V. fought Marcantonio Colonna, the hero of Lepanto, and in our own days the Catholic world glorifies the memory of Léon Juchault de Lamoricière.

None of these leaders, and not one of the Popes who employed them, felt any of the scruples affected by the enemies of the Holy See. No such scruples were entertained by those Pontiffs who, during four centuries, were the soul of the resistance made by the civilized world to the inroads of barbarous Islamism; and precisely because those Pontiffs did use the temporal sword in defence of religion and of the right, the crescent does not shine to-day over every capital in Europe. From St. Leo IX. to Pius IX., each Pope who has drawn the sword in defence of his temporal dominion has done only what the world admires in all other kings. It is curious, therefore, that we should so often hear men counselling the Popes to answer the invaders of their territories with a benediction.

The idea of the Supreme Pontificate is as contrary to that of aggressive warfare, as is the idea of the priesthood to that of violence. Meekness is not only appropriate to the

successor of St. Peter; it is the duty of his office, and he should ever remember the saying that "the Church abhors blood." And meekness has ever been, as a rule, the characteristic of the Pope-Kings. But when his States, the patrimony of the Church, are attacked, meekness and inactivity on his part would be culpable. It is not our province to prove the necessity of temporal sovereignty, as an aid and guarantee for the liberty of the Church; that has been done so effectually by writers of every kind, and in every quarter of the globe, that he who now denies that necessity must be either woefully ignorant or wilfully blind to the truth. But this much we will say: in this matter there is not a mere question of maintaining a reigning dynasty, although even that may sometimes be a holy cause. In the cause of the Pope-King, is involved the question whether or not society is to fall under the domination of mere brutal force, for to such barbarism must society come, if the profession of Christianity is denied it. That the profession is only possible with a free, that is, sovereign Pontiff, is admitted by the more frank of the enemies of the Church, and is asserted by the entire Catholic episcopate (1). Why then should not the Pope defend his temporal rights, if necessary, even with the armed hand? He was not

(1) On the 18th June 1859, Pope Pius IX., in an Apostolic Letter addressed to all the bishops, notified the world of the robbery just consummated in the four Legations; on the 20th, in a Consistorial Allocution, he declared the robbers excommunicated; on the 26th Sept., in another Allocution, he protested against the pretended *annexation* of the Æmelia to the Sardinian kingdom; and on Jan. 19, 1860, in an Encyclical, he informed Christendom why, in his letter to Napoleon III., under date of the 31st December, he had rejected all offers of compromise. His revered and authoritative words were immediately echoed by the bishops of the World. In all ecclesiastical history, there is no such record of unanimity on the part of the episcopal body, in a matter not directly entering into the domain of faith, as the reader will find in the immense collection entitled *The Temporal Sovereignty of the Roman Pontiffs Defended in its Integrity by the Suffrage of the Catholic World, in the Fourteenth Year of the Reign of Pius IX.*: Rome, 1860. The proposition asserted by the bishops may be epitomised as follows: I. It is necessary for the liberty of the Church, at least in the present condition of society, that the Pontiff possess, in a temporal sovereignty, a perfect independence, and a mastership of his own acts; so much so, that, without such sovereignty, persecution and servitude would be the lot of the Church. Hence, although the matter of this question of the temporal power may be political, nevertheless, since that power is sacred in its object, the said question assumes a religious aspect. II. To this fittingness or necessity, Providence has supplied, by means of a principality the most ancient, most legitimate, and least disputed, of all those of modern Europe—a principality constituted with the consent of peoples and of princes, as a patrimony of the Church, and a monarchy hereditary in the successors of Peter; nor, for any reason whatever, can any portion of it be violently usurped, without grave injury to the whole and a no less danger to the rest. III. The Supreme Pontificate, far from preventing the Popes from ruling their states properly, greatly assists them in so doing; and the pretended discontent of the Papal subjects, where not studiously excited by the spoliators, is a calumnious invention, unless, indeed, we are to regard as the people those few who abhor the Pontifical government, merely because it is Christian. In defending these propositions, the bishops, of course, did not mean to present a matter of faith; but, inasmuch as they have reference to the practical principles according to which the faithful should govern their thoughts and actions, we cannot see how the propositions can be questioned by any one unwilling to incur the note of rashness.

blamed when his police arrested, or his courts punished the ordinary criminals of society; why should he be reproved for resisting the enemies of society at large?

There is much similarity between the campaign of St. Leo IX. against the Normans, and the unfortunate yet glorious one which the Papal troops undertook in 1860. In both cases the enemy was composed of baptized persons, professing no heresy, but apparently glorying in the creed of Rome. However, in the case of St. Leo IX., the Pontiff himself marched against the invader; whereas in the campaign of Castel Fidardo the little Papal army, organized to deal only with the hordes of Garibaldi concentrated on the Neapolitan frontier, and expecting no attack from the regular troops of Sardinia, (1) were suddenly and treacherously assailed on their own territory. "Impious men!" said Pope Pius IX., "of whom the Almighty now makes use in order to punish the sins of all, but to disperse them and punish them in the day of his fury,—trampling on the law of God, cursing the voice of the Holy One of Israel, and ceasing not to wage most cruel war on the Church and this Apostolic See. Possessed by the spirit of Satan, they have excited the peoples of Italy to rebellion; they have unjustly expelled legitimate princes, and have disturbed all things human and divine; during the past year they have invaded our States, sacrilegiously occupying some of our provinces, and now they try to invade and usurp the rest." (2).

These aggressors, said the same Pontiff, "for a long time have waged war against the Catholic Church, her ministers, and her property; and, caring nothing for ecclesiastical

(1) The battle of Castelfidardo was fought September 18. It was only on the 10th that Lamoricière was informed by Capt. Farini, aid-de-camp of Gen. Fanti, the Sardinian war-minister and commander-in-chief, that, in certain described cases, the troops of King Victor Emmanuel would cross the frontier. In answer, the hero of Constantina replied: "What you propose to me is a shame and a dishonor—viz., to evacuate without combat the provinces which it is my duty to defend. It would have been more candid on the part of the king of Piedmont and his generals had they at once declared war on us. But, despite the numerical preponderance of the Sardinian army, we shall not forget that, on certain occasions, officers and soldiers must not count the enemy's numbers, nor spare their own lives in preserving the outraged honor of the government they serve." And, as late as September 13, the Duke de Gramont, French ambassador at the Vatican, telegraphed the following to the French Vice-Consul at Ancona: "The emperor has written from Marseilles to the king of Sardinia, that, if the Piedmontese troops enter the pontifical territory, he will be forced to oppose them. Orders have already been given to embark troops at Toulon, and these reinforcement will soon arrive. The Imperial Government will not tolerate the culpable aggression of the Sardinian Government; as Vice-Consul of France, you will regulate your course by this information." (See Lamoricière's "Report" to the Papal Minister of War.)

(2) Letter to the chaplain-in-chief of the Papal army, Sep. 10, 1860

laws or censures, they have dared to imprison illustrious cardinals and bishops and most worthy members of both the secular and regular clergy, to expel religious communities from their cloisters, to appropriate the goods of the Church, and to subvert the civil principality of this Holy See. . . . They open public schools for the teaching of every false doctrine ; with abominable writings and theatrical representations, they offend and banish all modesty, chastity, honesty, and virtue ; they despise the holy mysteries and the Sacraments, the precepts, institutions, ministers, rites, and ceremonies of our holy religion, and try to banish all justice from the earth, and to destroy the very foundations of religion and of civil society." (1)

The use of military force, therefore, was a duty incumbent upon Pius IX., just as it had been on his predecessor, the Ninth Leo. But we must here remark that in the days of St. Leo IX. no one thought of reproving, still less of insulting, the soldiers of the Pope. No Norman knight threw the stigma of "mercenary" in the faces of the defenders of the patrimony of St. Peter ; such mendacious discourtesy was reserved for a Cialdini and a Fanti to display to a Lamoricière, a Pimodan, a Charette, and the hundreds of scions of the noblest blood of Brittany and Belgium, who abandoned wealth and comfort for the defense of the freedom of the Chair of Peter. (2)

They who were killed at Civitella, fighting under the standard of the Keys, were hailed as martyrs, alike by Pontificals and penitent Normans ; and when the holy Leo IX. was seized with his last illness, he said to his weeping attendants : "The time of my departure approaches. Last

(1) Allocution, Sep. 28, 1860.

(2) Read the following proclamation of the Sardinian minister of war : "Foreign bands from every part of Europe have carried into Umbria and the Marches the belied standard of a religion at which they scoff. Without country or roof, they provoke and insult the populations to have a pretext to master them. Such martyrdom must cease, and such insolence is to be suppressed by our succoring, with our arms, those unfortunate sons of Italy who have vainly hoped for justice and mercy from their government. We shall fulfil the mission confided to us by king Victor Emmanuel ; let Europe know that Italy is no longer the rendezvous and the prize of the most audacious or fortunate adventurer. From Headquarters in Arezzo, Sept. 11, 1861. *The Minister of War, commander-in-chief of the Corps of Occupation in the Marches and Umbria : M. FANTI.*" The following morsel from Cialdini is exquisite : "Soldiers of the 4th Corps d'Armée ! I lead you against a herd of foreign drunkards, whom thirst of gold and lust of plunder have attracted to our country. Fight, destroy inexorably these hired assassins ; and let them feel, by your hand, the ire of a people desirous of their nationality and independence. Soldiers ! Unrevenged Perugia demands satisfaction, and though tardily, will have it. *The General Commanding the 4th Corps d'Armée : ENRICO CIALDINI.*" *Civiltà Cattolica*, in its *News of the Day*, s. iv, vol. 8.

night I saw in a vision the heavenly land ; and among other things, I saw crowned as martyrs those who fell in the Puglia fighting for the Church. With one voice they all said to me : ‘ Come and dwell with us ; for it was through thee that we attained this glory.’ ” (1)

It was not given to Lamoricière to crown with his death for Holy Church one of the most glorious military records which even the history of France can furnish. But he became the generous envy of every Christian soldier, and as a prisoner of war for the Roman Pontiff he was greater than when amid his triumphs at Medeah, Mascara, and Constantina. “ I found myself,” he wrote in his “ Report ” to Mgr. de Mérode, “ before a question of duty and honor ; and if, in my resolutions, I had at all considered the gravity of the danger probably awaiting us, my old companions in arms of the French army would have disowned me.”

CHAPTER XI.

THE PONTIFICATE OF ST. GREGORY VII.

Above all the historical personages of the eleventh century, there towers the figure of one person of such pre-eminent calibre, that certain historians have felt themselves compelled to designate that century by his name. As devout children of the Catholic Church, ready to accept any true glorification of her earthly head, we too would be willing to call that age the Hildebrandine ; but when Protestant authors and court-theologians use this term in regard to the century which was honored and fructified by Pope St. Gregory VII., they adopt it rather as a slur upon that period ; they imply, says Palma, that the name of Hildebrand should be assigned to that age which he “ greatly afflicted,” just as the names of Novatian, Arius, Nestorius, Photius, etc., are rightly used to designate the centuries accursed by their influence. If we may credit the opinion of Mosheim (2). Gregory VII. simply tried to

(1) Bollandists, April 11.

(2) *Cent. XI.*, p. 2, c. 2.

subjugate the universe to his temporal behests; if we may believe the Anglican Potter (d. 1747), Gregory would have better consulted his reputation for sanctity, if he had only tried to be a learned and virtuous monk. (1). Of the justice of these views the reader will judge when he has read the short sketch of this Pontificate which we propose to give, and the following chapters on the questions in which Gregory took so prominent a part.

Alexander II. having died in May, 1073, the cardinals immediately elected to the Pontificate the cardinal Hildebrand, who, born in 1018 at Soana in Tuscany, had been taken from among the monks of Cluny by Leo IX. and attached to the immediate service of the Roman Church. His diplomatic and other labors during the reigns of Leo IX., Victor II., Stephen IX., Nicholas II., and Alexander II., had already shown him to be worthy of the encomium of St. Peter Damian, writing to Pope Nicholas II., that he was "a man of most holy and most pure counsel." A man of great intellect, of mortified habits, and inflexible in regard to the rights of the Roman See, and concerning everything pertaining to clerical discipline, he was scarcely settled in the Chair of Peter before he launched the lightnings of the Vatican on all simoniacs, and all married and concubinary priests. So widespread were the disorders of simony and concubinage among the clergy, thanks to the iniquitous system of princely investiture, which filled the ecclesiastical benefices with incumbents who possessed no other qualification than the good will of the great, that everywhere, more especially in Lombardy and in Germany, the decrees of the Pontiff were productive of tumults and even bloody outbreaks. Gregory's zeal for the temporal rights of his See, together with regard for the well being of the vassals of Roman Church, caused him to threaten with excommunication the Norman Guiscard, who had conquered a great portion of the Two Sicilies, a fief of the Holy See, and who delayed his due homage and oath of fidelity to the Pontiff. Guiscard finally obeyed, as did Philip I. of France, who consented, under the same threat of excommunication, to

(1) *Spirit of the Church, etc.*, vol. v., pt. 2, b. 2.

repair many injuries done to his own subjects and to certain Italian merchants in his dominions.

Eleven different Councils were held at Rome during the twelve years of Gregory's Pontificate. In the First, held in 1074, the Pontiff decreed (1): "That all who have been promoted to the grade and office of Holy Orders by the *heresy of simony*, that is, by the use of money, hereafter hold no place of ministry in Holy Church. Those who obtain churches by gifts of money, let them lose their positions altogether." In this Synod, married and incontinent priests were interdicted from the celebration of mass; deacons and subdeacons in the same condition were excluded from the sanctuary. Lambert of Aschaffenburg tells us that when these decrees reached Germany, the married clergy called Gregory "a heretic, who, forgetful of the words of the Lord, that 'all do not understand this word,' would compel men to lead the life of angels . . . that they would sooner abandon the priesthood than the married state." The Second Council was held in 1075, and in it Gregory prohibited all Christians from hearing the masses of married priests." The imperialist Sigebert, in his overwrought zeal for Henry IV., insinuates that the Pontiff forgot that the mass of even a married priest was valid; but Gregory's words show that he did not deny the validity of any ordained priest's mass; that he only wished "that those who would not be corrected by the love of God, and for the dignity of their office, would be influenced by the judgment of the world and by the reproof of the people." In this Synod, Gregory excommunicated several friends and counsellors of Henry IV., who were in the habit of selling bishoprics, etc., namely, the bishops Otho of Ratisbon, Otho of Constance, Burchard of Lausanne; the counts Eberhard and Udalric. Here also was issued the celebrated decree against royal investiture. The Third Council was celebrated in 1076, and herein were excommunicated king Henry IV., the archbishop Sigefrid of Mentz, the bishops William of Utrecht and Robert of Bamberg. Of this Synod we shall have occasion to speak hereafter. The Fourth Council was

(1) *Epistle of Gregory to the Bishop of Constance.* MARIANUS SCOTUS, *Chronicle*, year 1074.

held in 1078, and was composed of a hundred bishops and a large number of abbots and clerics. Herein the archbishops of Milan and Ravenna, who, as we shall see, incited Henry IV. to another outbreak after his simulated penance at Canossa, were deposed from every sacerdotal ministry. In this Synod a decree was issued for the protection of the shipwrecked, and for the condemnation of piratical wreckers. The Fifth Council was celebrated in the same year, 1078, and in it the legates of Henry and of his rival, Rudolph, swore that they would not interfere with the Papal legates sent into Germany to settle their respective claims. The Sixth Council was convened in 1079, and in it Berengarius for the second time, retracted his heresy, and made a third Profession of Faith. Then the legates of Henry and Rudolph promised that a convention for the final settling of their masters' dispute should be held in Germany, in the presence of the Pontiff or of his legates. The Seventh Council met in 1080, and it condemned princely investitures, prohibiting any one to sit among bishops or abbots who had received his episcopal or abbatial investiture from a layman, and interdicting him from entrance into a church until he had resigned his benefice. The Eighth Council was held in 1081, and it confirmed the excommunication of Henry IV. and of all his abettors. The archbishops of Arles and Narbonne were deposed, and Ildimund and Lando, tyrants of Champagne, were anathematized. The Ninth Council met in 1083, and in it, as two of Gregory's epistles show (1), the Pontiff showed himself not unwilling to come to an accommodation with Henry; but, as we shall see, the wickedness of the king rendered hope of peace impossible. The Tenth and Eleventh Councils met in 1084, and both repeated the anathemas against the anti-Pope Guibert and Henry.

We shall devote a chapter to the treatment of the question of investitures. Here we merely observe that Gregory VII. was too far-seeing a man not to know that an endeavor to wrench so great a power from the hands of the usurping princes would be attended by apparently insurmountable

(1) *B. 9, epist. 3, to Altmann of Passau; and epist. 28, To All the Faithful.*

difficulties. He knew that Henry IV., the young king of Germany and expectant emperor, had triumphed over all his enemies at home, and was free to send his victorious troops into Italy. But, under God, he relied upon the greater part of the clergy, who were desirous of throwing off the yoke of this terrible usurpation, and upon the aid of the powerful Matilda, countess of Tuscany, as well as upon that of Robert Guiscard, who was bound by gratitude and vassallage to the Holy See.

Before the storm in Germany burst forth in its utmost fury, the Pontiff was greatly afflicted by disorders in Lombardy and by an outrage against his own person in Rome, both of which events were produced by his inflexible severity in the matter of ecclesiastical celibacy. Erlembald, archbishop of Milan, having adopted rigorous measures against the violators of the Canons, was attacked in the open street by these gentry and their friends, and after a bloody and obstinate resistance on the part of his cortege, was stretched dead on the pavement. In Rome, on Christmas eve, while the Pontiff was assisting at the divine office in St. Mary Major's, one Cencio, prefect of the city, burst into the sanctuary at the head of an armed band, dragged the Pope from the altar, and carried him prisoner to a fortified tower which the noble brigand possessed in the city. When the sacrilege was made known to the people, they rushed to arms, forced an entrance to the tower, and found the wretched Cencio kneeling before Gregory, begging him to save his life. The Pontiff forgave him and assisted him and his family to depart from Rome, imposing upon him, however, the penance of a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. (1). In the year 1076 the question of investitures resolved itself into open war between the Pope and the German king. The Pontiff had tried every peaceful measure to induce the young Henry to renounce the usurpation of his predecessors, but the haughty monarch was inflated by his recent victories over the Saxons, and was, besides, not very scrupulous in religious matters. Hence he loudly proclaimed that the conceding of investiture to bishops, abbots,

(1) LAMBERT of Aschaffenburg and PAUL Briedensis.

etc., was an inalienable right of his crown, and he was eagerly supported by the many whose interest it was to perpetuate what was a source of immense revenue to both king and courtiers. At length, tired of advising, praying, and threatening, Gregory published the decree against investitures which had been issued in his Second Synod in 1075. Henry grew furious, and in his turn, called a Diet at Worms, composed of his partisan bishops and many of the higher German nobles. By this convention the Pontiff himself was declared excommunicated; his election was pronounced null and void, as having been made without the consent of the king, and his deposition from the Pontificate was proclaimed. To this presumptuous and sacrilegious proceeding Gregory answered with a solemn excommunication of Henry and all his abettors, declaring him deposed from his throne, and pronouncing his subjects free from their obligation of allegiance. Henry now sent emissaries through Germany and Italy to excite the princes, bishops, and people against the Pontiff. He even sent an audacious ecclesiastic into the Pope's presence, who, in the name of the king, ordered Gregory, "the intruder," to make room for a legitimate Pontiff. The people would have torn this miserable man to pieces, had Gregory himself not protected him. But the censures of the Vatican soon told upon the princes, clergy, and people of Germany. Although many of the clergy were incontinent and simoniacal, the idea of being governed by an excommunicated monarch was horrible to them; and although Henry, rightly dreading the effect of their influence upon the people, now showered favors upon them, he experienced the mortification of beholding a Diet, convoked successively at Utrecht, Oppenheim, and Tribur, proclaiming his deposition from the throne. Immediately the great princes and the nobles, with few exceptions, abandoned the disgraced Henry; some even prepared to attack him and force him to an abdication. Then it was that the cowering monarch resolved to submit to necessity, and throw himself at the feet of the Pontiff. Disbanding his troops, and dismissing the few princes and nobles who still clung to his standard, he crossed the Alps

with a small retinue, in the midst of a most rigorous winter, and prepared to submit to his priestly adversary.

At this time Pope Gregory had left Rome with the intention of proceeding to Germany, at the request of the princes, to there pronounce sentence upon all points in dispute between the Papacy and the empire. He was resting in the strong fortress of Canossa, one of the strongholds of the "great Countess," Matilda, when an embassy from Henry appeared at the gates and besought an audience. The ambassadors were Amadeo, count of Savoy, Albertazzo, count of Este, and the abbot of Cluny. They informed Gregory that Henry had come, almost alone and without arms, to beg pardon of his spiritual father and to be reconciled with the Church of God. Henry then presented himself outside the fortress, dressed in sackcloth, bare-headed and bare-footed, in spite of the cold, and begged admission. After some delay he was introduced, entirely alone, but only into the outworks, and there he passed three days and three nights, no one approaching him even with a word of comfort. On the fourth day he was admitted into the presence of the Pontiff, and was absolved, on condition that he would conduct himself as an excommunicated person until the assembling of the Diet at Augsburg, when a definite judgment would be pronounced in his case. (1). When the tidings of this humiliation of Henry reached the ears of his partisans in Lombardy, who were far more bitter than the Germans against the Pontiff, they became so indignant at what they styled Henry's lack of firmness, that, on his passing through their country while on his return to Germany, he not unfrequently found the gates of the cities and castles shut in his face. Then it was that the monarch

(1) The historian Leo, a German and a Protestant, in his *History of Italy*, b. iv., c. 4, § 5, writes: Some German writers describe the episode at Canossa as an insult of an arrogant prelate to the German nation. This boldness is unworthy of an enlightened people. Let us, for an instant, lay aside the prejudices born of Protestantism and national pride, and let us entertain a truly Protestant freedom of thought. We behold in Gregory a man issued from a class enjoying no political privileges, a man relying only on the force of his own genius and of his own will, raising a vilified institution, the Church, out of abjection, and giving to it a splendor hitherto unknown. In Henry, on the contrary, we see a man—if he merits that name—whose father bequeathed him an almost absolute power over a brave and rich people, and who, in spite of such plenitude of external means, has been drawn by his base character into the mud of the worst vices; we see this person become an abject suppliant, and, after trampling on all that men hold as most sacred, trembling at the voice of an intellectual hero. Of limited spirit, indeed, is the one whom national vanity can so blind, that he will not exult at the triumph, effected at Canossa, of a most profound genius over a vile and characterless man."

showed how insincere had been his submission at Canossa. In order to prevent his partisans from entirely abandoning him, he listened to the suggestions of the excommunicated archbishop of Ravenna, and openly and publicly violated the conditions of his absolution. He appeared before the army clothed in his royal robes, and declared himself ready to vindicate the royal dignity outraged by Gregory. When Gregory was informed of Henry's proceedings, he renewed the excommunication, and sending legates to Germany, convoked a Diet. Henry was there deposed, and the crown was offered to Rudolph, duke of Suabia. The Pontifical forces were then joined to those of the countess Matilda, and Gregory was fairly embarked in secular as well as spiritual war. In this struggle no part was taken by Venice, Genoa, or Pisa, which republics were too intent upon the development of their commerce and industries, to interfere, unless they found their monetary interest in jeopardy. Robert Guiscard also, for a time, remained neutral, as he found it enough to consolidate and extend his Sicilian dominions. The Norman, however, took advantage of Gregory's being fully occupied with Henry in the North, and invading the territories of the Church which lay in the southern Campagna, he besieged Benevento. It was then that Desiderio, the holy abbot of Montecassino and destined successor of Gregory, entered the camp of Guiscard and prevailed upon him to relinquish his ungrateful and sacrilegious enterprise. The war in Germany between the rivals Henry and Rudolph was waged with alternate success for three years, and in it there perished many bishops and ecclesiastics, who, according to the terms of their tenures as civil barons, owed military allegiance to the king, either personal or by substitute, for their domains, and who themselves were too frequently willing to don the cuirass. In his Seventh Synod, held in 1080, our Pontiff again declared Henry deposed from the German throne, confirmed the election of Rudolph, and sent the latter a golden crown, inscribed "The rock (*Petra*) gave the diadem to Peter, and Peter gave one to Rudolph." When Henry learned of this decisive step in favor of his adversa-

ry, he convoked at Brixen a pretended Synod, which was composed of both his Italian and German partisans; and he caused a proclamation to be made to the effect that Gregory was deposed, and that in his place was located Guibert, the excommunicated archbishop of Ravenna, under the name of Clement III. While Guibert was enrolling soldiers for a march upon Rome, Henry and Rudolph met, for the fourth time, in pitched battle, and Rudolph was slain. About the same time the heroic countess Matilda, ever true to the cause of the Church, saw her troops defeated by those of Guibert. Henry now descended into Italy, at the head of a large army, with the avowed intention of installing Guibert in the chair of Peter, and of receiving from him the imperial crown. Many of Gregory's counselors, seeing the present inability of Matilda, the Pontiff's great reliance, to assist the Holy See, advised him to come to terms with Henry. But the wise and determined Pope replied that, even if he could bring himself to so humiliate the Holy See, which he never would do, it would not be prudent to confide in the promises of the perjured Henry. He therefore sent legates into Germany, who convoked a Diet of bishops and princes, and Hermann of Lorraine was chosen king of the Germans. The news of this election showed Henry that the Pontiff was inflexible and implacable in his regard. He therefore detached part of his army to occupy the attention of Matilda, and ordered the rest to march on the Eternal City. When he arrived in the meadows of Nero, he found that the walls and towers of Rome were well-manned by an ardent citizen-soldiery, whom the harangues of Gregory had induced to aid his few regular troops in the defence. For a short time the monarch presided over the siege, but growing tired of inactivity, he turned over the guidance of this operation to his anti-Pope, and withdrew with a portion of his men, to join the army operating against Matilda. But he was able to do no more than devastate the outlying districts of Tuscany, for the countess, perceiving that her troops were too few to successfully cope with Henry in the open field, kept them within her castles and fortified cities. The enraged mon-

arch now returned to the siege of Rome. In vain he ordered many assaults. Always repulsed, he had made up his mind to await the slow effect of hunger upon the Romans, when treachery came to his aid during the Lent of 1084.

The emperor Alexius Comnenus, hardly pressed, not only in his Sicilian dominions, but nearer to home, by his enemy Guiscard, had offered Henry a large sum of money if he would direct his arms against the Norman. This money Henry had in his camp, and he resolved to use it to immediate advantage. He succeeded in corrupting some of the citizens, upon whom the horrors of a strict blockade had begun to tell, and on the Thursday before Palm Sunday the Lateran gate, now called St. John's, was opened. With his anti-Pope and army Henry entered the city, occupied the Lateran palace, the bridges over the Tiber, and most of the strategic points. Pope Gregory had shut himself in the strong castle of San Angelo: and Henry, having received the imperial crown from Guibert, awaited the reduction of the fortress. But the monarch now learned that Guiscard had suddenly left the theatre of his victories in Greece, and that, having entrusted the prosecution of his designs against Alexius to his son Bohemond, he was coming to the aid of his suzerain at the head of a powerful force. Henry felt that the previous campaign had left him too weak to meet Guiscard in the field, and he knew that Rome was not yet sufficiently provisioned to warrant its undergoing a new siege. Therefore, taking with him his precious anti-Pope, he evacuated the city, and directed his march to the north. Guiscard entered Rome the following day, and wickedly and unwisely allowed his soldiery to punish the treachery of a few of the Romans, by a wholesale sacking of the city. Gregory in vain tried to prevent the devastation, and as the Romans were naturally in a most irritated state of mind, he deemed it wise to accompany Guiscard into that prince's Sicilian dominions. Proceeding first to Montecassino, he finally made his residence in Salerno. In May of the following year, feeling that death was coming upon him, he summoned all the cardinals to his presence, and earnestly exhorted them to

recognize as his successor only a canonically elected person. Being asked whom he would prefer for that office, he suggested as his first choice the cardinal Desiderio, abbot of Montecassino; as his second, the cardinal Otho of Ostia, or Hugh, archbishop of Lyons. Fortified by the last sacraments, he passed from a stormy life, his final words being: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity; therefore I die in exile."

Sigebert asserts that he "found it written," that, when Pope Gregory became aware of the approach of death, he rescinded his condemnation of Henry IV.: "The Apostolic lord Hildebrand, or Gregory, being at the point of death, called to himself one of the twelve cardinals whom he loved more than the rest, and avowed to God, and St. Peter, and the entire Church, that he had greatly sinned in the pastoral office committed to him, and that, by the persuasion of the devil, he had excited hatred and anger in the human race. . . . He then sent the aforesaid confessor to the emperor and to the whole Church, that he might obtain pardon, for he saw the end of life approaching. . . . and he abrogated all his decrees against the emperor, etc." But this interested discovery of the imperialist Sigebert is shown to be valueless by the testimony of grave contemporary authors, such as Paul Briedensis and Hugh of Flavigny. The first writes: "The Blessed Pope Gregory, being asked whether he wished to absolve those whom he had excommunicated, replied: 'I absolve and bless all who, without doubt, believe that I have this special power in the place of the Apostles Peter and Paul; *all excepting the said king and Guibert*, the invader of the Apostolic See, and the principal persons who have aided their iniquity by counsel or assistance.'" Hugh, abbot of Flavigny, in the *Chronicle of Verdun*, says: "knowing that the day of his summons was at hand, long before it he called together the cardinals, bishops, and his other fellow-captives, and predicted the day of his death. Having arranged all the affairs of the ecclesiastical government, on the 15th of the Calends of June he urged the aforesaid brethren, in the name of holy obedience, to presume not to keep silence if

they knew of anything that he ought to correct. And when they commended his course of life and his holy teachings, his morals and the fervor of his holy zeal, he forced them, by his Apostolic authority, to give him, one by one, their hands, and to promise that they would never receive that heretical invader of the Holy and Apostolic Church, unless perchance he canonically repented, and, deprived of all dignities of the ecclesiastical order, should offer a pure confession to the cardinals and bishops; affirming and attesting that all should be forever condemned who would presume to communicate with the arch-pirate Henry, the usurper of the empire, unless, having laid aside the dignity of king, he should, according to command, do penance."

Various indeed must necessarily be the judgments of critics upon such a Pontificate as that of Gregory VII. A modern author, much esteemed by the unitarians now at the helm in Italy, writes: "The Seventh Gregory was a Pontiff of pure life, austere virtue, and indomitable will. If human prudence can reproach him for an inflexibility which savors of excess, and for pretensions to a supremacy which may appear unlimited, we must not forget the enormity of the abuses that he was obliged to correct, and the unbridled tyranny that he strove to repress. From his attack on the imperial power in Italy came the completion of the establishment of the Italian communes, which, because the schism had enervated the authority of the imperial counts and of the prince-bishops of the cities, now commenced to elect their own magistrates." (1). Imperialist and Gallican writers generally hold that Gregory was so elated by his elevated views of his Apostolate that he wished everything, sacred and profane, to be prostrate at his feet. Alexandre is more moderate, when speaking of this Pontiff, than most authors of his school. For while he contends that "Gregory was the first Pope who claimed the power to depose kings, and this, also, against the teachings of the Fathers and of Scripture," he admits his sanctity and single-mindedness, and believes him to have been influenced, in his course toward Henry IV., by the

SPORZOSI, *History of Italy*, p. 286; Florence, 1858.

opinion, "held by Gregory, by certain other Pontiffs, and by some authors, that a change had come over the empire and the imperial dignity, when the empire was transferred to the Germans, and the confirmation of the imperial election devolved upon the Pontiff;" that, in fine, the empire was a fief of the Holy See. (1). That this opinion was as old as the Holy Roman empire itself, we have already seen when treating of that empire's foundation. Alexandre is unwilling to concede this, but though he did concede it, he would deny the application of the principle to the case of any other sovereign than the emperor; most especially, to the case of his Most Christian Majesty of France. We shall treat of this point when we come to our special chapter on the deposing power of the Pope.

Henke says of Gregory VII. that he was "a shameless and wicked man, full of tricks, and a rash innovator, although he had the prudence of a statesman and the courage, energy, and firmness of a hero. He was low and vile, although externally he presented a noble independence. He was a pretended saint, adored by his partisans and a man without religion, faith, or belief; one of his intimate friends called him St. Satan" (2). Schroek admires his perspicacity and his knowledge of the human heart, but reproaches him with dissimulation, an indomitable pride, unmeasured ambition, and obstinacy. (3). Bower says that our Pontiff tried to establish an absolute and universal despotism, and implies that he was a heretic, hypocrite, and impostor. (4). Sismondi says that he was dominated by an insupportable arrogance and an unlimited ambition, and that he sacrificed everything to these two passions. (5). After such judgments it is refreshing to hear the Protestant Voigt saying: "Gregory was profoundly convinced that religion alone can procure to the world safety, happiness, and universal peace; he was persuaded that the sole organ of religion is the Church, which, in his eyes, is the interpreter of the will of the Most High. But to attain this object the Church should have some means of subsistence; the mor., she separated

(1) *Cent. ii., diss. 2, art. 9.*(2) *History of the Christian Church, p. 2.*(3) *History of the Church, p. 2.*(4) *History of the Roman Popes, B. vi.*(5) *Italian Republics, vol. i.*

herself from the state, or severed the ties hitherto binding them, the more urgent it became to provide for her existence in some other manner. Restored to her liberty, the Church could rely only upon herself, upon her own rights, and not upon the favors of the state. . . . Gregory was a Pope, and acted as one; in this aspect, he was grand and admirable. To form a right judgment upon his actions, one should consider his object and his intentions, and should see what was necessary for his time. A generous indignation may seize a German, when he beholds the humiliation of his emperor at Canossa. or a Frenchman, when he hears the severe lessons given to his king. But the historian, who regards the life of peoples from a general point of view, rises above the narrow horizon of German or Frenchman, and finds these things just, although others condemn them. . . . Gregory's has been the lot of all the great men of history; there have been ascribed to him motives of which it would be difficult, if not impossible, to prove the existence. . . . Nevertheless, even the enemies of Gregory are obliged to admit that his dominating idea, the independence of the Church, was indispensable for the propagation of religion, for the reform of society, and that, to obtain this effect, it was necessary to sever all the ties which had bound the Church to the state, to the detriment of religion; the Church had to be an entirety, one in herself, and by herself a divine institution, whose salutary influence over all men was not to be checked by any prince of the earth. . . . The genius of Gregory embraced, and had to embrace, the whole Christian world, because the independence of the Church was a general idea; his action was necessarily energetic, for he acted *in his century*: his faith and his conviction were what they were, because the course of events had given them birth. It is difficult to give him exaggerated praise, because he everywhere laid the foundations of a solid glory." (1)

(1) *Gregory VII.*, B. xii. We take pleasure in subjoining the following reflections of the Abbé Jager, taken from his *Introduction* to the work of Voigt. "The great men who appear in critical times, as instruments of Providence, do not always labor for their own epoch, but for the future. . . . So it was with Gregory. In spite of all obstacles, in spite of every effort of the imperial power, he died a conqueror; but he did not enjoy his victory. The Anti-Pope Guibert did not ascend the Pontifical throne; Henry did not die an emperor; investitures were abolished; the Church obtained worthy ministers; a new era was inaugurated—the twelfth century, so remarkable in history. This was entirely the work of Gregory, for when we compare the tenth century with the twelfth, we see the traces of a

There are several subjects of importance, connected with the Pontificate of St. Gregory VII., to each of which a special chapter must be devoted. These are the freedom of Papal elections, to restore which our Pontiff spared no labor; the question of investitures, the settlement of which may be regarded as the one object of his life; clerical celibacy, the enforcement of which excited in Gregory more zeal than had been shown by any of his predecessors, and the right exercised by the Roman Pontiffs, during the Middle Ages, to depose sovereigns. But before we treat of these questions, we would submit to the reader some passages from the *Epistles* of Gregory, which illustrate the spirit which animated his whole career. "The Church ought to be independent of every secular power. The altar is reserved to him who, through an uninterrupted series of Pontiffs, succeeds to St. Peter. The sword of princes is subject to the Pontiff, and is obtained from him, for it is a human thing; the altar, the Chair of Peter, came from God, and depend from Him alone (iii., 18; viii., 21). The Church is now buried in sin, because she is not free, because she is attached to the world and to worldly things (i., 42, 55); her ministers are not legitimate when instituted by men of the world; among the anointed ones of God abound cupidities and criminal passions, and hence we behold dissensions, haughtiness, and envy, where ought to reign the peace of God (ii., 11; i., 42; ii., 45; vii., 2; viii., 17). The Church ought to be free, and to become so, by means of her head, the first person of Christendom, the sun of faith. The Pope holds the place of God, and governs His kingdom on earth; without him, there is no kingdom; without him, government disappears, like a leaking ship. Things of the world pertain to the emperor; those of God to the Pope. Therefore the latter must relieve the ministers of the altar from the chains imposed on them by the lay power. The state is one thing, the Church another. As faith is one, so

great man. This great man was Gregory, the Hercules of the Middle Ages. He chained up their monsters; he destroyed the feudal hydra; he saved Europe from barbarism; and, what is still more praiseworthy, he illuminated Christendom by his virtues. The grateful Church has canonized him, and never was that homage more merited: for Gregory is covered with immortal glory, a glory without stain, which, in spite of prejudice, has always found some to appreciate it, and which, it is said, caused the most illustrious soldier of modern times to exclaim, 'If I were not Napoleon, I would wish to be Gregory VII.'"

the Church is one ; the Pope is one, the faithful members one. If the Church exists by herself, she ought not to operate by herself. Just as a spiritual thing is visible only by an earthly form, and as the soul operates by the body, so religion does not exist without the Church, and the Church does not exist without the possessions which assure her existence (i., 7). As the spirit is nourished by earthly things in the body, so the Church is maintained by temporal possessions. It is the duty of the emperor, who holds the supreme power, to see that the Church procures and preserves these possessions ; therefore, emperors and rulers are necessary for the Church (i., 75 ; v., 10 ; vi., 20) ; but she exists only through the Pope, and the Pope exists only through God (i., 39). If the Church and the empire are to prosper, the priesthood and the lay power must be strongly connected, and must unite their forces for the peace of the world (i., 19). The world is lighted by two luminaries ; a greater one, the sun, and a lesser one, the moon. The Apostolic authority can be compared to the sun ; the royal power to the moon. Just as the moon illuminates only because of the sun, so emperors, kings, and princes subsist only by the grace of the Pontiff, who comes from God. The power of the Roman See is immeasurably greater than that of princes ; a king owes obedience to the Pope (ii., 13, 31 ; viii., 21 ; i., 75 ; viii., 20, 23). As the Pope comes from God, every thing is subject to him ; spiritual and temporal affairs should be brought to his tribunal ; he it is who should teach, exhort, punish, correct, judge, decide. The Church is the tribunal of God (i., 62, 35, 15 ; ii., 51 ; vii., 21 ; ix., 9 ; i., 60 ; vii., 25) ; she is the finger of God. Great and tremendous is the dignity of the Pope, the representative of Christ (i., 53), for of him it is written, 'Thou art Peter, etc.' (vii., 6 ; viii., 20). The Church is composed of all those who profess the name of Christ and are called Christians ; hence all particular churches are members of the Church of Peter, that is, of the Roman Church. This Roman Church is the mother of all the churches of Christendom, all of whom are subject to her, as daughters to a mother (ii., 1 ; iv., 28). As a mother, the Roman Church

commands all churches, and all their members, archbishops, bishops, priests, emperors, kings, princes, and the rest of the faithful. By virtue of her authority, the Roman Church institutes and can depose all these; she conters their power, and not for their glory, but for the good of the many. Whenever they enter into the ways of sin, their holy mother is obliged to check them; otherwise, she would share their guilt (i., 60; viii., 21; ii., 18, 32; vii., 4; v., 5; ii., 5; iii., 4; iv., 1; *Appendix*, i., 3, 4). He who holds the place of Jesus Christ on this earth, may find much opposition; but he must stand firm in his position, and suffer, as did his Master (iv., 24). From the head of the Church must proceed all reforms; he, therefore, must declare war on vice, and he must aid all who are persecuted for the sake of justice and truth. He who threatens, or does violence to the Church, or who causes grief in her heart, is a son of the demon, and she must banish him from human society (*Append.*, ii., 15; iv., 37; vi., 1)."

Convinced of the truth of these conceptions, Pope St. Gregory VII. devoted his life to their actuation; and while his frankness and vigor may astound men of to-day, they were adapted to the needs of his time, just as his sentiments were conformable to the persuasions of that time. Therefore, says Cantù, "he claimed the right of high domain over Sicily, Spain, Sardinia, Hungary, and Dalmatia, the princes of which countries, recognizing the wisdom, justice, learning, and protecting authority of Rome, had made their crowns feudatory to her, thus assuring to themselves and their heirs a protection against foreign attack and domestic rebellion. . . . Our age, which styles itself liberal, bases its constitutions on the inviolability, or rather the infallibility, of kings, and it rages at the thought of their responsibility for their acts. Our ignorant ancestors saw infallibility only in that Church with whom Christ promised to ever abide; they thought that the Church possessed the right of watching the conduct of rulers, of correcting their sins, and of punishing their contumacy. The wisdom of to-day, in order to balance power, introduces a royal veto, and a refusal, on the part of parliament,

to vote the budget; and the Chambers not only call the ministers to account for their administration, but sometimes pretend to change dynasties and to send kings to the scaffold or into exile. Terms have changed; the substance of things remains. In the days of Gregory, no one had heard the maxim that ordinary morality and equity should not regulate government affairs. Then—and let it be noted by those who believe that liberty was born only yesterday—no man was born a king. He was elected a king, and merit was a condition of his election. Kings were not despots, but were limited by the Assemblies of the nation, and the supreme authority of the Pope was acknowledged, not only by the Canon, but by the civil law.” (1)

CHAPTER XII.

THE ELECTION OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF, AND HILDEBRAND'S DEFENCE OF ITS FREEDOM.

When Pope St. Gregory VII. ascended the Pontifical throne, many abuses claimed his immediate attention, but there was one the thought of which stirred his inmost soul, for often its exercise nearly annihilated the Apostolic liberty of Christ's vicar, and nearly neutralized his influence over the hearts of men. For a long time princes had more or less controlled the Papal elections, and the emperors “of the Romans” now claimed a right to exercise such control. Of the few “bad Popes” who have reigned, nearly all owed their elevation to the schemes of princes. When Hildebrand was elected, the Christian world yet blushed at the memory of John X., thrust upon the Papal throne by Theodora, his mistress (2); of Sergius III., who also owed

(1) *Illustrious Italians*, vol. i., art. *Gregory VII.* (Milan, 1873).

(2) In early life, John frequently came to Rome on business for the archbishop of Ravenna, his ordinary. Being possessed of great beauty, he touched the imagination of Theodora, a noble Roman dame, and she succeeded in seducing him. She soon procured for him the see of Ravenna, and finally, that she might keep him in Rome, intrigued with Landolph, prince of Benevento and Capua, to raise him to the Papacy, in 915. After his elevation, John emancipated himself from Theodora's influence and rendered great service to the Church and to Italy. In 928, Marozia, a daughter of Theodora and duchess of Tuscany, who had inherited her mother's power in Rome, fearing to lose her influence if Hugh of Provence, whom John favored, were made emperor, seized the Pope, threw him into a dungeon, and there had him assassinated. See LIUTPRAND, B. iii., c. 12. FLODOARD, *Chronicle*, year 929.

his elevation to the schemes of a mistress, Marozia; of John XI., son of this Marozia, perhaps by Sergius III. (1). Four successive Pontiffs owed their election to Alberic, the son of Marozia and half-brother to John XI., whom he imprisoned; and the influence of this family procured the tiara for Octavian, (John XII.), son of Alberic, when he was only eighteen years old. To obviate these evils, St. Gregory VII. used all his energy to restore to the Holy See its freedom of election. We now proceed to give a brief description of the various phases through which the system of elections passed, from the days of St. Peter to those of Hildebrand.

Down to the time of Constantine, the only relations between the Pontiffs and the emperors were those of persecuted and persecutors; but for this very reason, while there was no external liberty for the Church, her internal liberty was inviolate. Receiving no favors from the state, the Holy See was forced to grant none, and the clergy and people of Rome were free to choose their pastor. Nor is it strange that, at that time, unworthy arts were seldom employed to secure the prize of the Papacy. Torture and death were the almost certain earthly rewards of the office. Nor was liberty of election infringed by the early successors of Constantine. In the schism of Ursicinus against Pope St. Damasus (367), and of Eulalius against St. Boniface I. (418), the emperors followed and defended the decision of the better and greater part of the clergy. Odoacer, king of the Heruli (476), was the first ruler who forgot his duty in this matter. His edict was recited in the fourth Synod of Pope Symmachus by the deacon Hormisdas, and from it we learn that Pope Simplicius (467—483) had requested that the prince would repress any tumults that might occur at the election of his successor, and that Odoacer thereupon decreed that no Papal election should be held without his advice and sanction. This decree was never put into execution, and the fourth Synod of Symmachus protested that "for a layman to interfere in an ecclesiastical election was plainly against the Canons."

(1) So says Liutprand, but other authors ascribe John's paternity to Marozia's second husband, Guy of Tuscany.

When, in 523, Theodoric the Ostrogoth had thrown Pope John I. into prison, there to perish, he compelled the Romans to receive Felix IV. As Felix was a reputable and fit man, the clergy deemed it best to acquiesce, and after a short time they consented to his elevation. Atalaric (526) decreed that the Pontifical election should be made, indeed, by the Roman clergy, but that a notification, accompanied by a donation of 3000 ducats, should be sent to the king of Italy. Here we may observe that neither the Western emperors nor the Gothic kings of Italy ever claimed an *originary and inborn* power of controlling a Papal election; they merely pretended to obviate discord. This originary and inborn right of princes is generally conceded by the olden Protestant jurists (1) and by Catholics of the stamp of Hontheim (Febronius) and Giannone. Their principle, "his is the religion, whose is the region," necessarily involves such a claim. But, says Muratori, "the kings of Italy never claimed (in a Papal election) the right of *eminent dominion* . . . the Western emperors never exercised that power." We may also note that, during the domination of the Western emperors and of the Gothic kings, there is no vestige of any recognition, on the part of the Church, of any princely right to interfere in a Papal election; when the clergy yielded, as in the case of Silverius, imposed upon them by Theodatus (536), it was under protest, and to avoid greater evils. When the valor of Belisarius had subverted the Gothic rule in Italy (536), and restored the peninsula and adjacent islands to the empire of Constantinople, the emperors insisted that the certificate of a Papal election should be sent to them; but they did this without any pretense of interference, and only for the sake of the donation which was to accompany the document. Cardinal Deusdedit speaks of this custom as follows: "While we read that the decree of election was frequently sent to the emperors, we never read that they contradicted the choice of the Romans. . . . After a time this custom came to an end, or at the most, it was only kept up by the exarchs of Ravenna. For we read that at

(1) See PUFFENDORF and GROTIUS, *passim*.

this period the *interpontificia* (1) were very short. The *interpontificia* are counted from the burial of the deceased Pope until the day of consecration of the new one. Three acts were performed in regard to a new Pontiff: the election, which was restricted to no definite locality; the enthronization, in the Lateran; the consecration, in the Vatican basilica. Sometimes the enthronization or legitimate 'possession' (2) preceded the consecration; hence the duration of the *interpontificium* is calculated up to the day of consecration. When, then, we see that there was a very brief *interpontificium*, we may conclude that the consecration was performed without the assent of the emperor, since there was not sufficient time to obtain it." (3). The emperor Constantine Pogonatus (668) remitted the odious tax on a confirmatory decree, although he at first insisted upon the imperial assent being obtained for the consecration; but finally, as we learn from Anastasius (4), he issued a decree, permitting that "the one elected to the Apostolic See should be consecrated without delay." Here again, then, just as in the case of the Western emperors and the Gothic kings of Italy, we find that the Eastern emperors claimed no right of eminent dominion in confirming a Papal election.

The emperor Charlemagne carefully abstained from any interference in Pontifical elections. Florus the Deacon, writing in the middle of the ninth century, says: "We observe that in the Roman Church, down to the present day, the Pontiff is consecrated after the manifestation of the divine judgment, and without any interposition of princely consent." (5). Equally just was Louis the Compliant, as is proved by Leo of Ostia, Anselm, and Ivo, who give his decree, ordering that Papal elections shall proceed, "according to the Canons, without contradiction; and when the Pontiff shall have been consecrated, he shall send unto us legates, who will confirm peace, charity, and friendship between him and ourselves, as was the custom in the times of our great-grandfather, Charles (Martel), of our grandfather, Pepin, and of our father, the emperor Charles, all of blessed

(1) This term corresponds to the "interregnum" of civil governments.

(2) In Italian, *il possesso*.

(3) *Againi Schismatics*, B. i.

(4) *Lives of St. Benedict II. and John V.*

(5) *Election of Bishops*.

memory." But the emperor Lothaire (840-855), as we read in the *Bertinian Annals*, did interfere in Papal elections. He sent Hulderic to Rome, in 844, with orders that "hereafter, on the death of the Apostolic, no one shall be consecrated Pontiff without our consent, or in the absence of our ambassadors." Some critics deny the authenticity of this decree, but we know that at this time the *interpontificia* were unusually long; thus sixty-five days elapsed between the death of Valentine and the election of Gregory IV. Again, the interference of Lothaire is plainly shown by the *Bertinian Annals*, when they tell us that, on the death of Valentine, "the priest Gregory was elected, but not consecrated, until the imperial legate had come to Rome and inquired into the election." This move of Lothaire, however, was of little consequence. Sergius II. succeeded Gregory IV. fifteen days after the latter's death, and Anastasius says of St. Leo IV. (847) that "they consecrated him Pontiff without the permission of the prince." Again, down to 884, the *interpontificia* were very short; from Leo IV. to Benedict III., forty-four days; from the latter to Nicholas I., fourteen days; from John VIII. to Martin II., seven days; from Martin II. to Adrian II., six days. Here we must make mention of a decree of Pope Stephen IV. (1), which we find in Anastasius and in Anselm of Lucca: "Under pain of anathema we decree that no layman, whether of the civil or military order, presume to be found at an election of a Pontiff; let the election be made by certain priests and officers of the Church, and by the entire clergy."

We now approach the period when the liberty of the Church was to be attacked by those whose first duty, inculcated especially by their coronation oath, was its defense. It was reserved for the emperors of the German line to attempt to destroy that which the Byzantine sovereigns, the Gothic kings of Italy, and the French emperors, had scrupulously respected. In *Dist.* 63, chap. *Synod*, Gratian gives a decree of the anti-Pope Leo VIII., in which that intruder pretended, in return for his elevation, to concede to

(1) Some chronologists call him Stephen III., since they wish not to count Stephen II. (752), who died before his consecration, on the third day after his election.

Otho I. and his successors the right of choosing the Roman Pontiff. In our chapter on the *Pretended Deposition of John XII.* we have given the reasons for which Baronio regards this decree as supposititious (1), but here we will remark that, even though it be authentic, it can have no value, being the work, not of a legitimate, but of an anti-Pope. However, all the early German sovereigns interfered, more or less, in the Papal elections, and, on the Christmas of 1049, the deacon Hildebrand, the future Gregory VII., first displayed his invincible opposition to their usurpation. It was then that he persuaded Bruno, bishop of Toul, who had just been named Pontiff by a Synod at Worms, and who stopped at Cluny on his way to Rome, to doff the Pontifical robes, and to proceed to the Eternal City, dressed as a pilgrim, and to await his election by the Roman clergy. Hildebrand's second opportunity of combatting the imperial pretensions arrived in 1054. As we have seen, he had been for five years a cardinal-deacon, and was regarded as the right-arm of the Holy See. He was sent to Germany, on the death of Leo IX., to select, in the name of the Roman clergy and people, a new Pontiff. His choice fell on Gebhard, bishop of Eichstadt, a man of much prudence, and much loved by Henry III. (2); but when Hildebrand met Henry at Mayence, and mentioned his preference, the emperor again and again suggested another person for the Papacy. But Hildebrand persisted, and finally Gebhard departed for Rome, where he was formally elected by the clergy and people, and took the name of Victor II. And here we may observe that, while Hildebrand was determined that only the clergy and people of Rome should elect their Pontiff, he was too much of a statesman to unnecessarily excite the ill-will of the emperors. In his time, men had not excogitated the principle, nowadays so often badly applied, of a "free Church in a free state;" his idea was rather to preserve a harmony between Church and state, each being independent in its own sphere, but each helping the other. Thus, in the election of Leo IX. at Worms, he did not resist the emperor, but merely insisted that the Romans

(1) Bianchi and Catalani also reject it.

(2) LEO OF OSTIA, *Cassinense Chronicle*, b. ii., c. 80.

themselves should first signify their will ; in the election of Victor II., he preferred a person beloved by the emperor.

During the reign of Nicholas II., Hildebrand procured, in a Roman Synod, held in 1059, the publication of a decree which would define the limits of the two powers in the matter of an election. It reads as follows : “ The cardinal-bishops will carefully consult together, and will immediately convene with the cardinal-priests and deacons ; then the remaining clergy and the people will approach to give their consent to the election. they will select one from the bosom of the Roman Church, if one can be found fit ; but if such is not found, let him be taken from another church, saving the honor and reverence due to our dear son Henry, at present king, and, as is hoped, God granting, future emperor, as we have conceded this to him and his successors, *who will personally ask the Apostolic See for this right.*” (1) This decree was signed by eighty persons, archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons. “ It is certain,” says the Protestant Voigt, “ that this Canon was a masterpiece of Pontifical wisdom, or rather of that of Hildebrand. It took from the emperor the right of approving of the election of Popes, a right until then uncontested. The Canon does not expressly state this, but it says sufficient when it exacts that the emperor shall ask the Pope himself for the right.” The death of Nicholas II., in 1061, was to test the value of the above decree. On the invitation of Hildebrand, then archdeacon of the Roman Church, the cardinals assembled and chose Anselm, bishop of Lucca, a man of great learning and austere morals, who took the name of Alexander II. When the news of this election reached Germany, a number of imperialist prelates assembled at Basel ; most of them came from Lombardy, led by Gilbert of Parma, the royal chancellor, whom Nicholas of Aragon calls “ a most wicked man.” These bishops

(1) Muratori edited this decree from the Farfensian Chronicle, and it agrees with the testimony of St. Peter Damian, B. i., 20. But the cardinals Densdedit and Baronio refuse to give it implicit credit, asserting that it was mutilated and corrupted by schismatics. Certainly no credence is to be accorded it, merely because Gratian gives it (dist. 23, c. *in nomine*), for he lived a century after, and records many apochryphal Canons and Pontifical elections. But it seems to be genuine, if we read St. Damian's *Dialogue* between himself and the royal advocate. The saint never denies the existence of the privilege which the king claimed as his by Apostolic concession, but he constantly insists that Henry IV. had rendered himself unworthy to exercise it.

resolved to recognize only a Pontiff taken from "the Paradise of Italy," as they styled Lombardy, and they inveighed most bitterly against the decree of Nicholas II. Shortly afterwards the bishops of Piacenza and Vercelli formed themselves into a Synod, and elected as Pontiff Cadalao, bishop of Parma, who assumed the name of Honorius II. Our limits will not permit of our entering into the details of this schism. While it was at its height, a Council of Italian and German bishops was held at Osbor (1) in 1062, as a means of reunion. Here was read a remarkable letter of St. Peter Damian, and as it throws much light upon the events of the day, and explains the plans of Hildebrand, we give a few extracts from it. It purports to be a dialogue between a defender of the Roman Church and a royal advocate. "*Defender.* This is a question which, if well settled, will settle the rest (2); but which, left uncertain, will cause all else to be dubious, since it is the basis of all other disputes. The king, or the emperor, or perhaps an irreproachable representative of each, used to arrange, according to their will and power, the sees of the patriarchs, the limits of the metropolitans, the jurisdiction of the bishops, the dignities of the churches, and of each order. They regulated, in a uniform manner, the extent of ecclesiastical prerogatives. But the Roman Church is founded and built upon the rock of faith, by no will or intention of man, but by that Word which made heaven and earth. On this power she relies. It is certain that he is unjust who deprives a church of any one of her rights, and that he is a heretic who takes from the Roman Church that supremacy which she received from the Head of all the churches. *Advocate.* I contend that, in naming a Pope without the consent of the king, the Roman Church has violated the rights, and dishonored the majesty, of the sovereign. *Def.* Before speaking of violated rights, let us see whether the Pope can be named without the king's consent. *Adv.* Clearly, the Pope ought to be elected by those who, according to the holy Canons, are to obey him ;

(1) So the locality is designated by Damian ; where it was, is now unknown.

(2) That is, whether the Pope should be chosen by the Church, or by the monarch, or by both in concert. In the above *Dialogue*, we give the synopsis of Voigt.

now, the Roman people, and the emperor, who is their head, are bound to obey him as their Sovereign Pontiff. The question then is, whether the people, without their head, can perform an election; whether the people should obey a Pope whom the emperor has not chosen. It is shown, then, that a Pontifical election is not complete unless it is confirmed by the king of the Romans." The Papal *defender* then shows, by many examples, that temporal princes have not exercised great influence in ecclesiastical elections, and he concludes that, since the head of Christianity was established by the King of Heaven, the king of the earth should not interfere with him. The emperor has no power in the Church; why then ought not the Pope be elected without his approbation? The *advocate* admits this proposition, but he advances another: "It cannot be denied that Henry III., father of our present monarch, was made 'Patrician of the Romans,' and received from them the first place in the election of a Pope. And what is more, Pope Nicholas confirmed, by a Synodal decree, this privilege which the king already had from his father." The *defender* does not contest the reality of the privilege, but falls back on the minority of the king. The Church, he says, is the young king's mother; he is merely a child, needing a tutor. How can he choose a Pope? *Adv.* "Defend what you please, but you cannot change what a Pope has established and confirmed. *Def.* Cannot a weak man change his arrangements, when even the Almighty does so? The *defender* then proves this assertion by Scripture, and concludes, the *Dialogue* as follows: "We, counsellors of the crown, and servants of the Holy See, make common efforts for the union of the Priesthood and the Empire, in order that the human race, governed by these two powers, may never be divided, that they may sustain each other like the two poles of the earth, and that the peoples may not become indocile because of their differences; so that, as the Mediator between God and man has mysteriously united royalty and the priesthood, their two heads may be united by a mutual affection, and the king be found in the Roman Pontiff, and the Pontiff in the king; saving the

right of the Pontiff, which he alone can exercise. Let the Pope repress criminals by the law of the prince; and let the prince order, through the bishops, according to the holy Canons, what concerns the salvation of souls. Let the Pope, as the father, have the pre-eminence; let the king, as an only son, repose in the arms of the Pontiff's affection."

In this Synod of Osbor the infamous Cadalao was solemnly and effectively deposed. When Hildebrand became Pontiff, he continued, with greater zeal, his struggle for the independence of the Church, and his last act was a protest against princely interference in Papal elections. His victory was a lasting one, for, as Pagi says: "We have carefully examined, and we have found that Gregory VII. was the last Pontiff whose election was signified to the emperor before his consecration."

CHAPTER XIII.

THE QUESTION OF INVESTITURES.

According to ancient custom, the election of bishops had depended on the votes of the clergy, the testimony of the people, and the consent of the provincial prelates. But in course of time sovereigns arrogated to themselves, and with some show of reason, a right of interference in these elections. The piety of the great and wealthy had endowed the churches and monasteries with lands; the interest of sovereigns had caused them to give the rank of temporal lords to men upon whose fidelity they could depend. Nearly every bishop and abbot was a feudal dignitary, and subject therefore, as such, to the same obligations, either personally or by substitute, as the secular noble. Every possessor of a fief held it by virtue of an investiture from his lord or suzerain, and this investiture was conferred with certain ceremonies, more or less solemn and symbolical, according to the nature of the fief. Hence it came to pass that, when an ecclesiastic had been chosen as bishop for a vacant see, or a monk had been elected by his brethren

to an abbacy, the elect applied to the sovereign for his induction into the fiefs or *regalia* pertaining to his particular diocese or monastery. Before he received his investiture, the elect gave *hominium*, or homage, for his fief, and swore fidelity to his suzerain. So long as the sovereigns were content with an exercise of the right of investiture within these limits, the Church did not complain. There were, doubtless, many inconveniences in the system, but it was considered that they were more than counterbalanced by the accession of dignity and influence which accrued from the elevation of the bishops and abbots to a position among the temporal rulers of the earth. But in time Cæsar became dissatisfied with the possession of only those things which belonged to him; he laid his hand upon the things of God. Under the pretext that he had a right to see that the *regalia* of his spiritual fiefs did not fall into the hands of his enemies, he did not always confer them upon the canonically elected person. Then he commenced to ignore the election altogether, and to nominate whom he would to the vacancy. Hence an opening to favoritism, to simony, and to every species of irregularity. In some countries, immediately upon the death of a prelate, his crosier and ring, the emblems of his spiritual jurisdiction, were taken to the sovereign, to be retained by him until he saw fit to confer them upon an acceptable candidate; too frequently this candidate had no merit beyond the love of the sovereign or a plethoric purse. In all countries where the feudal system had obtained, the granting of the *regalia* was effected by the suzerain's presenting the staff and ring to the beneficiary. Until that ceremony had been performed, whether he was canonically elected or not, whether he was consecrated or not, no bishop or abbot could enter upon the duties of his office. In taking a determined stand, therefore, against this method of investiture, the Roman Pontiffs derogated from no legitimate right of a sovereign; they simply insisted upon the inherent and divinely accorded right of the Church to elect her own pastors. They did not wish a prelate to obtain the fiefs annexed to his charge by any evasion of the temporal duties thereto attached;

they merely contended that those fiefs should not be accorded by the suzerain in a manner which would imply that the said suzerain was the source of the prelate's spiritual jurisdiction. For nearly half a century Rome fought this battle with the great ones of the earth, but principally with the German sovereigns. Finally, as we shall see, she was victorious.

In France the exercise of the right of investiture was as ancient as the monarchy itself. It is recognized in the tenth Canon of the fifth Council of Orleans, held in 549, during the reign of the great Clovis; and is claimed in an edict of Clothaire II., in 615. The ancient writer of the *Life of St. Romanus* of Rouen speaks of the Saint as receiving the crosier from Clovis II., and being "therefore" enthroned as bishop, in 623. Gregory of Tours and Fortunatus assign to the order or consent of Clovis II. the election of Quintian and of Gallus of Auvergne; to that of Childebert the episcopacy of Germain of Paris; to that of Clothaire II. the choice of Euphronius of Tours, and of other bishops. In the *Appendix* to the second volume of the *Councils of France*, edited by Sirmond, there are several ancient formulas used by the Merovingian kings in the granting of investitures. In one of them, the king says to the elected: "By the advice and will of our bishops and nobles, according to the will and consent of the clergy and people of the said city, we commit to you the episcopal dignity, in the name of God. Therefore, by the present precept we decree and command that the aforesaid city or things of its church, and its clergy, remain under your will and government." Under the Merovingians and Carolingians, the French church experienced but little trouble from the system of royal investiture; but under the Capetians, simony was quite frequent, especially during the reign of Philip I. St. Gregory VII., writing to the bishop of Chalons (1), says: "Among other princes of our time who have desolated the Church of God by simony, and have crushed their mother into the condition of a handmaid, Philip, king of France, has so oppressed the church of

(1) *Epistles*, B. i, n. 35.

France, as we have learned from reliable sources, that he seems to have arrived at the very depth of this detestable iniquity. We have been the more grieved because of this state of things in that kingdom, on account of its well-known prudence, religion, power, and devotion to the Roman Church. The desolation of the churches, and our general pastoral solicitude, have urged us to reprove most severely such audacious excesses; but since he has, through his private chamberlain Alberic, just now earnestly promised to change his life, and to arrange ecclesiastical affairs according to our judgment, we have delayed to exercise the rigor of the Canons. We wish, however, first to test the value of his promise in the affair of the church of Matiscon, long bereft of a pastor and reduced to extremity; that is, we desire that the archdeacon of Autun, already elected by the unanimous voice of the clergy and people, and as we have heard, with the consent of the king himself, be installed at the head of that church, having received *gratis*, as is proper, the episcopal position." According to the system permitted by the Holy See, therefore, a widowed diocese was to be provided for in this manner. The election by the clergy should first take place; then the approval of the king was to be requested; then the investiture was to be granted, but always *gratis*; finally, the consecration was to take place. It was only owing to the royal violation of these wise regulations that trouble arose in any country.

The system of investiture was very old in England. William of Malmesbury (1), speaking of the privileges of the monastery of Glastonbury, says that "King Edgar decreed that the monks should always elect their abbot; but he reserved, for himself and his heirs, the power of giving the pastoral staff to the brother elected." St. Wulstan, bishop of Worcester, received his investiture from king St. Edward, and when he was accused of "illiteracy and simplicity, and of being almost an idiot, and ignorant of the French language, and unable to assist at the royal council," (2) he refused to resign his crosier to William the

(1) *Deeds of the English Kings*, B. ii., c. 8.

(2) MATTHEW OF PARIS, *year 1095*.

Conqueror, who had not given it to him, but, approaching the tomb of St. Edward, there laid down the emblem of his dignity (1). Ordericus Vitalis (2) gives a favorable picture of the conduct of the Conqueror in the matter of investiture, and says that he always deferred to the judgment of the wise "during the fifty-six years in which he held the reins of government either in Normandy or in England, thus leaving a good example to his posterity. He detested every kind of simony; and hence, in choosing abbots and bishops, he regarded the sanctity and wisdom of the person, rather than his wealth or power." But Ingulf, abbot of Croyland, talks in a very different manner of William's proceedings, saying that "for many years, there has been no really free and canonical election of prelates; all the episcopal and abbatial dignities have been given by the royal court, through ring and staff, just as it pleased." And Gervase, a monk of Canterbury, says of Lanfranc: "He asked the king to give him the abbey (Canterbury), as all his predecessors had possessed it. The king replied that he would like to have all the pastoral staffs in England in his own hand. At this, Lanfranc wondered; but, for the greater good of the Church, which he could not effect without the king, he held his peace for the time." The successors of the Conqueror exercised the right of investiture in a shameless manner; William Rufus (1087-1100) especially distinguished himself as a public auctioneer in conferring every ecclesiastical office that fell vacant. Under Henry I. (1100-1135) things came to a crisis, thanks to the zeal and determination of St. Anselm of Canterbury. This prelate had attended a Roman Synod, in which excommunication had been pronounced against all lay patrons of ring and crosier,

(1) Matthew records that Wulstan replied to Lanfranc: "I well know that I am not worthy of this honor, nor am I equal to the labor; but you should not demand my pastoral staff, since you did not give it to me. Obeying your sentence, however, I shall resign the crosier; but I will do what is more fitting, if I yield it to St. Edward, by whose authority I received it." Then going to the tomb, he thus apostrophized the saint: "Most holy king Edward, thou knowest how unwillingly I assumed this burden; how often I absented myself, when they sought me. Nor do I deny that I was unwise, but thou didst compel me. For although they were not wanting an election, the petition of the people, the will of the bishops, and the grace of the nobility, yet it was thy authority and will that turned the scale. But now there came a new king, a new law, and new prelates, and they issue new decrees. They charge thee with error, because thou madest me a bishop; they accuse me of arrogance, because I yielded. Not to those who demand what they did not give, but to thee, I resign the staff thou gavest; to thee I resign the care of those thou didst entrust to me."

(2) *History*, B. iv., year 1070.

and when he returned to England, in 1106, he firmly but respectfully informed the king that he would enforce the Synodical decrees. Henry was at that time at war with his brother Robert (1) and knowing how difficult it would be to carry out his projects without the aid of the prelates, he dissimulated, and suggested that a special appeal should be made to the Holy See. The result was that after a long interchange of letters between Rome and England, and a continued series of artifices on the part of Henry, Anselm was persuaded to journey to Rome and personally consult the Pope. He was then ordered by Henry to remain in exile until he had decided to obey the royal behests. For three years the aged and infirm prelate was the guest of the archbishop of Lyons, and during this time Henry was continually annoyed by the murmurs of his barons and people, and by the importunities of queen Matilda and of his sister Adela, countess of Blois, urging him to yield. Finally, having been warned by Pope Paschal that his excommunication was imminent, he met the primate at the abbey of Bec, and abandoned the claim to investiture by staff and ring; reserving, however, the claim of fealty and homage, as civil duties, on the part of bishops and abbots. (2)

St. Gregory VII. was not the first Pontiff to raise his voice against the abuse of investitures, although he was the first to ply the axe to the root of the evil, by decreeing the utter abolition of the system. Pope St. Leo IX. (el. 1049), in the first year of his reign, had decreed, in the Council of Rheims, that "no one should be promoted to the government of a church, unless elected by the clergy and the people." Alexander II., in 1063, had issued a Canon, in a Roman Synod of 110 bishops, declaring that, unless by canonical election, "no one should obtain a church through favor of laics, either for money, or *gratis*." Nicholas II. (el. 1058), had written to Gervase of Rheims "correct your glorious king; beseech him; admonish him;" because

(1) This prince was the inventor of a profitable improvement in the matter of investiture. He sold the reversion of bishoprics in favor of children, and frequently sold more than one seat to the same buyer. So says IVO of CHARTRES, *Epistles* 178, 179, 181.

(2) "On the whole," says Lingard, "the Church gained little by the compromise. It might check, but did not abolish, the principal abuse. If Henry surrendered an unnecessary ceremony, he still retained the substance. The right which he assumed of nominating bishops and abbots was left unimpaired, and though he promised not to appropriate to himself the revenues of the vacant benefices, he never hesitated to violate his engagement."

Henry III. had appointed a bishop without a canonical election. Nor did St. Gregory VII. at first wish to abolish the investitures. In an epistle to the Germans (1), he simply besought that no interference should be made with the freedom of elections: "Let him use counsellors who love God, and not merely their own gain; men who will prefer God to all worldly profit. Let him no longer think that the Church is, like a handmaid, subject to him; let him regard her as placed above him, as a mistress." Before he proceeded to the extremity of abolition, Gregory, says William of Tyre, (2) "seeing that the rights of the Church were down-trodden, again and again admonished the same emperor to desist from such detestable presumption." Only when he found that no other course was left, did the Pontiff, says William of Malmesbury, (3) "openly effect what others had threatened to do, excommunicating all who received investiture of their churches from the hands of a layman by means of staff and ring." Hugh of Flavigny, in the *Chronicle of Verdun*, gives us the decree which was issued in Gregory's Second Roman Synod, held in 1075: "If any one hereafter receives a bishopric or an abbacy from the hands of any lay person, let him not be received among bishops or abbots, or receive any hearing as a bishop or abbot. We also deprive him of the grace of Blessed Peter, and debar him from entrance into a church, until he shall have relinquished the position which he has occupied in ambition and in disobedience, which is the wickedness of idolatry. We decree the same in reference to the inferior ecclesiastical dignities. Also, if any emperor, duke, marquis, count, or any other secular power or person, presumes to give the investiture of a bishopric or of any ecclesiastical dignity, let him know that he falls under the same sentence." This decree was confirmed in the Roman Synods of 1078 and 1080.

The immediate successors of St. Gregory VII. imitated his firmness in the matter of investitures. Victor III. renewed the prohibitory decree in the Synod of Benevento, held in 1087; and Urban II. did the same in the Synod of

(1) *B. iv., Epist. 3.*

(2) *Sacred War, B. i., c. 13.*

(3) *Deeds of the English Kings, B. iii.*

Amalfi, in 1089, in a Synod at Clarendon, in 1095, and in a Roman Synod, in 1099. While the German and English sovereigns persisted in the obnoxious system, king Philip I. of France readily obeyed, relinquishing the solemn delivery of the staff and ring, but receiving, as was perfectly reasonable, the oath of fidelity for the fiefs, into possession of which the newly elected was inducted. In fact, Ivo of Chartres (1) attests that the concord between the Holy See and the French monarchs was never disturbed by the question of investitures.

In the year 1106, Paschal II. held a Synod at Guastalla, at which were present the ambassadors of Henry V. of Germany. Another decree against investitures was issued in these words: "For a long time the Catholic Church has been oppressed by wicked men, both lay and clerical; hence, in our days, many schisms and heresies have been born. However, by the grace of God, she now regains her proper liberty, the authors of this wickedness having departed. We must therefore take care that the causes of these schisms be entirely removed. Agreeing, therefore, with the Constitutions of our fathers, we absolutely prohibit the giving by laymen of ecclesiastical investitures; and if any one braves this decree, let him, as guilty of injury toward his mother, be removed from his dignity, if he is a cleric; be debarred from entrance to a church, if he is a layman." Pope Paschal had intended, after holding the Synod of Guastalla, to proceed to Germany, hoping that his presence would contribute to a settlement of all troubles; but his counsellors persuaded him that it would be injudicious to trust himself to the courtesy of the young Henry. He accordingly journeyed into France, in 1107, to seek the aid, or at least the influence, of king Philip, in his struggle with the German monarch. Suger, then a monk, and afterwards abbot of St. Denis, gives us an interesting account of this visit (2). After the Pontiff had paid his respects to the shrine of St. Denis, "king Philip and the lord Louis, his son, gratefully came here to meet him, prostrating, for the love of God, the royal majesty at his feet; just as kings

(1) *Epistle to Paschal II.*, 238.

(2) *Life of Louis the Fat*, c. 9.

are accustomed, having offered their diadems, to bow before the tomb of the fisherman Peter. The lord Pope raised them with his hand, and caused them, as most devout children of the Apostles, to come before him. He then conferred with them upon the state of the Church in a wise manner, and familiarly; blandly influencing them to give aid to Blessed Peter and his vicar, to take the Church by the hand, and to strenuously oppose all tyrants and foes of the Church, especially the emperor Henry. They gave the Pontiff their right hands, in token of friendship, advice, and assistance." The Pontiff having promised to receive the ambassadors of Henry V. at Chalons-sur-Marne, they came to the audience, "not humble, but rigid and obstinate; leaving behind (at St. Mene's) the chancellor Albert, through whose tongue and heart the emperor acted; the others coming to the court with an immense retinue, much pomp, and excessively bedecked. These were the archbishop of Treves, the bishops of Halberstadt and Munster, a great number of counts, and the duke Guelph, with a sword carried before him—a corpulent man, wonderful and boisterous through his whole extent of length and breadth—and all this noisy crowd seemed to have been sent to terrify, rather than to reason. The archbishop of Treves, an elegant and jovial man, well practised in the speech of France, then held forth, tendering greeting and service, saving the rights of his kingdom, to the lord Pope and the court, on the part of the lord emperor. Carrying out his instructions, he said: 'Such is the cause of our lord the emperor, in behalf of whom we are sent. In the days of our predecessors, the holy and apostolic Gregory the Great and others, it was acknowledged as a right of the empire, that, before an election could be held, the ear of the emperor should be sought, and if the person in view proved acceptable, the imperial consent should be given; then, according to the Canons, the petition of the people, the election by the clergy, and the assent of the great (*honoratorum*), should take place; finally, the consecrated person should go to the emperor for the regalia, that is, to be invested with staff and ring, and to swear fidelity and do homage. And no

wonder, for cities, castles, marches, etc., can be obtained in no other way. If the lord Pope agrees to these things, there shall be prosperity and peace in Church and kingdom, to the honor of God.' To these things the lord Pope considerately replied, through the bishop of Piacenza: 'The Church being redeemed by the Precious Blood of Jesus Christ, and established in freedom, cannot again be reduced to the condition of a handmaid. If the Church cannot elect a pastor without consulting the sovereign, the death of Christ is rendered null, and she is servilely subjected to that sovereign; if the ring and staff are used for investiture, the things of God are usurped by the prince, for the ring and staff are religious symbols; if the hands consecrated to the Lord's Body and Blood are subjected, in obligation, to the hands of a layman reeking with human blood, there is an insult to Holy Orders and the Holy Unction.' " When the stiff-necked ambassadors had heard this answer, their rage became frenzy, and if they could have done so with impunity, they would have insulted the Pontiff. But, continues Suger, they replied: " 'not here, but at Rome, the quarrel shall be settled by the sword' When they had departed, the lord Pope proceeded to Troyes and celebrated the long-proposed Council; then he safely returned to the See of Peter, with the love of the French, who had served him well, and with the fear and hatred of the Germans." In the year 1108, Pope Paschal reiterated the condemnation of investitures in the Synod of Benevento, and in 1110 he did the same in a Roman Synod.

The question of investitures now assumed another and a bloody aspect. (1) Henry V. moved from Germany at the head of an immense army, passed through Savoy, and penetrated into Italy. The Lombard cities prepared to defend themselves, but, terrified by the fate of Novara, which Henry gave to the flames, they soon made overtures of peace. The great countess, Matilda, shut herself in her stronghold of Canossa, but promised Henry that she would not attack him in the rear, and as he had enough on his

(1) The events we are about to narrate are described by PETER THE DEACON, in the *Chronicle of Cassino*, B. iv., c. 37; SUGER, *loc. cit.*; JOHN OF TUSCULUM, *Epist. to Richard of Albano*; OTHO OF FRIELIGNEN, B. vii.

hands, the monarch feigned to be satisfied, reviewed his army in the plains of Roncaglia, and marched on Rome. Pope Paschal looked vainly around for succor. Many of the Lombard cities had formally submitted to Henry, others thought only of their own affairs. Venice, Genoa, and Pisa were too busy making money out of the Crusades, furnishing provisions of all kinds to the heroes in the Holy Land. The strength of the Normans was enrolled under the cross; the duke of the Puglia, Calabria, and Sicily, was a child (Roger II.), under the regency of a timid woman. Abandoned by all, the venerable Pontiff, weakened by age, had recourse to negotiations. But Henry was firm in retaining his hold on the investitures, and Paschal just as firm in his design to abolish them. At length, after many proposals and rejections, the Pontiff, to the astonishment of the world, made the following proposition. All ecclesiastics, without exception, were to yield up to Henry all their fiefs and regalia, whatever they had received from the empire and the kingdom; and on his side, Henry was to renounce the right of investiture with staff and ring. It is easy to imagine the joy with which Henry acceded to this proposal. Here were the means of attaching more and more to his person a large number of creatures, who would be dependent upon him alone, and not hold an allegiance to Pope as well as to emperor. Hostages were immediately exchanged, and Henry prepared to enter the Eternal City. Toward Monte Mario proceeded the officers of the Papal court to meet him, and they were accompanied by crowds of the people, carrying garlands, palms, and olive-branches. Outside the Leonine city were stationed bands of Jewish youth, and in the arch of the gate were placed Greek boys and girls; and as the king approached, Hebrew and Greek hymns of praise saluted his ears. All the Roman clergy were within the gate, arrayed in their most gorgeous vestments, and flanked by bands of monks with lighted torches. In spite of all this peaceful appearance, the suspicious Henry would not enter within the walls, until all the gates and strategic points were handed over to his soldiers. On the steps of St.

Peter's, Pope Paschal, surrounded by the cardinals and a number of bishops, awaited the king. When Henry arrived, he fell at the Pope's feet, and when lifted, kissed the Pontiff "on the lips, forehead, and eyes;" hand in hand, the two then entered the basilica. But no sooner did it become noised about that all this festive and peaceful scene meant the loss, on the part of the ecclesiastics, of nearly all their temporal possessions, than there ensued a Babel of discord. Nor was Henry disposed to fulfil his part of the agreement, for when "the Pontiff requested him to restore the rights of the Church, as had been agreed in the treaty," the answer was returned that "the treaty could not justly and legitimately be fulfilled." Pope Paschal therefore refused to proceed to the coronation of Henry as emperor; whereupon the monarch caused the Pontiff and many of the cardinals to be confined under military custody. Immediately the Roman people flew to arms, and pouring into the great square of St. Peter's, attacked the German soldiery. The vestibule and steps of the basilica were drenched with the blood of the combatants; Henry himself was wounded in the face, and his horse was killed. The fight lasted several hours, and finally the German king drew off his troops, and, taking with him the captive Pontiff, retired into the Sabine province, where the main body of his army was encamped. During his imprisonment, the determination of Paschal was not shaken by any regard for himself, but after two months of resistance, regard for the Romans, who were suffering greatly from the hardships of war, and pity for his fellow-captives, prompted him to sign the following *Privilege* (1): "That privilege of dignity which our predecessors conceded to the Catholic emperors, your predecessors, we also concede to your Belovedness, and confirm it by the present page; that you may confer the investiture of staff and ring upon the bishops and abbots of your kingdom, who will have been freely elected, without violence or simony." The Pontiff and king Henry now came together to Rome for the latter's coronation as emperor, but it was probably the most melancholy coronation which

(1) *Chronicle of Cassino*, B. IV., c. 42.

Rome ever witnessed. During the entire ceremony, so much did the Germans fear another outbreak on the part of the Romans, that the gates of the city were kept closed, and the Leonine city, that is, the Vatican district, was shut up within itself. Immediately after the coronation, the emperor departed for Germany.

So hostile was the majority of the Sacred College to the concession made by Pope Paschal, that there wanted but little to cause an open schism. The Pontiff retired to Terracina, and wished to resign the tiara, but the Roman people and clergy sent him a deputation, begging him to return. He did so, but the reproaches he constantly endured became so painful, that he resolved to submit the question to a Synod. Accordingly, in April, 1112, three hundred bishops met in the Lateran Basilica, and the Pontiff humbly laid the affair before them. According to Godfrey of Viterbo (1), Pope Paschal laid aside the Pontifical insignia and offered to abdicate, if the Synod deemed it best. The result was that, on the last day of the Synod, the Pope issued his Profession of Faith, concluding: "And I receive the decrees of the Roman Pontiffs, especially those of my lord, Pope Gregory VII., and of Pope Urban of blessed memory; whatever they praised, I praise; what they held, I hold; what they confirmed, I confirm; what they condemned, I condemn; what they rejected, I reject; what they interdicted, I interdict; what they prohibited, I prohibit, in all things; and in that state, I shall always persevere." The following sentence was then promulgated: "That Privilege which is not and ought not to be called a Privilege, which was violently extorted by King Henry from the lord Pope Paschal, for the freedom of the Church and of certain captives, we all, met together with the lord Pope in this holy Council, condemn, by the judgment of the Holy Ghost; and we judge it to be null, and we cancel it entirely, and anathematize it as of no authority or power. And it is condemned, because in it is asserted that he who is canonically elected by the clergy and the people can be consecrated by no one until he has been invested by the

(1) *Chronicle*, part 17.

king; which is contrary to the Holy Ghost and the institutions of the Canons." In the year 1117, Henry V. determined to strike another blow in defense of investitures, and he entered Italy with a large army. The countess Matilda had just died, and the Pontiff knew that the emperor had many partisans in Rome. He therefore betook himself to Benevento, to implore the aid of the Normans. When Henry arrived in Rome, the Ghibelines received him with joy, but as there was no one with whom he could treat on the matter in question, and as he feared the effects of the climate on his army, he soon retired into Lombardy. Pope Paschal now returned, but he soon died. (1118).

Three days after the death of Pope Paschal II., the cardinals elected the Cassinese monk, the cardinal John Gaetano, who took the name of Gelasius II. Immediately after the election, the partisans of Henry, headed by Cencio Frangipane, rushed into the Lateran, dragged the new Pontiff from the sanctuary, covered him with blows and outrages, and carrying him half-dead to Frangipane's palace, thrust him into a dungeon. But the horrified people, although many of their leaders were in the emperor's pay, rescued the Pope by force of arms. Gelasius then prepared for his consecration, but before it could be effected, news arrived that Henry was making forced marches on Rome. The Pontiff and his court then embarked on galleys, and although a furious tempest was then raging, set sail for Gaeta. Here he was reverently received by William, duke of the Puglia and of Calabria, and by the principal Southern barons, and was solemnly consecrated. Henry, being now arrived in Rome, again and again sent embassies to Gelasius, inviting him to return to the capital of Christianity, but the Pope feared the fate of his predecessor, and remained within the walls of Gaeta. The furious emperor then called a convention of his ecclesiastical partisans, declared the election of Gelasius null, and caused the pretended election to the Papacy of Maurice Bordino, archbishop of Braga, in Portugal, who is known among the anti-Popes as Gregory VIII. Having obtained from his creature a pseudo-confirmation of the right of investiture,

Henry returned to Germany. Gelasius now re-entered Rome, but fear of the Ghibelines very soon caused another flight. At first he sought refuge at Pisa, then at Genoa, and finally made a pilgrimage to Cluny. Here he was taken with his death-sickness, and having caused himself to be laid upon the ground, and his suffering frame to be sprinkled with ashes, he yielded his soul to God, in February, 1119.

Three days after the death of Pope Gelasius II., the cardinals and Roman clergy who had accompanied him to Cluny met in that monastery, and chose for his successor Guido of Burgundy, archbishop of Vienne, in Dauphiny, son of the great William of Burgundy, and uncle of Adelaide, queen of Louis the Fat. The cardinals remaining in Rome having signified their assent, Guido ascended the Papal throne as Calixtus II. Having called a Synod of 213 bishops, and a large number of abbots, at Rheims, in November, 1119, he confirmed the anathemas pronounced against Henry and the anti-Pope Bordone, and re-asserted the abolition of investitures. Being recognized as head of the Church by all but a few of Henry's creatures, he left France in 1121, and entered Rome in triumph. Bordone had retreated and thrown himself into the strongly fortified city of Sutri, relying upon the fidelity of its Ghibeline citizens and confidently expecting aid from Henry. But in a few days the Sutrini, wearied of the state of siege maintained by the troops of Pope Calixtus, and being, besides, terrified by the anathemas which hung over them, seized the wretched Bordone and handed him over to the Papal commander. Conducted to Rome, he finished his days in a monastery. While in France, Pope Calixtus had, for a short time, flattered himself that the question of investitures was at length terminated. The legates of the Pontiff and the imperial representatives had met near Metz, and had signed a compact, whereby the emperor resigned all claim to investitures, and the Pontiff admitted Henry to communion. This convention having been reported to Calixtus, then at Rheims, he sent to the camp of Henry the cardinal John of Ostia and three other legates, to urge the emperor to immediately fulfil his part of the

compact. To their indignation, Henry hesitated and demanded delay, that he might consult the princes of the empire. Day after day the final settlement was postponed until, at length, nothing seemed to stand in the way of peace, but the comparatively unimportant question as to whether the emperor should publicly, and bare-footed, beg the Pontiff's pardon. The Pope had already advanced considerably on the way to the interview, when the legates began to suspect a trap on the part of the unscrupulous Henry. They found that he had collected a force of thirty thousand men and that the number was hourly increasing. Hurriedly returning to Calixtus, they prevailed upon him to turn aside and take refuge in the camp of the powerful count of Troyes. Henry then wrote to the count, asking him to detain the Pontiff for one day, that the peace might be concluded. The faithful noble refused to interfere, and before daylight Calixtus started for Rheims, making the journey of twenty leagues in time to celebrate mass the same day, and consecrate the bishop of Liege. Calling together the members of the Synod then sitting in Rheims, Calixtus re-excommunicated Henry. In 1121, as we have said, the Pontiff returned to his capital. He soon learned that Henry was, at length, sincerely desirous of peace. Profoundly discouraged by the fall of Bordone and by the reconciliation of the clergy and people of Lombardy with the Holy See, and finding that his own Germans were heartily sick of the long struggle with the Papacy, the monarch finally yielded to the prayers of the barons, and made overtures to Calixtus. The bishop of Spire and the abbot of Fulda were sent to Rome, with instructions to request the convocation of a general Council, "in order that whatever could not be settled by human judgment, might be arranged by the Holy Ghost." The Pope then commissioned the cardinal Lambert of Ostia and two other cardinals to receive Henry into the Church, after he had abandoned all claim to investiture, and to accord to him the right of superintending elections, and of giving the regalia, *by means of the sceptre*. The following agreement was presented to the Diet at Worms: "I, Henry, by the grace

of God, august emperor of the Romans, for the love of God and of the lord Pope Calixtus, and for the good of my soul, do yield to God and to his holy apostles Peter and Paul, and to the Holy Catholic Church, every investiture by staff and ring, and do grant that in all churches free election and consecration be held. I restore to the same Holy Roman Church all the possessions and regalia of Blessed Peter which have been appropriated from the beginning of this discord until to-day, and which I hold ; and as for those which I do not hold, I shall faithfully see that they are restored. I shall also faithfully help in the restitution of the possessions of all the other churches, of the princes, and of others, both clerics and laymen ; and I accord true peace to the lord Pope Calixtus, to the Holy Roman Church, and to all who are or have been on their side ; and I shall faithfully aid the Holy Roman Church in all she asks of me.—I, Calixtus, servant of the servants of God, do grant unto thee, beloved son Henry, by the grace of God, august emperor of the Romans, that in thy presence, be held, without simony or any violence, those elections of bishops and abbots of the German kingdom, which belong to the kingdom ; so that, if any discord shall arise between the parties, thou mayest, by the advice and judgment of the metropolitan and provincials, give countenance and aid to the deserving side. The person elected shall receive the regalia from thee, by means of the sceptre, and shall effect what he owes to thee of right ; excepting all those things which are known to belong to the Roman Church. Any one, however, who is consecrated in other parts of the empire, shall receive from thee the regalia, by means of the sceptre, within six months. I shall grant my aid, according to the duties of my office, in all things of which thou mayest complain to me. I accord true peace to thee, and to all who are or have been on thy side during this discord. Given on the ninth of the Calends of October, of the year 1122.” With the signing of this compact the war of investitures came, for all practical purposes to an end. A finishing stroke was given to the dispute, in the Ninth General Council, the first of the Lateran,

but of that assembly we shall speak in a special chapter.

Some authors, hostile to the Holy See, have deemed themselves especially brilliant when they asserted that the struggle about investitures was merely a dispute as to whether the *regalia* should be conferred "with a crooked stick, or a straight one." (1). In this connection, the "crooked stick" or crosier was the emblem of spiritual power, and the Church would have stultified herself had she sanctioned its use by a secular ruler; "the straight stick" or sceptre, the emblem of temporal jurisdiction, was the proper insignia with which to invest a prelate with his temporal estate. This is admitted even by Mosheim (2): "Nor is this reason a foolish one, if we regard, not the opinions of our own day, but of an age when the staff and ring were signs of sacred things, and when he who delivered these signs was thought to give sacred power with them." No Catholic will deny that the Church has the right to defend her liberty against any potentate or society interfering with it. In the time of St. Gregory VII. bishoprics and abbacies were as much the subject of barter and sale as any goods in the public markets, and they were handed over to the highest bidder by means of the staff and ring, the emblems of spiritual power. Listen to St. Anselm of Lucca, the right hand of St. Gregory in this war: "Your king constantly sells bishoprics, publishing edicts to the effect that no one shall be regarded as a bishop, even though elected by the clergy and sought by the people, unless according to the royal pleasure; as though he were the keeper of this gate . . . you dismember the Catholic Church, attacking her throughout the entire kingdom, and having reduced her to vile slavery, hold her under your dominion, subjecting her liberty, divinely accorded, to your will, saying that to the emperor belong all things, bishoprics, abbacies, and all the churches of God; although the Lord says 'My Church, My dove, My sheep,' and St. Paul says 'Let no one take unto himself the honor, unless called by God, like Aaron' . . . Who is elected because of morals,

(1) Thus, for instance, the authors of the famous *Art of Verifying Dates*.

(2) *Cent. XI.*, p. 2, c. 2, in note.

or honesty, or integrity? The wolves are to be attacked, etc." But the granting of investitures by staff and ring was an ancient custom, replied the German sovereigns. To this assertion, the holy bishop of Lucca replies: "We need not dispute about the length of time that this condemnable practice of the secular power, appointing bishops at its pleasure, has been in vogue. That custom is rather to be followed which was originated by our Catholic ancestors, treading in the footsteps of their fathers; namely, that sanctioned by the prelates of the Seventh and Eighth Councils, according to the statutes of the holy Roman Pontiffs, which were founded on the practice of all the churches from the times of the Apostles. The wickedness of secular princes is of no prejudice to that holy custom, no matter how long it has been manifested. Otherwise, the Lord our God is to be blamed because He freed the Jews, who had been a long time in bondage, and because, by His own death, He liberated man from the slavery of the devil, which had lasted for five thousand years. Again, while adultery is forbidden by the Old and New Testament, are kings allowed to commit it, because former kings did so? God forbid! . . . Any ecclesiastic whose zeal is not excited for the cleansing of God's house from this stain is not consumed with zeal for that house, and God will regard him as a mute dog who cannot bark. Who does not see that this plague is the cause of the heresy of simony, and the lamentable destruction of the whole Christian religion? When the episcopal dignity can be obtained from a prince, in spite of the bishops and priests, the Church of God is contemned; one man pours a large amount of money into the purses of the courtiers, that their influence may work his infamous promotion; another, at great expense, serves ten years at court, patiently suffering the rigors of the seasons and everything else; another constantly yearns for the death of the prelate to whose post he aspires. And alas! Often dignities are conferred upon slaves and fornicators. When such persons have obtained their posts by such means, they dare not reprove the powerful when they sin."

CHAPTER XIV.

CLERICAL CELIBACY.

One of the most difficult of the tasks imposed upon himself by Pope St. Gregory VII. was the enforcement of the law of clerical celibacy. According to Leo of Ostia (d. 1110), when Gregory ascended the Pontifical throne "one seldom found a priest without a wife or a concubine"; (1) and Lambert of Aschaffenburg (d. 1077), tells us that many of the clergy resisted the Pontiff's "insane teaching," as they styled the decrees on celibacy, and declared that if "he proceeded to enforce them, they would sooner abandon the priesthood than the conjugal state, and then let Gregory seek for angels to minister to the people of the Church of God." In such a state of affairs, says Baronio, speaking of the reformatory efforts undertaken, with the aid of Hildebrand, by Leo IX., the Pontiff must have felt as does a farmer about to free an immense field of a growth of thorns and weeds. But Hildebrand was not dismayed. Whether as a deacon of the Roman Church, and confidential adviser of several Pontiffs, or as himself the incumbent of the Papal Chair, he pursued his favorite object with unvarying fortitude. His zeal in this matter, as we learn from Otho of Frisingen, caused many bishops to urge Henry IV. to oppose his election. In 1074 Gregory held a Plenary Council of all the bishops of Italy, and decreed that "all ecclesiastical ministrations are forbidden to incontinent clergymen; under pain of deposition, no clergyman shall marry; no one shall receive Holy Orders unless he solemnly promises continency, according to the decrees of the ancient and holy Councils."

Mosheim (2), Potter (3), Ranke (4), and most Protestant authors, condemn the action of Pope Gregory VII. as an innovation upon ancient discipline. Among the writers

(1) *Life of St. John Gualbert.*

(2) *Inst. Hist. Eccl.*, cent. xi., p. 2.

(3) *Spirit of the Church*, vol. v., p. 2, b. 2.

(4) *Papacy*, vol. i., b. 1, § 3.

who have defended the Pontiff from this charge, proving the antiquity and propriety of clerical celibacy, the palm of success must be accorded to Zaccaria, in his *Polemical History of Holy Celibacy*. The reader may also consult with profit Gaume's *Ecclesiastical Celibacy in its Religious and Political Relations*; the *Celibacy of Rosmini*; the *Protestantism and Catholicism Compared* of Balmes; and the *Dictionary* of Bergier. We now proceed to show that neither St. Gregory VII., nor any of the Benedictine Pontiffs, to whom Ranke ascribes the design of making monks of the secular clergy, instituted the system of clerical celibacy; that, in fine, this system is quite as old as the Church herself. Such was the opinion of St. Jerome (b. 340); for he says that "Christ, a virgin, and Mary, a virgin, consecrated the love of virginity (*dedicavere principia*) in both sexes. The Apostles were either virgins, or, after their nuptials, were continent." (4).

In the Third Synod of Carthage (397) the primate Aurelius, speaking of celibacy, says: "Let us also follow what the Apostles taught, and what antiquity observed." Such is the testimony of the African church, which derived her discipline directly from Rome. In the year 385, Pope St. Siricius addressed to Himerius, bishop of Tarragona, a letter in reply to one sent by that prelate to the previous Pontiff, St. Damasus, in which the Pope had been consulted as to the course to be pursued toward certain clergymen who had married. Himerius had informed St. Damasus that some of the delinquents alleged ignorance as an excuse, while others justified their course by the example of the priests of the Old Law. In his answers to Himerius, St. Siricius declares the absolute obligation of ecclesiastical celibacy, and speaks of it in such terms as to leave no doubt as to the antiquity of the custom. After adducing arguments from the Gospel and from St. Paul, to show the propriety of the discipline in question, the Pontiff subjoins: "We all, priests and levites, are bound, by an irrefragable law, to devote our hearts and bodies, from the day of our ordination, to sobriety and purity And since some

(4) Epistle 48, to Pammachius.

of those of whom we speak, according to your Holiness, lament their fall through ignorance, we do not deny them mercy, but on this condition, that, if they hereafter prove to be continent, they may officiate in their present dignities, but are to receive no further promotion. As for those who try to excuse themselves by the concessions of the Old Law, they are deprived, by the authority of the Apostolic See, of every ecclesiastical honor which they have so unworthily used, nor can they ever again handle those venerable Mysteries, of which, by clinging to obscene cupidities, they have deprived themselves. And whereas the present cases warn us to look to the future, every bishop, priest, and deacon, who shall hereafter be found like unto them,—and we trust none will—must know that every avenue to our mercy will be closed to them, for those wounds must be treated with the knife, which do not heal under the influence of milder remedies.” The Pontiff then orders Himerius to communicate this Apostolic Letter to the Carthaginians, Boetians, Lusitanians, Gauls, and as many as he can reach. Here, then, is a Pontifical decree, enjoining that celibacy which Ranke and others would have us regard as an invention of Hildebrand, written seven hundred years before his time, and the language of the Pontiff plainly indicates the previous existence of the law he enforces.

In the year 405 Pope St. Innocent I. also was consulted on this matter by Exuperius, bishop of Toulouse, and the Pontiff replied as follows: “In such cases the discipline of the divine law is clear, and the commands of bishop Siricius, of blessed memory, went forth; that is, that persons enjoying such offices (the higher Orders), who proved incontinent, should be deprived of all ecclesiastical honor, and ought not to be permitted to exercise a ministry that ought to be conducted only by the continent.” In view of these decrees of his early predecessors, St. Gregory VII. properly declared that he made no innovation in the matter of celibacy, and most reasonable was his decree, directed to Otho of Constance, that “if they condemn our behests, yea, those of the holy Fathers, the people must in no way receive their ministrations.”

The custom of the Greek Church, united and schismatic, is adduced by the foes of ecclesiastical celibacy to show the futility of the reasons put forth by the Westerns in justification of their discipline ; to prove that married clergymen may fulfil their duties with zeal, etc. But there are several points to be noticed in the discipline of the Greeks, which our adversaries generally keep in the background. Firstly, the Greek Canons do not allow a priest or deacon to contract matrimony after his ordination. (1) Secondly, they have nearly always prohibited the use of matrimony to bishops. As a rule, the bishops are taken from the monasteries ; and when, perchance, a secular priest is chosen, his wife, if he have one, must enter a nunnery. The only recorded exception to this latter point of discipline is that of the learned Neo-Platonician Synesius (410), who, being forced into the see of Ptolemais, endeavored to escape by protesting that he could not forego the society of his wife, and therefore received permission to retain her. But this very fact proves the existence of the contrary discipline. Thirdly, SS. Jerome and Epiphanius, and Eusebius, show us that among the olden Orientals, at least in Egypt and Syria, there were instances of enforced sacerdotal celibacy. Fourthly, the 26th Apostolic Canon, though not authentic, was greatly respected by the early Greek Christians, and it allowed only lectors and chanters to be married. And the Council of Neo-Cæsarea (315) deposes a priest who marries after his ordination. When Pope St. Gregory VII. enforced the already existing law of ecclesiastical celibacy, he had

(1) These Canons are observed by the United Greeks, but, as is shown by Joseph Assemani (*Library of Oriental Law*, B. i., c. 13, no. 361), the *practice* of the schismatic clergy is to take as many successive wives as they wish provided these be virgins; they call a widow, when again married, only "half a wife," but sometimes they marry such. The Russian "orthodox" church has, in modern times, forgotten the ancient Greek Canons, prohibiting priests and deacons from marrying after their ordination. Before the time of Peter the Great, a priestly widower was obliged to retire to a monastery, but in 1724 this head of the "orthodox" church allowed a second marriage to a priest, and permitted him to be employed in a seminary or episcopal chancery. The following is the celibitic discipline of the United Greeks, Ruthenians, Maronites, and such other followers of the Oriental rites as are in communion with Rome. I. Bishops cannot, after their consecration, either marry again or cohabit with the wives married before their ordination. If the newly consecrated has a wife living, she must retire to a distant nunnery, and there be supported by her late husband. II. Priests and deacons may, in accordance with the Trullan Canon XIII. (y. 692), keep the wives taken before their ordination, but they must abstain from marital intercourse for some time before officiating at the altar. Pope Clement VIII. (1592-1605), in his *Constitutio* 3^a, ordered this abstinence to be, if possible, for seven, and at any rate, for three days. III. Priests and deacons cannot marry after ordination; such was the decree of Benedict XIV. (*Bullarium*, vol. i., *Constitutio* 57), issued May 6, 1742, and such attempt at marriage was pronounced null. But in the case of priestly converts from schism, the same Pontiff decreed (*Constitutio* 129) that the Holy See might permit the retention of a wife taken after ordination.

no intention of interfering with the ancient custom of the Eastern churches. He simply fulfilled his duty, in insisting upon obedience to the Canons which he found, upon his accession to the Papacy, in force in the West. And here we may remark that no theologian pretends that clerical celibacy is a matter of divine law. The Holy See, if it sees fit, may abrogate the discipline at once. In fact, dispensations have frequently been granted in particular cases, as we shall soon show.

Mosheim finds an argument against the antiquity of the celibitic discipline in the fact that so many of the clergy resisted St. Gregory's enactments. So did the Arians resist the definition of the Church upon the Divinity of Christ, but Mosheim would not contend that their repugnance furnishes a proof that the early Church did not believe in that Divinity. It is not our province to enter upon a polemical discussion as to the advantages of clerical celibacy, but there is one assertion of certain of its adversaries that we ought not to disregard. They affect to discover in St. Gregory VII. a design to found a sacerdotal caste, by means of which his theocratic ideas might be disseminated and actuated. Celibacy, they say, segregates the clergy from the world to a great extent, and forms them into a body more amenable to central authority, more deeply penetrated by an *esprit de corps*, than a married priesthood shows itself to be. But, we ask, would not matrimony have been for the Pontiff a more powerful means whereby to perpetuate a priestly caste? Can a caste easily endure, without the principle of heredity? As Balmes rightly observes (1), had the Church been solely intent upon aggrandizing herself, by any and every means, she would rather have imitated those who instituted an hereditary class, and would have allowed her priests to marry.

We are frequently told that several of the Apostles were married men, and sometimes St. Clement of Alexandria (d. 215) is cited against us. This father says: "Will they condemn the Apostles? Peter and Philip had children, and the latter gave his daughters in marriage. Paul, in one of

(1) Loc. cit., c. 60.

his epistles, finds no difficulty in speaking of his wife ; he did not take her along on his journeys, because he had no need of much service, but he says in his letter : ‘ have we not power to lead about a woman, a sister, as well as the rest of the Apostles ? ’ ” In citing this passage of St. Clement, our adversaries cunningly omit the following words of the saint : “ But since they (the Apostles) gave all their attention to preaching, a task which does not admit of distraction, they were accompanied by these women, *not as spouses, but as sisters*, in order that they themselves might enter, without suspicion, into the apartments of women, and there communicate the doctrine of the Lord.” (1). But is it true that several of the Apostles were married men ? And if they were, did they continue the marriage relation during their Apostolate ? Now, as to the remark concerning St. Paul and Philip, made by St. Clement of Alexandria, it is certain that he erred, and his mistake has been noticed by ancients and moderns. (2). The Philip with two daughters was not an Apostle, but was one of the seven deacons. As for St. Paul, does the following language sound like that of a married man, or at least like that of one who kept up the marriage relation ? “ Defraud not one another, except, perhaps by consent, for a time, that you may give yourselves to prayer ; and return together again, lest Satan tempt you for your incontinency. *But I speak this by indulgence, not by commandment. For I would that all men were even as myself* ; but every one hath his proper gift from God : one after this manner, and one after that. But I say to the unmarried, and to the widows : it is good for them if they so continue, *even as I*.” (3). Nor can it be replied that St. Paul would not have this rule applicable to all time, for the reasons which he assigns for

(1) *Stromata*, B. iii., c. 6. St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Isidore Pelusiotes. Eucumenius, and Theophylactus—all Greeks—interpret the passage of St. Paul as alluding, not to *wives*, but to women who accompanied the Apostles as assistants, especially in household matters. All the Latin fathers understand the *mulierem sororem (adelphin gundika)* of St. Paul’s, I. Cor. ix., as indicating either a wife with whom there was no longer any cohabitation, or some worthy woman who aided the Apostles in their works of charity, and took charge of their domestic concerns ; the first class of writers are represented by St. Avitus of Vienne in a letter to king Gvadobald of the Burgundians (BALUZE, *Miscellany*, B. i.), and the second by St. Jerome (B. i., *against Jorinian*), St. Augustine (*Work of Monks*, c. 4), St. Leo IX. (*Can. Omnino. dist. 31*), and even Tertullian (*Monogamy*, c. 8) whose authority is adduced against our thesis.

(2) See the Critical Notes on the *Stromata*.

(3) I. Cor. vii. 5—8.

celibacy, in the same chapter, are valid at every period. As for St. Peter, he was undoubtedly, before his vocation, possessed of a wife, but he said to his Master: "We have left *all things* and have followed Thee." (1). Finally, in citing St. Clement of Alexandria, the opponents of clerical celibacy omit to mention that the saint is combating those heretics of his day who condemned marriage as an evil thing; he by no means wished all to enter into that state.

The opponents of clerical celibacy are fond of adducing the instance of Gregory, father of St. Gregory Nazianzen, as a proof that, in early times, bishops were not obliged to observe continency; St. Nonna, wife of Gregory, gave birth, they say, to the saintly prelate, some time after his father became a bishop. Even among Catholic writers are found some who hold this opinion—namely, Tillemont, Baillet, the Benedictine editors of St. Basil, and Ceillier. Baronio, Alexandre, and Tournely combated this idea, but its full and triumphant refutation is due to the Bollandist Stilling (2), and after him, to Zaccaria, in his *New Justification of Holy Celibacy* (3). In the first place, we may observe, with Baronio, that St. Jerome tells us that even Jovinian acknowledged that "he could not be a bishop, who begat children during his episcopacy; if this were found to be the case, he would be condemned as an adulterer" (4). How is it, then, that the Arians, who did everything possible to detract from St. Gregory Nazianzen's reputation, never thought of calling him illegitimate? And how do our adversaries show that St. Gregory Nazianzen was born during the episcopacy of his father? Their only argument is drawn from a distich, in which the saint introduces his father as saying to him: "Thou hast not yet lived as many years as I have spent in sacrifices" (5). Baronio thinks that the verses are hyperbolic; Papebroch conjectures that there is some error in them; Alexandre accepts both of

(1) Matth. xix. 27.

(2) *Dissertation on the Date of Birth of St. Gregory Nazianzen*, published in 1750, in vol. iii. for September.

(3) Foligno, 1785, p. 121.

(4) *Against Jovinian*. St. Jerome wrote this passage only thirty years after the death of Nazianzen, and a little further on he speaks of this discipline as obtaining throughout the East.

(5) The Greek text has: *Oupo tosouton ekmemetrikas bion, osos diilthe thusion emoi chronos*. (*On His Life*, i., c. 35).

these opinions; Tournely supposes that the father of the saint compares the years of his son with the time which has passed since he himself was baptized, and became, therefore, a participant in the sacred Mysteries. At any rate, the verses are sufficiently ambiguous to prevent any serious argument to be drawn from them. The word *thusion* does not necessarily mean the Christian Sacrifice of the Mass; nay, it is much more appropriate to signify the Pagan mysteries, to which, before his conversion, the father of Nazianzen was addicted. The word *ekmemetrikas* is also ambiguous, and if, as Stilting translates it, "thou hast not considered" is the true meaning, the whole passage would read: "Thou hast not considered my age; I am not able any longer to sacrifice." But there are good reasons for believing that St. Gregory Nazianzen was born before the conversion of his father from Paganism. I. It is certain that the father was converted in 325. Now, in one of his poems, the saint says that he and his bosom friend, St. Basil, had resolved to leave Athens, where they had been studying many years: "For much time had been spent in study; it was now my thirtieth year." That the words "my thirtieth year" do not mean his thirtieth year of age, but his thirtieth year of study at Athens, is the opinion of the Greek priest Gregory, who compiled his life. All critics admit that the saint left Athens in 355; he therefore commenced his Athenian studies in 326. Precocious though he was, he could not have begun the study "of eloquence," which was his object in going to Athens, before his tenth year; therefore, concludes Stilting, he was born about 316, while his father was yet a Pagan. II. In certain of their writings, both St. Gregory and St. Basil speak of their extreme old age. The former says that he is "oppressed by hoary age; his members are withered by long life and sickness;" (1) he appeals to the prefect Olympius to have mercy on the citizens, for the sake of his gray hairs. (2). Now it is certain that St. Gregory died in 389. Can we suppose that he would use such language as the above, when he was not sixty years old? Yet, according to our

(1) *Oration* 27.(2) *Epist.* 172.

adversaries, he would have so spoken, for they place his birth in 329, and the expressions noted were penned some years before his death. III. We know that, when the father of St. Gregory was ordained priest, he was fifty-five years old, and that his wife, St. Nonna, was of about the same age. (1) Are we to believe that St. Nonna gave birth to our saint at that period of her life? IV. St. Gregory himself is, at least implicitly, an authority for the assertion that his birth preceded his father's conversion. Narrating the life of his father, he is very particular in observing the order of events, and whenever he, for a moment, deviates from chronological sequence, he reminds us of it. But he speaks of his own birth before he mentions his father's conversion, and makes no sign of realizing that he has interrupted the order of time. (2) For the above reasons, and especially because of the testimony of St. Jerome concerning the discipline obtaining in his day, we must hold that St. Gregory Nazianzen was born before his father's elevation to the episcopal dignity.

Although we avoid discussing the economic, romantic, and sanitary reasons alleged against the celibitic life of the clergy, we deem it proper to direct the reader's attention to the following remarks of Lingard: "To calculate the probable influence of this institution on the population of nations has frequently amused the ingenuity and leisure of arithmetical politicians; of whom many have not hesitated to arraign the wisdom of those by whom it was originally devised, and of those by whom it is still observed. Yet, in defiance of their speculations, several Catholic countries continue to be crowded with inhabitants; and to account for the scanty population of others we need only to advert to the defects of their constitution, the insalubrity of the climate, the establishment of foreign colonies, and the barrenness of a parched and effete soil. Neither is it certain that to increase the number of inhabitants is, in all circumstances, to increase the resources of the state; but it is evident that the man who spends his life in promoting the

(1) *Oration 19 and 10.*

(2) *Oration 19.* Stilting develops this argument at some length.

interests of morality and correcting the vicious propensities of his fellow-creatures, adds more to the sum of public virtue and of public happiness than he whose principal merit is the number of his children. If it be granted that the clerical functions are of high importance to the welfare of the state, it must also be acknowledged that, in the discharge of these functions, the unmarried possesses great and numerous advantages over the married clergyman. Unencumbered with the cares of a family, he may dedicate his whole attention to the spiritual improvement of his parishioners ; free from all anxiety respecting the future establishment of his children, he may expend without scruple the superfluity of his revenue in relieving the distresses of the sick, the aged, and the unfortunate. Had Augustine and his associates been involved in the embarrassments of marriage, they would never have torn themselves from their homes and country, and have devoted the best portion of their lives to the conversion of distant and unknown barbarians. Had their successors seen themselves surrounded with numerous families, they would never have founded those charitable establishments, nor have erected those religious edifices, that testify the use to which they devoted their riches, and still exist to reproach the parsimony of succeeding generations. (1). But it was not from the impolicy of the institution, that the reformers attempted to justify the eagerness with which they emancipated themselves from its yoke. They contended that the law of clerical celibacy was unjust, because it deprived man of his natural rights, and exacted privations incompatible with his natural propensities. To this objection a rational answer was returned : that to accept the priestly character was a matter of election, not of necessity ; and that he who freely made it the object of his choice, chose at the same time the obligations annexed to it. The insinuation that

(1) "He that hath wife and children," says Lord Bacon, "hath given hostages to fortune ; for they are impediments to great enterprises, either of virtue or mischief. Certainly the best works, and of the greatest merit for the public, have proceeded from the unmarried or the childless men, which, both in affection and means, have married and endowed the public. . . . Unmarried men are best friends, best masters, and best servants A single life doth well with churchmen, for charity will hardly water the ground, unless it must first fill a pool." *Essays*, p. 17, London, 1696. Seneca says : "Conjugal life breaks high and generous spirits, and draws them from great to the most debasing thoughts."

a life of continency was above the power of man was treated with the contempt that it deserved. To those, indeed, whom habit had rendered the obsequious slaves of their passions, it might appear, with reason, too arduous an attempt; but the thinking part of mankind would hesitate before they sanctioned an opinion which was a libel on the character of thousands, who, in every department of society, are confined by their circumstances to a state of temporary or perpetual celibacy." (1).

Many dispensations from the obligation of celibacy have been accorded to ecclesiastics, and Zaccaria gives a long list in his *New Justification*, already cited. He doubts as to the dispensation given, according to Volterrano, Claude Espenceus, and others, to a bishop of Vardin (year 1096), in order that he might marry and raise heirs to the Hungarian throne, offered to him after the death of St. Ladislaus. But Mariana (B. xiii., c. 9) gives as certain a dispensation accorded to Peter, archbishop of Seville, and son of Ferdinand III., king of Leon, to marry the princess Christiana of Denmark. In the *Metropolis Salisburgensis* and in the *Germania Sacra*, is recorded a dispensation given in 1322, to the archduke Albert of Austria, *parochus* of Vienna, and bishop-elect of Passau, to marry Jane, daughter of Uric, last count of Pford. Claude Espenceus (*Redemption of Vows*, B. v., c. 7) and the *Christian Gaul* (vol. v.), narrate that, in 1391, Burchard of Lutzelstein, bishop of Strasburg, was allowed to resign his see, and to marry. Cæsar Campana speaks of two dispensations, one in the line of the counts of Flanders (p. iv., no. 40), and one in that of the counts of Holland (no: 50). The first was in favor of Peter, lord of Alsace and bishop of Cambray, allowed to marry Sybil, daughter of the count of Nevers. The second was given to John, son of Alberic, (or Albert), count of Holland, who, in 1418, was permitted by Pope Martin V. to resign the bishopric of Liége, and to marry Elizabeth of Luxemburg. The *Metropolis Salisburgensis* (vol. i., p. 180, no. 48) and the *Ecclesiastical History of Germany*, Brussels, 1724, (vol. ii., p. 24), narrate that Robert, count palatine and bishop of

(1) *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, c. 2.

Frisingen, resigned his diocese to his brother Philip, and, by a dispensation from Pope Alexander VI., married Margaret duchess of Landshut. In a memorial presented to Clement XI., for the prince de Vendôme, it is said that Gregory XIII. similarly dispensed a certain archbishop, but his name is not given. Alexander VI. allowed Cæsar Borgia, a cardinal-deacon and archbishop of Valencia, to lay aside the purple and marry Charlotte d'Albret. Gregory XIII. wished to dispense the cardinal Charles of Portugal, uncle of king Sebastian, that he might give heirs to the crown, but the cardinal, alleging that he was too old—seventy-seven—declined to marry. In 1648, Innocent X. granted two dispensations to the Jesuit father, John Casimir of Poland—then a cardinal. Having been elected king of Poland, he was allowed to resign the purple, and was permitted to marry Mary Louisa di Gonzaga, the widow of his brother Ladislaus. In 1709, Clement XI., allowed the cardinal Francis dei Medici to marry Leonora di Gonzaga, daughter of the duke of Guastalla. The above instances of dispensation in the matter of celibacy, the reader will observe, are all in cases of cardinals and bishops. Although Zaccaria secured the good offices of Gaetano Marini, the Vatican archivist at the time, to search for evidence, he procured no “particular documents” referring to similar dispensations in cases of simple priests. He tells us, however, that Latino Latini wrote to Pope Pius IV: “Your Holiness has the example of your predecessor, Paul III., of happy memory, who, by letters which now exist (but which Zaccaria could not find), gave to three bishops the faculty of dispensing, in the cases of such priests as had married, provided they were men of great learning.” In modern days, the only instance of a validation of priestly marriages is that by Pius VII., in the case of the French *Constitutionnels*, who had married during the Revolution. Many deacons have been allowed to marry. In 1040, Benedict IX. dispensed in the case of Casimir, a monk of Cluny, for the sake of the Polish succession; see Longinus (*Hist. Polon.*, B. iii.) and Cromer (*Origin and Affairs of the Poles*, B. iv.). In 1354, Clement VI. allowed Henry, brother of king Rudolph of Bohemia,

to marry Elizabeth of Wittemberg; see Espenceus, (*loc. cit.*, B. v., c. 7). In 1534, Paul III. dispensed in the case of James Jacovacci; see *Register of Paul III.* In 1572, Gregory XIII. did the same with Francis, baron of Ghimes, chancellor of Transylvania. In 1620, a Brief of Paul V., addressed to the archbishop of Treves, allowed the deacon William von Ussbœck to marry. Several more dispensations for deacons are cited in the memorial of the prince de Vendôme to Clement XI. As to subdeacons, we find the following dispensations from celibacy. On Jan. 16, 1434, Eugenius IV. granted one to Christopher d'Héricourt of Amiens, a relative of the king; see *Register of Eugenius IV.* Claude Espenceus speaks of one given to a canon of Passau, in the sixteenth century. On March 24, 1608, Paul V. writes to his nuncio at Cologne, dispensing in the case of Herman, of the counts of Salm, "that the many and great fiefs of this house may not revert to a heretical branch." On Sept 13, 1612, the same Pontiff grants a dispensation to marry to John of Braccamonte, a subdeacon of Toledo, "because of the gravity and justice of the cause." In 1614, he also allowed marriage to Lupo de Mendoza, archdeacon (but as yet only subdeacon) of Compostella. Gregory XV. dispensed in the case of Francis Ciacco, subdeacon, and archdeacon of Toledo; see Barbosa (B. i., on *Subdiaconate*, c. 37, no 28). On Dec. 18, 1625, Pope Urban VIII. allowed the subdeacon Leopold, archduke of Austria, to resign his many benefices and marry. On July 12, 1644, the same Pontiff dispensed in the case of John, count of Ritberg, and a subdeacon of Cologne, so that the estates of that family might not pass to a Calvinist heir. On Nov 9, 1655, Alexander VII. dispensed in favor of Everard of Schendelagen, of the diocese of Osnabruck; on Oct. 31, 1656, he did the same for Henry of Savoy, duke of Nemours, a subdeacon of Paris; in both these cases, the perpetuation of extensive estates in Catholic hands was the object of the concession. On June 30, 1685, Innocent XI. allowed the subdeacon Ferdinand Maximilian, of the counts of Ritberg, a canon of Cologne, to marry, to prevent his estates from passing to the Landgrave of Hesse, a Calvinist, and "to preserve the

bishopric of Paderborn from probable danger." Dispensations to monks, friars, and nuns are numerous. Among the most celebrated are the following: In 1134, the death of Alphonsus the Warlike having left the kingdom of Aragon without an heir, the prince Ramiro, a brother of the late king, and a priest and monk, was placed on the throne, and was allowed, by Pope Innocent II., to marry. So say all old Spanish writers, the *Art of Verifying Dates*, and Arnold Wion, in his *Wood of Life*, B. iv. In 1177, Alexander III. allowed the Benedictine, Nicholas Giustiniani, to marry Anna, daughter of the doge Vitale Micheli, in order that the great family of the Giustiniani might not die out; but on condition that, when heirs had been born, Nicholas should return to his monastery. So it was done; the wife imitating the husband, and founding the nunnery of St. Adrian, at Venice. Constance, daughter of king Roger of Sicily, and a nun, was dispensed from her vows in 1191, by Celestine III., to marry the emperor Henry VI., who was crowned as king of Sicily in 1194. Dispensations in cases of persons belonging to the Military Religious Orders are quite numerous.

CHAPTER XV.

THE RIGHT OF THE POPE TO DEPOSE SOVEREIGNS.

Comparatively speaking, there are very few modern authors who do not declaim against the power exercised by the Roman Pontiff, during the Middle Ages, in the matter of deposing sovereigns. We are told that the Popes had no right to judge sovereigns, in temporal matters; furthermore, that such a usurpation was pernicious to society. Nor is the declared enemy of the Holy See the only one to inveigh against the deposing power, claimed and exercised by so many holy Pontiffs; many writers, whose devotion to the Church is beyond suspicion, have been so influenced by national prejudice and by an exaggerated respect for monarchy, as to join in the outcry

against the "pretensions" of Rome. (1). The prodigious power over sovereigns exercised by the Pontiffs of the Middle Ages has given rise to many and various theories as to its origin, some of which are theological, that is, viewing the matter according to the principle of revelation and of divine right, while others are historical, that is, examining the question with an eye to the public law of the olden time. It was only in the beginning of the eighteenth century (2) that the theological theories commenced to be laid aside. It is not our province to here defend any one of them, but a brief exposition of their meaning is necessary. According to the system of the "direct divine right," the Pope has received, *immediately from God*, full power to govern the world, both in spirituals and temporals; the temporal ruler is only an official of the Pontiff, and as he receives the temporal sword to be used in conformity with the order of God, he may be deprived of it by the Pope, when he uses it against that order. Gosselin, whose excellent treatise is certainly the most exhaustive, clear, and impartial, of all modern works on the subject (3), thinks that the first to advocate this theory was John of Salisbury (1159). St Thomas à Becket certainly held it (4); so did the compiler of the *Laws of Suabia* (5). Henry de Suza (d. 1365) even asserts that "since the coming of Jesus Christ all the dominion of infidel princes was transferred to the Church, and is vested in the Pope as the vicar of Jesus Christ, the King of kings." (6). Besides these famous men, the principal defenders of the "direct divine right" theory were Augustine Triumphus (d. 1328), and Alvarez Pelayo (d. 1340). Another theory of the divine right is that said right is only indirect. According to this opinion, the Pope has received from God, immediately and directly, no power over temporals; nevertheless, his power over spirituals in-

(1) Among the eminent authors who have censured the Popes of the Middle Ages, and most especially Gregory VII. and his successors, for this reason, may be particularly mentioned FLEURY, *passim*, and BOSSUET (if, indeed, he wrote the work), in the famous *Defence*, B. i., sect. 1, c. 7; B. iii., c. 2, 9, 10. As to Fleury, see MARCHETTI'S *Criticism*, MUZZARELLI'S *Remarks*, and ZACCARIA, in *Anti-Febronio*, Introduction, c. 6., no. 11.

(2) FENELON was the first Catholic writer to defend the deposing power by the public law of the Middle Ages, in his *Authority of the Supreme Pontiff*; LEIBNITZ, though with less clearness, had done the same *passim*, but especially in his *Right of Supremacy*.

(3) *Power of the Pope, during the Middle Age, over Sovereigns*; Paris, 1839.

(4) *Epistles*, B. i., no. 64, to king Henry II.

(5) SENCKENBERG, *Body of German Law, Preface to the Suabian Law*.

(6) *Commentaries on Decretals*, B. iii., tit. 34, Vow, etc., c. 8, nos. 26, 27.

cludes, *indirectly*, a right to manage temporals when the good of religion demands such management; the Pope cannot, *ordinarily*, depose princes, but he can do so in extraordinary cases, when, that is, the salvation of souls is impeded by princes. Bellarmine, the principal advocate of this opinion (1), cites in its favor Hugh of St. Victor, Alexander of Hales, St. Bonaventura, Durandus, Peter d'Ailly, John Parisiensis, John Torquemada, Gaetano (Cajetan), and many others of note. But Gosselin holds that many of these authors defend rather the "directive" power, in the sense explained by Fénelon. Gosselin also remarks that many others of the authors cited by Bellarmine as advocates of the indirect divine right are really defenders of the direct. They try, he says, "to soften down what appears extreme in that opinion, and sometimes seem to reduce it to an indirect power; but all of them hold, as a fundamental principle, that the Pope receives temporal as well as spiritual power, immediately from God, which is the very essence of the opinion of the direct power." Although Bellarmine's theory was soon adopted by nearly all "ultramontane" theologians (2), many of them so modified it as to reduce it to the solution of a case of conscience, concerning the binding force of an oath of allegiance. As explained by the celebrated cardinal du Perron, this modified system of the indirect divine right inculcates that the Pope cannot depose a sovereign, but that he can decide whether the prince has forfeited his throne, because of some offence against religion (3). When so presented, Bellarmine's theory differs but little from that of the "directive" power, defended by Fénelon. The theological opinion of the divine right is only an opinion; it has never been defined as an article of faith, nor has any Pontifical or

(1) When Bellarmine's theory (*Supreme Pontiff*, B. v., c. 6) appeared, it was so bitterly censured by the partisans of the direct divine right, that Pope Sixtus V. placed the work on the *Index*. The new edition of the *Index*, containing the prohibition, was about to be published, when Sixtus V. died; the new Pope, Urban VII., erased the book from the list. SACCHINI, *History of the Society of Jesus*, p. v., vol. 1.; FULIGATI, *Life of Bellarmine*, B. ii., c. 7; D'AVRIGNY, *Chronological and Dogmatic Memoirs*, cent. xvii., Nov. 1610.

(2) PERCEIRA DE CASTRO, *Royal Hand*, Lisbon, 1625; RONCAGLIA, *Notes on Alexandre's Diss.* ii., cent. xi.; BIANCHI, *Power and Policy of the Church*, vol. i., B. i. § 8; PEREZ VALIENTE, *Public Law of Spain*, Madrid, 1751, vol. i., c. 14; MAMACHI, *Origins and Antiquities*, Rome, 1749, vol. iv., c. 2.

(3) During the session of the States General of France, in 1614, du Perron thus explained his mind. See D'AVRIGNY, *loc. cit.*, vol. i., Oct. 27, 1614; LITTA, *Letters on the four articles of 1632*, no. 9.

Conciliary decree sanctioned it. Indeed, at present at least, the Holy See is very far from maintaining either the theory of the direct, or that of the indirect divine right. (1).

Fénelon thus presents his explanation of the conduct of the Popes in deposing princes: "An impression began gradually to take deep hold of the mind of Catholic nations, that the supreme power could be vested in none but a Catholic; and that a condition was implied in the tacit contract between princes and people, that the people should faithfully obey the prince so long as he remained faithful to the Catholic religion. This condition once supposed, it was the general belief that the oath which bound the nation to its prince ceased to be obligatory whenever he violated that condition and openly revolted against the Catholic religion. In these times it was usual that excommunicated persons should be deprived of all communication with the faithful, and should have no intercourse with them, unless for the necessaries of life. It is not wonderful, therefore, that nations so devoted to the Catholic religion should shake off the yoke of an excommunicated prince. They had become subject to him only on condition that he also should be a subject of the Catholic religion (2). But a prince whom the Church had excommunicated, either because of heresy, or because of an evil and impious administration of his power, was no longer looked upon as that devout prince to whom the whole

(1) GOSSELIN, *loc. cit.*, *Confirmatory Evidence*, no. 8. In our day, says this author, the Holy See, "far from favoring the theological opinion of the direct or indirect power, embraces readily such opportunities as present themselves of showing the slight importance it attaches to that opinion, and of openly professing principles which subvert, or at least are not easily reconciled with, it."

(2) This contract will not surprise us, if we bear in mind that in most of the monarchies established on the ruins of the old Roman empire the crown was not purely hereditary. It was also elective, inasmuch as the sovereign could be chosen among all the princes of the reigning family; quite naturally, therefore, conditions were attached to the coronation of the elect. As De Maistre remarks, after Voltaire (*Essay on Customs*, vol. iii., c. 121), election necessarily implies a contract between the king and the nation, "so that an elective monarch can at all times be called to account and judged . . . in the Middle Age, elective sovereignty had no other firm stay but that derived from the personal qualities of the sovereign; let no one, therefore, wonder at its having been so frequently attacked, transferred, or subverted." (*The Pope*, B. ii., c. 9). John de la Chapelle, secretary of the prince de Conti, in his *Letters concerning the War of the Spanish Succession* (Basel, 1703, vol. iii., p. 146) says that "the emperor swears to observe all the articles of a contract. By a violation of them, he frees his subjects from their allegiance; he forfeits every right to the empire, because he received the empire only on condition that he observed said articles." In the old *Capitularies* (BALUZE, *Cap.*, vol. 1); in the *Law of the Visigoths*, b. 12, tit. 2, no. 2, (CANCIANI, *Laws of the Barbarians*, vol. iv.); in the *Laws of England* (*ibid.*); and in the *Preface to the Saxon or German Law*, no. 2-4 (SENCKENBERG, *Body of German Law*, vol. ii.), we find it expressly determined that the sovereign shall be elected only on condition that he professes the Catholic faith, and swears to defend it, with all his power, against every kind of heresy and impiety.

nation had been willing to commit itself. The people therefore regarded their oath of allegiance as no longer binding. Again, the Canon law had decreed that an excommunicated person who did not submit to the Church within a certain period, and thus obtain absolution, was to be considered, if not a heretic, at least one suspected of heresy. Hence princes who contumaciously persisted in a state of excommunication were regarded as impious contempters of the Catholic Church, and, consequently, as heretics; and such were deposed by the nation, for having failed to keep their compact with it. The usage, however, was so far modified, that the deposition was not effected until the Church had been consulted The Church neither deposed nor instituted lay rulers; she merely told the people, when they consulted her, what they could conscientiously do, in the matter of a contract and an oath. This is not a juridical and civil power, but only that directive and ordinative power which Gerson admits." (2). In another place, Fénelon says that the deposing power "consists only in this. that the Pope, as prince of pastors, and chief doctor and governor of the Church in all great questions of morality, is bound to instruct the people who consult him as to the binding force of their oath of allegiance. But the Popes do not wish to command princes, unless they have acquired the right by a special title, or by some peculiar prescription over such princes as are feudal vassals of the Apostolic See." (1). The deposing power, according to the bishop of Cambrai, was not one of temporal jurisdiction, founded on the divine law; it was, however, both a directive power, of divine institution, and one of temporal jurisdiction, of human institution. The Supreme Pontiff, by divine institution, directs the consciences of men; and during the Middle Ages he received, by human institution, by the public law of the time, a power of temporal jurisdiction. When the Popes pronounced a sentence of deposition, contends Fénelon, they did not claim a divine right to do so; they merely declared that, by not having complied with the conditions implied

(2) *Loc. cit.*, c. 39.(1) *Ibid.*, c. 27.

in his election or coronation, a certain prince had forfeited his crown.

While authors may differ as to the origin and grounds of the belief, universally held during the Middle Ages, that the Pope possessed a right, in certain cases, to depose princes, the existence of that belief is indisputable. It is admitted by Gallicans like Bossuet, Fleury, and Michaud; by such Protestants as Leibnitz, Pfeffel, Hurter, and Voigt; and by that enemy of all religion, Voltaire. Bossuet observes that "the obligation of avoiding heretics had made such an impression on pious and enlightened men in the time of Gregory VII., that they renounced allegiance to Henry IV., when he was excommunicated by that Pope. It was the custom in those days to insist on an avoidance of intercourse with the excommunicated." (1). Fleury, who yields to none in opposition to "ultramontanism," admits that during the eighth and ninth centuries kings themselves acknowledged that the Church could depose them, as appears from the petition presented by Charles the Bald to the Council of Savonières, in 859 (2). The same author says that, "more than two hundred years before Gregory VII., Popes had commenced to decide authoritatively on the rights of crowns." (3). Michaud says that "the pretensions of the Popes, in this matter, were unquestionably favored by the common belief of the age. Occasional complaints there were of unjust decisions issuing from the tribunal of the heads of the Church; but their right of judging the Christian powers was never questioned, and their judgments were almost always received by the people without murmur." (4). Leibnitz holds that "it is certain that many princes were feudatories or vassals of the Roman empire, or at least of the Roman Church; that some kings and dukes were created by the emperor or the Pope; and that others were not anointed kings without, at the same, time doing homage to Jesus Christ, to whose Church they promised fealty, when they were receiving the unction from the hands of the bishop; and this it was that verified the formula

(1) *Defence of Declaration*, B. i., sect. 2, c. 24; B. iii., c. 4.

(2) *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. xiii., discourse iii., no. 10.

(3) *Ibid.*

(4) *History of the Crusades*, 4th edit., vol. iv., p. 163.

'Christ reigns, conquers, commands' (1), for all history attests that most of the Western nations submitted to the Church with equal promptitude and piety. I am not now examining whether these things were by divine right. The facts are that they were done with unanimous consent; that they could most properly be done; and that they are not opposed to the good of Christendom; for not unfrequently the salvation of souls and the public good are promoted by the same measure. From the strict connection that exists between sacred and profane things, it resulted that people believed the Pope to have received some authority over kings themselves." (2). It is interesting to notice this great Protestant thinker sighing for the restoration of the Papal supremacy: "My opinion would be, to establish, yes, even in Rome, a tribunal (to decide controversies between sovereigns) and to make the Pope its president, as he really did, in former ages, figure as judge between Christian princes. And since there is no prohibition against the planning of romances, what harm can there be in suggesting one which would revive the golden age?" (3). Voltaire observes: "It appears that the princes who had the right of electing the emperor, had also the right of deposing him; but to admit the Pope to preside in such decisions was to acknowledge him as the natural judge of the emperor and the empire." (4). The same malignant carper asserts that "every prince who desired to recover or to usurp a territory addressed himself to the Pope, as to his master. No new prince dared to call himself sovereign, nor would other princes recognize him as such without the consent of the Pope; and the fundamental principle of the entire history of the Middle Ages is that the Popes regarded themselves as lords paramount of all kingdoms, without one exception." (5). In the valuable work of Gosselin the reader will find many special

(1) This legend "*Christus regnat, vincit, imperat*" was on all the gold coins of France, from Louis VI. (year 1100) to Louis XVI.

(2) *Right of Supremacy*, p. iii.

(3) *Letter ii. to M. Grimaret* (*Works*, vol. v.). Pfeffel, in his *New Compendium of German History*, vol. i., year 1106, thinks that Pope Gregory VII. could not have acted toward Henry IV. otherwise than he did, for all his measures, he says, were the logical realization of principles then universally admitted.

(4) *Loc. cit.*, vol. ii., c. 46.

(5) *Ibid.*, vol. iii., c. 44.

proofs that it was universally admitted, during the Middle Ages, that the Roman Pontiff could depose, for certain reasons, any monarch in Christendom. We would here, however, only draw attention to a few proofs of the existence of that belief, with regard to the Holy Roman empire. By an examination of these proofs, the reader will be convinced that the said belief was not introduced by St. Gregory VII., and that the Popes of the Middle Ages have been falsely accused of usurpation in their conduct toward the empire.

Some of the olden authors speak of the empire as a fief of the Holy See, but that expression must not be understood as implying that the Pontiff held the same rights over the empire that he held over those countries, the rulers of which were, properly speaking, vassals of the Holy See. This is evident from the difference between the oath of fidelity taken to the Pontiff by the emperors, and that taken by the vassal princes, the kings of Sicily, Hungary, Aragon, and in at least one case, of England. The vassals, in their oath, plainly declare that they hold their domains by favor of the Pontiff; the emperor, in his, recognizes an obligation of protecting and defending the Roman See, from which alone he derives his title. But that the empire really depended on the Holy See, in the sense that the Pontiff could elect an emperor (or confirm an election by the prince-electors), and that he gave the title, and could take it away, is easily proved. During their conflict with Henry IV., the Saxon princes, and many other German lords, appealed to the Pontiff, and urged that "it is not right to tolerate so wicked a prince on the throne, especially as Rome has not yet conferred on him the royal dignity; it is proper to restore to Rome her right of appointing kings; it belongs to the Pope and to the city of Rome, in accord with the German princes, to select a man whose life and wisdom merit such an honor." (1). Godfrey of Viterbo, writing about the year 1184, represents the Pope as saying to the emperors: "We have given you the empire; you

(1) *Analogy of Henry IV.*, in *PRISTITIUS, Illustrious Writers of Germany*, cited by *VOIGT, Gregory VII.*, B. viii.; and by *BOSSUET, Defence*, B. 1., c. 12.

have given us little; you are Roman emperors by our gift." (1). Arnold, bishop of Lisieux, speaking in a Council of Tours in 1163, says that the emperors, "according to all old histories, have no other claim to the crown, than the will of the Holy Roman Church." (2). Gervase of Tilbury, writing to Otho IV., about the year 1211, tells that emperor to consider that "Pope Innocent II. gave to Otho's great-grandfather that empire which he now holds from Innocent III.," and then he proceeds: "The empire is not yours, but Christ's; not yours, but Peter's; you have received it, not from yourself, but from the vicar of Christ, the successor of Peter. . . . When you give his own to Peter, you lose nothing of your own. . . . By favor of the Pope and not of itself, did Rome revive the empire, in the time of Charlemagne; the favor of the Pope gave the empire to a king of the Franks; the favor of the Pope transferred it from the Frankish to a German king; nor does the empire fall to him whom Germany chooses, but to him whom the Pope appoints." (3). Ludolph, bishop of Bamberg, an eminent juriconsult of the thirteenth century, regards as unquestionable "that after Charlemagne's elevation all the emperors received the unction and the crown from the Roman Church; that from the time of Otho every emperor, at his coronation, swore fidelity to that Church. . . . that the German princes, who had the right to elect a king of the Romans, had acknowledged to Pope Innocent III. that the Roman Church possessed the right of examining the person chosen as king of the Romans, who was afterwards to be promoted to the empire." (4). John of Paris, a devoted adherent of Philip the Fair, and hence very averse to anything like pretension on the part of Rome, says: "To the objection that the Pope can depose the emperor, I reply that it is true: the Pope deposes him whom he has made—the emperor receives his fief from the Pope." (5). But let us

(1) *Univ. Chron.*, *Paschal II*, in PISTORIUS, *German Writers*, vol. ii.

(2) LABBE, *Councils*, vol. x.

(3) *Imperial Recreations*. This work was probably suggested to Gervase, remarks Gosselin, by John of Salisbury's *Polycraticeus*, also written for the instruction of princes. It is worthy of note, continues Gosselin, that these writers, though differing in their explanation of the subjection of the power of princes to that of the Pope, both assert the general belief in that subjection. See LEIBNITZ, *Writers on Brunswick Affairs*, vol. i.

(4) *Zeal of the German Princes*, Strasburg, 1508.

(5) *Royal and Papal Power*, c. 16.

hear the emperors themselves. Louis II., writing, in 871, to his rival, Basil, says of his own predecessors that "not one of them assumed the imperial title, until, for that end, he had been anointed by the Roman Pontiff." (1). Lothaire I. writes to his father, Louis the Compliant, "I have received from the Supreme Pontiff, before the altar, and before the body of St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles, as you desired, the blessing honor, and title of the imperial office; also the crown, and the sword, for the defence of the Church." (2). Muratori declares that, in the immense multitude of charters and diplomas which he had examined, he could not discover one instance of the title of emperor having been given to a king of Germany before his coronation by the Pope. (3).

Let us now read the oath of fidelity to the Popes taken by the emperors. In two copies of the *Sacramentary* of St. Gregory, preserved in the Vatican and Orbonian libraries at Rome, and proved by Muratori (4) to be of a date prior to the death of Pope Leo III. (816), the oath is given as follows: "I, N., king of the Romans, by the grace of God, to be emperor, promise and swear, before God and the blessed Peter, that hereafter I shall be the protector and defender of the Supreme Pontiff and of the Holy Roman Church, in all their necessities and interests, guarding and preserving their possessions, honors, and rights, as far as the divine assistance will enable me, with all my knowledge and power, in pure and sincere fidelity. So help me God, and these holy gospels of God." (5). Before Otho I. even entered Italy, Pope John XII. required the legates to administer to him, before a portion of the true cross, the following oath, which was afterwards inserted (6) in the *Body of Canon Law*: "I, king Otho, do promise and swear to the lord John, Supreme Pontiff, by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and by this wood of the life-giving cross, and by these relics of the saints, that if, God per-

(1) BARONIO, year 871, no. 59. CENNI, *Monuments*, diss. 6, no. 19.

(2) CENNI, *loc. cit.*, no. 21. MABILLON, *Acts of the Benedictines*, cent. iv.

(3) *Annals of Italy*, years 1433, 1493, 1519.

(4) *Ancient Roman Liturgy*, vol. i., dissert. on *Liturgical Matters*, c. 6.

(5) MURATORI, *ibid.*, vol. ii.

(6) *Decree*, p. i., dist. 53, c. 33, *Tibi Domino*.

mitting, I arrive at Rome, I shall with all my power exalt the Holy Roman Church, and thee its ruler; and I shall never injure, by my will, consent, advice, or persuasion, thy life, or members, or position; and I shall not make in Rome, in anything regarding thee or the Romans, any decree or law without thy counsel; and I shall restore to thee whatever part of the territory of St. Peter comes into our power: and whomever I shall place over the kingdom of Italy, I shall cause to swear that he will be thy ally in defending the territory of St. Peter, with all his might. So help me, etc." (1). The terms of this oath, says Gosselin, may have varied with time, but it was certainly taken by the emperors at their coronation, during the whole course of the Middle Ages. Having now shown that, contrary to the assertions of Sismondi, Michaud, Voigt, Guizot, and certain other modern authors, Gregory VII. was not the first Pontiff to regard the empire as a dependency of the Holy See, we proceed to defend the legitimacy of the deposing power, as exercised by the Popes of the Middle Ages.

We shall not consider the question of the Pontiff's divine right in the premises, whether that right be regarded as direct or indirect. It is not within our province, as historians, to do more than indicate that such a right has been defended by certain grave theologians, if not by the whole power of the schools. But we do contend that, when the Popes of the Middle Ages deposed sovereigns, they acted in accordance with the constitutional law of the day. (2) If

(1) BARONIO, year 960, no. 5.

(2) With regard to the meaning of what is called constitutional or public law, see SUAREZ, *On Laws*. In the Preface to his *Public Law*, John Domat, whom Canth styles, "by excellence, a philosophical jurisconsult," says: "With regard to that part of the order of society which refers solely to persons united in one state under the same government, the matters arising from this order are of two kinds, which it is necessary to distinguish. The first consists of those which relate to the general order of the state; such as those that relate to government, the power of the authorities, the obedience due to them, etc. The second consists of those which regard the relations between private individuals, their various obligations to each other, whether with or without a contract. The first kind of matters, having reference to the general order of a state, is the object of *constitutional* law; and the second, which regards only what passes between private persons, is the object of that other class of laws, which, for that reason, is called *private* law. Of these two kinds of law there are two sorts, admitted in practice by all the nations of the earth. One consists of those which belong to the natural law; the other, of laws peculiar to each country; such, for instance, as customs sanctioned by long usage, and laws such as the reigning power may enact." In his *Civil Law*, prelin., tit. 1, sect. 1, nos. 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, the same author explains how these laws may be known: "Laws or rules are of two kinds: one belongs to the natural, and the other to positive, otherwise called human or conventional law, because enacted by men. Human laws are of two sorts; the first, such as from their very institution were written and promulgated by competent authority, as, for instance, the ordinances of the kings of France; and the other, those whose origin cannot be traced, but which are found sanctioned by the universal approbation and immemorial usage of the people. These latter rules, or laws, are called customs. Customs derive their obligatory

the public law of the time authorized the deposing power of the Popes, that power was legitimate. Now it is certain that, during the Middle Ages, it was stipulated in the election of all sovereigns, by the constitution of their states, that an heretical prince, or one who rebelled against the Church, incurred deposition. In proving that such was the public law of the time, we will not insist, with de Maistre, that the existence of this law is sufficiently shown by the fact of the universal belief of the day (1); we shall furnish direct proofs, founded on the constitutional law of Spain, of England, of Sicily, of France, and above all, of the Holy Roman empire. Firstly, then, in regard to Spain, the reader of Mariana, Ferreras, and Valiente will find that, as far back as the seventh century, the general assemblies of the nation insisted upon the Catholicism of the monarch. In the Sixth Council of Toledo (638), it was decreed that "hereafter, no king shall mount the throne until he has sworn, among other conditions, not to tolerate heretics in his states." The Jesuit Charenton, in his notes on Mariana, says that "it is not surprising that the Councils imposed new laws and conditions on the Gothic kings. All the grandees of the kingdom assisted at these Councils, for they were a kind of States-General. The bishop, it is true, had the exclusive management of ecclesiastical matters, but in civil affairs the barons, as well as the prelates, had a voice." Valiente tells us that the obligation of maintaining religious unity in Spain remained in force for all Spanish monarchs, and they were obliged to accept it at their coronation until the fifteenth century; and then it was no longer expressly mentioned, because it was no longer necessary for thoroughly Catholic Spain (1).

force from the people who have received them, whereas, in republics, the authority is vested in the people. But in monarchical states customs are not established, and cannot acquire the force of law, unless with the assent of the sovereign. Thus, in France, the kings have fixed and drawn up in writing, and confirmed as laws, all the customs, preserving for each province the laws which it had already possessed, either from the ancient consent of the people who instituted them, or of the princes who governed them." In *sect.* 2, no. 19, *ibid.*, Domat concludes from the above principles, that "if the difficulties arising in the interpretation of a law or custom are found explained by an ancient usage, which fixes its sense, and which is confirmed by an uninterrupted succession of uniform decisions, we must adhere to the sense as decided by custom, which is the best interpreter of laws."

(1) Generally speaking, says Gosselin, the sole fact of the universal belief will establish the existence of the law (GROTIUS, *Law of War*, B. ii., c. 4. PUFFENDORF, *Law of Nature and Nations*, B. iv., c. 12, § 8; B. vii., c. 7, § 4; c. 8, § 9.), "but when there is question of proving a point of constitutional law in favor of the Holy See, it is not enough, in the opinion of the enemies of the Church, to appeal to prescription . . . we must prove, besides, that the Church had from the beginning, possessed this power legitimately."

(1) *Public Law of Spain*, vol. ii., c. 7, no. 18.

Secondly, as regards England, the *Laws of St. Edward*, which were solemnly confirmed by the Conqueror in 1069, declare, in art. XIV., that "the king, as he holds here below the place of the Supreme King, is appointed to rule an earthly kingdom and the Lord's people, and above all, to venerate His Church, to defend her from those who would injure her, to expel from her all evil-doers, and to utterly destroy them. Unless he does these things, the name of king shall not cling to him; yea, as Pope John declares, he shall lose the name of king." (1). And then, after mentioning the duties of a king, the same article says: "The king, in his own person, placing his hand on the holy Gospels, and on the sacred relics, shall, in the presence of the priests and of his kingdom, swear to observe all those things, before he is crowned by the archbishops and bishops." In the sixteenth century, the English Catholics confidently cited, against Elizabeth's claim to the throne, the ancient laws of England, which expressly excluded a heretic from the throne. (2). Elizabeth herself, though she affected to ridicule the Pope's sentence against her pretensions, tried every means to procure its revocation, and even sought the emperor Maximilian's intercession. Pope Pius V. asked the emperor, in return, "whether Elizabeth deemed the sentence valid or invalid. If valid, why did she not seek a reconciliation with the Holy See? If invalid, why did she wish it to be revoked?" (3). Thirdly, in regard to the Two Sicilies, there can be no question, for from the time of Charlemagne, the Holy See was suzerain of nearly all the peninsular part of this kingdom (4); Adrian I. having received, in 773, from Charlemagne, the sovereignty of the duchy of Benevento, which then included all of the peninsular domain, excepting the duchy of Naples and Gaeta. During the Pontificate of John VIII. (872-882), whether,

(1) WILKINS, *Anglo-Saxon Laws*, London, 1721. It is well here to observe that, according to the best critics, these laws were, properly speaking, not St. Edward's own, but a compilation, with amendments, of old Saxon laws, reaching back to the year 602, in the reign of Ethelbert of Kent.

(2) See ALLEN, *A True, Sincere, and Modest Answer of Catholics to the English Persecutors*, 1534, c. 4, 5, and the same cardinal's *Admonition to the Nobility and People of England and Ireland*, Antwerp, 1588. Also, DOLEMAN, *Conference on the Next Succession to the Crown of England*, 1593, p. 2, c. 7.

(3) LINGARD, *History of England*, vol. vi., c. 1.

(4) BORGIA, *History of the Temporal Dominion of the Apostolic See in the Two Sicilies*, Second Edit., Rome, 1789, *Dissert. Prelim.*, no. 18.

as the anti-Papal historian, Giannone, admits (1), by effect of another donation of Charlemagne, or by the voluntary submission of the people, Gaeta also became a fief of the Holy See. Under St. Leo IX. (1049-1054), the Holy See received from the emperor Henry III. a cession of the high dominion which the successors of Charlemagne had retained, subject to the Pontiff's rights, over these and the other Neapolitan territories; and we find the same Pope investing count Humfred with the sovereignty of the island of Sicily. From this period, down to our own day, the kings of Naples and of Sicily (or of the Two Sicilies) whether they were Normans, Suabians, Angevines, Aragonese, Austrians, Bourbons, have always solemnly recognized the suzerainty of the Holy See. (2). The following oath of fealty, taken by Robert Guiscard to Pope Nicholas II., in 1059, will sufficiently show the relations subsisting between the Roman Pontiffs and this kingdom. "I, Robert, by the grace of God and of St. Peter, duke of the Puglia and of Calabria, and by the same protection, duke-elect of Sicily, will henceforth be faithful to the Holy Roman Church, and to thee, *my liege Lord*, Nicholas. I shall take no part in any act or scheme against thy life, limbs, or liberty; nor shall I knowingly disclose, to thine injury, the plans which thou mayest entrust to me, and which thou forbiddest me to reveal. In all places, and with all my power, I shall aid the Holy Roman Church against all men, to hold and to preserve the property and domain of St. Peter; I shall assist thee to preserve in security and honor the Roman Popedom, the land, and the principality of St. Peter; I shall not try to invade, to acquire, or to seize, without certain license from thee or from thy successors in the dignity of St. Peter, any possessions other than those which thou or thy successors may grant to me. I shall try, in good faith, to pay annually to the Roman Church the tribute fixed for the lands of St. Peter which I hold or may hold. I shall place in thy power all the churches in my dominions, together with their possessions; and I shall de-

(1) *Civil History of the kingdom of Naples*, Naples, 1724, B. vi., c. 1.

(2) For dates of this solemn recognition, and payment of tribute, see the cited work of Borgia, p. xvi. When Borgia wrote (1789), this mark of vassalage had been exhibited to the Roman Pontiffs fifty-one times.

send them in their fidelity to the Holy Roman Church. Shouldst thou die, or any of thy successors die, before me, I shall help toward the election and installation of a successor worthy of St. Peter, according as I shall be advised by the best cardinals, and by the Roman clergy and people. All the above things I shall observe to thee and to the Holy Roman Church, and I shall observe this fidelity to thy successors in the dignity of St. Peter, who may confirm to me the investitures thou hast granted to me. So help me, etc." (1).

Fourthly, in regard to France, as far back as the sixth century, we find French kings subjecting themselves to be deposed, in certain cases, by the authority of the Pope. At the request of queen Brunehilda, St. Gregory the Great, when granting certain privileges to the monasteries and hospital of Autun, decreed that "if any person, king, bishop, judge, or any secular whosoever, knowing this our constitution, shall try to violate it, he forfeits the dignity of his power and honor." (2). But whatever may have been the custom of France under her first race of kings, it is certain that under the Carolingians the king was amenable to a national Council, an assembly which was at once ecclesiastical and political—a kind of States-General. (3). When Lothaire had been deposed, in 842, by the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle, the bishops declared that his brothers could not take possession of his states unless they promised to rule according to the law of God; and when the princes so promised, the president said: "Then, by the divine authority, we advise, exhort, and command, that you receive the kingdom, and rule it according to the will of God." (4). Charles the Bald, having been deposed by the Council of Attigny, in 857, presented a petition to the Council of Savonnières, in 859, in which he thus admitted the competency of the ecclesiastical tribunal: "By no one could I be cast down from the height of royal power, without at least the consideration and judgment of the bishops, by

(1) BARONIO, years 1059, no. 70.

(2) *Epistles*, B. xiii., ep. 8, 9, 10.

(3) THOMASSIN, *Old and New Discipline of the Church*, vol. ii., B. iii., c. 44—57. BERNARD, *Origin and Progress of French Legislation*, B. v., c. 3.

(4) NITHARD, *Dissensions of the Sons of Louis the Compliant*, B. iv., in Labbe, vol. 7. DANIEL, *History of France*, vol. 2. FLEURY, vol. x., B. xlviii., no. 11; B. xlix., no. 46.

whose ministry I was consecrated king, and who are called thrones of God, in whom God sits, and through whom He pronounces His judgments." (1).

And now, fifthly, for the public law of the empire. We have already seen, when treating of the revival of the empire under Charlemagne, that this prince owed his title to the Roman Pontiff, the representative and guardian of the Roman people. (2). Again, by the nomination and coronation of Charlemagne, the Pope did not renounce his right in future elections, as is proved by the exercise of that right during the Carlovingian period, and by the transfer of the empire, at the will of the Pontiff (John XII.), from the Franks to the Germans. These facts would, of themselves, demonstrate the special dependence of the empire on the Pontiff, but that dependence, and the emperor's liability, in certain cases, to deposition by the Pope, are clearly asserted in the ancient monuments of German law. In the *Swabian Code*, compiled in the thirteenth century, from the ancient laws and customs of the empire (3), we read: "The Church sword is given to the Pope, that he may pronounce judgment at the proper times, seated on a white horse (then a sign of pre-eminence). The emperor must hold the stirrup, lest the saddle should shift. (4). Thus it is indicated that whoever resists the Pope, and who is not induced to obey by an ecclesiastical judgment, is to be compelled by the emperor and other lay princes and judges, by proscription." (5). Concerning the election of an emperor we read: "The election of the *king* belongs by right to the Germans. . . . when he is consecrated, and crowned, and placed on the throne at Aix-la-Chapelle, with the consent of the electors, then he receives the power and

(1) DANIEL, *ibid.* BOSSUET, *Defence*, B. ii., c. 43.

(2) It is worthy of remark that, in modern times, when the emperors were no longer crowned at Rome, the Popes did not style them emperors, but emperors-elect. See two Briefs of Pius VI. to Leopold II. and Francis II. in *Briefs of Pius VI.*, Paris, 1798, p. 557, 561. GOSSELIN, p. 2, c. 3, § 2.

(3) So says the title: "Here begins the Book of Imperial Provincial Law, established and ordained by the Roman emperors and electors, containing all the common articles of law—whatever is to be done or omitted. . . . for the sake of general peace, established by the Holy Emperors, and seriously confirmed in ancient times." *Preamble to the German or Swabian Law*, in Senckenberg's *Body of German Law*, vol. ii. For the opinion of eminent jurists as to the high authority of this Code, see Senckenberg, in *Preamble*, § 20, and Eichorn, in his *History of the German Empire and Laws*, vol. ii.

(4) This custom was certainly older than the ninth century, for it is mentioned in copies of the *Sacramentary* of St. Gregory in use at that time. See Muratori's *Ancient Rom. Lit.*, vol. ii.

(5) *Preamble*, 21-24.

name of *king*; but when the Pope has consecrated and crowned him, then he has the full power of the empire, and the name of *emperor* Deformed, leprous, excommunicated, proscribed, or heretical persons cannot be chosen by the princes; but if they should choose such a person, the other princes have a right to reject him, in the place where the imperial court assembles." (1). As to the excommunication of an emperor, it is decreed that "Only the Pope can put the emperor under the ban; but he should do this only for three causes: firstly, if the emperor doubts as to orthodoxy of faith; secondly, if he leaves his wife; thirdly, if he injures churches." (2). Concerning heretical princes, it is established that "any lay prince who does not punish heretics, and who defends and protects them, shall be excommunicated by ecclesiastical judgment; and if, within a year, he does not amend, the bishop who excommunicated him shall denounce his crime to the Pope, and shall state, at the same time, for how long a period he has, because of that crime, persevered in the state of excommunication. This having been done, the Pope should deprive him of his princely office and of all his honors. Such shall be the judgment, in the cases of magnates, as well as in those of the lowly; for we read that Pope Innocent deposed the emperor Otho (IV.) from his throne, for other crimes. This the Popes do, of right, for God said to Jeremiah: 'I have appointed thee judge over every man and every kingdom.'" (3).

It is evident, therefore, that, whether or not the deposing power be of divine right, the Pontiffs of the Middle Ages were guilty of no usurpation, and of no presumption, when they exercised it. As to the practical results of this exercise, if the reader will refer to the valuable work of Gosselin (4), he will be convinced, firstly, that the Popes were always

(1) C. 18, nos. 1, 2, 3; c. 22., nos. 8, 9.

(2) C. 29.

(3) C. 351. Gosselin properly infers from those provisions of the ancient German law that "it clearly follows that the Papal sentence of deposition deprived an emperor, not only of the imperial title, but of his rank and of his honors, and consequently, of the title and rights of king of Germany. . . . these provisions will, doubtless, surprise many readers, and it is to be regretted that the majority of modern writers who have treated of the history of this period were ignorant of this ancient jurisprudence, which throws so much light on the history of the lamentable conflicts which so long divided the priesthood and the empire." *Loc. cit.*, p. ii., c. 3, § 3

(4) P. ii., c. 4.

moderate in the use of their power ; secondly, that monarchical sycophants have falsely accused the Holy See of degrading, by their treatment of sovereigns, the royal authority in the eyes of the people ; thirdly, that the blame for the wars caused by the collision of the spiritual and temporal power is to be assigned, not to the Pontiffs, but to rebellious and tyrannical, and sometimes heretical, kings. As to the real advantages accruing to society from the exercise of the deposing power, namely, the preservation of religion, morality, and public tranquillity, they are admitted by many Protestant, and even infidel, authors of eminence, who have been curious enough, and brave enough, to study the matter. Coquerel, (Athanasé) than whom modern French Protestantism has produced no more brilliant light, admits that "the Papal power, by disposing of crowns, prevented the atrocities of despotism ; hence, in those dark ages, we see no instance of a tyrant like Domitian ; a Tiberius could not exist ; Rome would have crushed him. Great despotisms develop when kings believe that there is no power above them ; then it is that the intoxication of unlimited power engenders the most atrocious enormities."

(1). Ancillon (John), one of the best of Protestant historians, confesses that "during the Middle Ages, when there was no social order, the Papacy alone perhaps saved Europe from utter barbarism. It created bonds of connection between the most distant nations ; it was a common centre, a rallying point for isolated states. It was a supreme tribunal, established in the midst of universal anarchy, and its decrees were sometimes as respectable as they were respected. It prevented and arrested the despotism of the emperors, and diminished the inconveniences of the feudal system." (2). Even Voltaire is compelled to acknowledge that "The interests of the human race required some check on sovereigns, and some protection for the life of the subject : this religious check could, by universal consent, be placed in the hands of the Pope. This chief Pontiff, by never meddling in temporal quarrels except to appease them,

(1) *Essay on the History of Christianity*, p. 75.

(2) *Tableau of the Revolutions of the Political System of Europe after the 15th Century*, Berlin, 1803, vol. i., *Introd.*, p. 133, 157.

by admonishing kings and nations of their duties, by re-proving crimes, by inflicting excommunications on great offences only, would have been regarded as the image of God on earth." (1).

CHAPTER XVI.

THE HERESY OF BERENGARIUS.

Berengarius was born at Tours, toward the close of the tenth century. His education was received in the schools of Chartres, and his principal master was the holy and learned Fulbert. (2). Adelman, who was one of his companions, informs us that, while yet a youth, Berengarius manifested a petulant spirit and a craving for novelties, which frequently impelled Fulbert to warn him not to desert the beaten path, namely, the Apostolic faith and the teachings of the Fathers. (3). According to William of Malmesbury (4) and Henry Knighton (5), St. Fulbert, when on his death-bed, prophesied that Berengarius would destroy many souls, and ordered him to be expelled from the schools of Chartres. On the death of Fulbert, the future heresiarch returned to Tours, became rector of the academy of St. Martin, and soon acquired a great reputation as a professor. Certain manuscripts of the abbey of Lorris, Polydore Virgil, and other writers, accuse Berengarius of having been addicted to necromancy, but Alexandre observes that none of his contemporaries make such a charge. Before the year 1047 he was received into the diocese of Angers, and was soon made archdeacon and treasurer. In 1047 he began to propagate his errors on the Holy Eucharist, and many others. He condemned infant baptism, and asserted that promiscuous intercourse between the sexes was licit. Guitmund of Aversa, a contemporary, thus describes his

(1) *Essay on General History*, vol. ii., c. 60.

(2) Gerson asserts that Berengarius was a disciple of Abélard, but he evidently confounds the Sacramentarian with the Berengarius of Poitiers, who wrote an *Apology* for that great unfortunate. Abélard survived the heresiarch many years.

(3) *Epistle to Berengarius*.

(4) *English Kings*, B. iii.

(5) *English Affairs down to 1395*, B. i., c. 13.

error regarding the Real Presence: "He denied that the Eucharist is truly and substantially the Body and Blood of the Lord; and asserted that it is such only in name, inasmuch as it is a sign and significative figure of the Lord's Body and Blood." From the *Formula of Faith* which Berengarius subscribed in the Roman Synod of 1079, we find that he had denied "that the bread and wine are substantially converted, by the mystery of holy prayer and the words of our Redeemer, into the true and very Flesh and Blood of Christ." Hugh, bishop of Langres, writing to Berengarius, says: "You assert that the Body of Christ is in this Sacrament in such manner that the nature and essence of the bread and wine are not changed." Some have attributed to Berengarius the theory that in the Eucharist there are both the substance of the Sacred Body and Blood, and the substance of bread and wine; that Christ's Body and Blood are hidden in the bread and wine. Certain of his followers taught this doctrine; not so Berengarius. Guitmund writes: "All those who err in this matter do not follow the same path of error. All the Berengarians agree that the bread and wine are not essentially changed; but some assert that there is nothing whatever of Christ's Body and Blood, that the Sacrament is only a type and a figure; others, yielding somewhat to the teaching of the Church, without abandoning their error, say that the Body and Blood of Christ are, in effect, contained in the Sacrament, but hidden in a kind of *impanation*, for our reception. These latter pretend that their theory is the more subtle opinion of Berengarius himself. Others, again, hold that the bread and wine are partly changed. Some believe that they are entirely changed, but that, if an unworthy communicant presents himself, the Body and Blood of Christ resume the nature of bread and wine." (1).

Berengarius soon abandoned his errors on infant-baptism and the advisability of fornication (2), and bent all his energies to disseminate that on the Eucharist. Some have thought (3) that Berengarius imbibed his heresy from the

(1) *Against Berengarius* B. i.

(3) PAPIRIUS, *Bishops of the City*, B. iv.

(2) *Ibid.*

work of the Jew, Joseph Albo, entitled *Foundations of the Mosaic Law*, but Alexandre observes that Albo wrote in 1425, nearly four hundred years after Berengarius, and that it is more likely that Scotus Erigena, to whose works the heresiarch was much addicted, is responsible for Sacramentarianism. Berengarius tried hard to gain the adherence of Lanfranc, then a simple monk, but of great reputation for learning; but he labored in vain, and the great Lanfranc was probably the most energetic of all the defenders of the ancient doctrine. Among the writers whom God raised up to combat Sacramentarianism during the life-time of its author, we may mention, besides Lanfranc, the heresiarch's fellow-student, Adelman, bishop of Brescia; Hugh, bishop of Langres; Guitmund, bishop of Aversa; Durand, abbot of Troars; while after his death the cause of truth was admirably defended by Alger, a monk of Cluny. (1). It is an immortal glory of the Benedictine order, observes Alexandre, that it gave to the Church these four defenders of the Eucharistic doctrine. Although there are some minor errors (2) in the work of Alger, Erasmus thought it worth all the polemical treatises which appeared on the same subject in the sixteenth century. Berengarius admitted that he could not answer its arguments.

Mosheim (3), with his usual proclivity to adulation of all heretics, asserts that Berengarius was renowned for his learning and for personal sanctity. His holiness could not have been great, as he thrice perjured himself. As for his learning, it is not manifested by any of his writings, and Guitmund tells us that "he could not attain the secrets of the deeper philosophy; he was not sufficiently acute." He acquired a reputation in France, because at that period "the liberal arts had become, in France, nearly obsolete." (4). Mosheim also contends that, before the time of Beren-

(1) *Body and Blood of the Lord*.

(2) Alger agrees with Guitmund that the Sacramental species cannot be corrupted; that such corruption is only apparent, God so permitting, in order to punish the neglect of the priest or to try our faith; that the Body of the Lord is taken up to heaven when corruption seems to attack the species. He also attributes the error of the *Stercoranists* to the Greeks, while they were innocent of it. He asserts that Christ prescribed that the Eucharist should be consecrated in unleavened bread, which is not true.

(3) *Cent.* 11, p. 2, c. 3, § 13.

(4) *Body and Blood of the Lord*, B. i.

garius, the Church had not decided anything as to the manner in which Our Lord is present in the Eucharist ; that each person believed as he thought proper. We have already shown, in our chapter on the Eucharistic doctrine in the tenth century, the absurdity of this assertion. Mosheim insinuates that Pope St. Gregory VII. sympathized with the heresy of the Sacramentarians. The reader will judge of the truth of this charge when he observes the conduct of Gregory in the Synods held to condemn that heresy. The first Council called in this matter was held at Rome, in 1050, under the presidency of Pope Leo IX. It was occasioned by the letter written to Lanfranc by the heresiarch, reproving him for condemning Scotus Erigena, and giving a summary of his own views. Some had accused Lanfranc of sympathy with these views, and the holy Benedictine wished to clear himself of the aspersion. In this Synod the epistle of Berengarius was read and condemned ; he was excommunicated, and Lanfranc was vindicated. The Pontiff then ordered another, and fuller Synod, to meet at Vercelli. This body was convened in September of the same year, 1050, and the same Pontiff, Leo IX., presided over it. There appeared two clerics as representatives of Berengarius. His heresy was again condemned, as well as the book (supposed to be) by Scotus Erigena, on the Eucharist, which the heresiarch had alleged in justification of his own error. As Berengarius proved contumacious, a Synod of French bishops met at Paris, in the month of November, 1050, and, in the presence of king Henry I., the decree of Vercelli was solemnly received. After this Synod of Paris the heresiarch wrote to the abbot Richard, asking that prelate to obtain for him from the king some compensation for the injury done to him by the bishops, and saying that he was ready, at any time, to prove to the satisfaction of his majesty that Scotus and himself had been unjustly condemned. "The king should remember," he said, "that Scotus had written his book by command of, and at the expense of, the great Charles (the Bald). . . . that hence the king ought to vindicate him against the calumnies of men now living, unless he (Henry) wished to show himself

an unworthy successor of that magnificent monarch." In the year 1055, Pope Victor II. again condemned Berengarius in a Synod held at Florence; and in the same year, a Council was held at Tours for the same purpose, presided over by the subdeacon Hildebrand, then Pontifical legate in France. In this latter assembly Berengarius made and signed an abjuration of his heresy, and solemnly swore never to teach it again. This having been done, he was benignly received by Hildebrand. The conversion of the heresiarch was short-lived, and in 1059 Pope Nicholas II. held a Synod at Rome, composed of 113 bishops; and here Lanfranc so pressed Berengarius with argument, that he again abjured his doctrine, and threw his own and the book of Scotus into the flames. He also read and signed the following *Profession of Faith*: "I, Berengarius, an unworthy deacon of the church of St. Maurice, at Angers, knowing the True, Catholic, and Apostolic Faith do anathematize every heresy, especially the one by which hitherto I have been disgraced, and which seeks to show that the bread and wine placed upon the altar are, after the consecration, only a sign, and not the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that they cannot, in the Sacrament, be sensibly handled by the hands of the priest, or be broken or crushed by the teeth of the faithful. And I agree with the Holy Roman and Apostolic See, and with tongue and heart I declare that I hold, in regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's table, that faith which the venerable lord Pope Nicholas and this holy Synod, by Evangelical and Apostolic authority, has given me to hold; that is, that the bread and wine placed upon the altar are, after the consecration, not only a sign, but also the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that not only in the sign, but in truth, they are handled by the hands of the priest, and broken, and crushed by the teeth of the faithful; this I swear by the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity and by these Holy Gospels of Christ. And I pronounce worthy of eternal anathema those who contradict this faith; them, and their teachings, and their followers. If ever again I presume to think or preach anything against the above, I shall be subject to the severity

of the Canons. Having read and re-read the above, I willingly subscribe to it." (1).

After this Synod, Berengarius returned to France, and upon the death of king Henry I. he took advantage of the minority of Philip I. and reasserted his heresy, issuing a book against the last Roman Council and violently attacking cardinal Humbert, the author of the *Profession* he had signed. Against this book Lanfranc wrote his famous treatise on the *Body and Blood of the Lord*. About this time Berengarius began to use a terminology very much in vogue with modern heretics. He styled Pope St. Leo IX. by whom he was first condemned, not a Pontiff, but a *Pompifex* and a *Pulpifex*; he called the Roman Church "the Church of the malignant," and said that she held, not the Apostolic Chair, but the "Chair of Satan." In 1063, a Synod held at St. Ouen, in the presence of William of Normandy, and in 1075, another, at Poitiers, condemned Berengarius; but he persisted in his obstinacy. In 1078, Pope Gregory VII. summoned the heresiarch to appear again before a Roman Synod. He begged a year's delay, and in the meantime sent a *Profession of Faith*, which did not satisfy the Pontiff. In 1079 he appeared before another Synod, over which Pope Gregory presided in person. The *Acts* of this assembly tell us that "Berengarius, the teacher of this error, frequently avowed his crime to the Council, and having begged pardon, merited it of the Apostolic clemency." He then made the following *Profession*: "I, Berengarius, believe in my heart, and avow with my tongue, that the bread and wine placed upon the altar are converted substantially, by the mystery of the holy prayer and by the

(1) In regard to the meaning of the words "not only in the sign, but in truth, it is handled by the hands of the priest, and broken, etc." Catholic doctors differ. Some hold that these acts are exercised only on the Sacramental species; others contend that they affect the Body of Christ. The former hold that the species or accidents remain, after the consecration, and that these are broken, etc. Among the assertors of this theory was Abélard, and because of it, he was styled by some "another Berengarius." Abélard says: "This breakage may well be said to take place, not in the substance of the Body but in the form of the Sacramental bread; then the breakage or partition would be *true*, though not in the substance, but in the Sacrament, that is, in the species. . . . *Truly* indeed, but only in the Sacrament." Walter, abbot of St. Victor's at Paris, accused Abélard of hereby "subtracting from the truth; saying that all these are done, not in the substance but in the visible species, and in the form of the bread." But this is unjust to Abélard, remarks Alexandre. Abélard contended against Berengarius that the Eucharist is the *true* Body of Christ, that the bread is changed into the substance of the Lord's Body; but that breaking, etc., is exercised, not in the Body, but in the "Sacrament," (sign or species. And certainly, for more than seven hundred years the Church has sung the words of St. Thomas Aquinas, "there is no partition of the substance: the fracture is only of the sign."

words of our Redeemer, into the true, real, and vivifying Flesh and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that, after the consecration, they are the true Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, which hung from the cross for the salvation of the world, and which sits at the right hand of the Father, and the true Blood of Christ which flowed from His side; not only in sign and virtue of a Sacrament, but in property of nature and in truth of substance, as it is stated in this Brief, which I have read and you understand. Thus I believe, and never again will I contradict this Faith. So help me God, and these Holy Gospels of God!" Berthold of Constance, a contemporary, informs us that Pope Gregory then commanded Berengarius, by the authority of God Almighty, and of the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, never again to dispute with any person, or to teach any person anything regarding the Real Presence, unless indeed it were to convert to the truth those whom he had perverted. In spite of this third recantation, it would seem that Berengarius again relapsed. But there is good reason for believing that he died in the orthodox faith. The ancient MSS. of Lorris record that, "Leaving Rome, Berengarius came to Tours, and in the Island of St. Cosmas renounced the pomps of the world, combating for the Lord nearly twenty-eight years. (1). And Clare of Fleury says: "The master Berengarius of Tours, an admirable philosopher, was a lover of the poor. He composed the prayer 'Jesus Christ, Just Judge,' and finished his life a faithful and true Catholic." (2). Finally, William of Malmesbury writes: "Although Berengarius stained his hot early youth with the defence of certain heresies, in his more austere age he so repented as to be regarded by some as a saint." (3). Mosheim quite naturally dislikes the idea of any return, on the part of a heretic, to the bosom of mother Church; hence he ridicules the above and other testimonies, which show that, after all his vacillations, the most distinguished of Sacramentarians died in the communion of Rome. But when this author himself admits, nay insists, that Berenga-

(1) The number 28 is evidently an error, for Berengarius died in 1088.

(2) Clare wrote his *Chronicle* in the beginning of the twelfth century.

(3) Book iii.

rius was regarded, after death, as a saint, how does he account for this opinion, if he believes this "saint" to have died in his old Sacramentarian belief? Mosheim says that in his day the canons of Tours performed an annual service at the tomb of Berengarius; and how could that be, if these canons were not persuaded that he died in friendship with the Holy See? The German historian points to the fact that Berengarius begged pardon of God for the "perjury" he had committed at Rome in renouncing his theories. But this pardon was asked in the work written shortly after the death of king Henry I. (1060), and during the twenty-eight years of life yet remaining to him Berengarius may have repented of that expression. (1)

CHAPTER XVII.

ABELARD.

In reference to the amatory phase of Abélard's life we shall say very little. It has been so frequently the theme of poets, that a general and crude notion of it is widely spread. Only the student, however, is aware that the "woes of Abélard and Héloïse" are by no means the chief things for him to consider in the career of this extraordinary man. In fact, if Abélard were celebrated only for the events of which Pope and others have sung, his career would find no place among the topics noticed by the ecclesiastical historian. But the errors which he taught from his professorial chair, and his peculiar relations with the great St. Bernard which thence ensued, are worthy of the student's attention. Bayle (2), Mosheim (3), and other Protestant authors, have shown great sympathy with Abélard; not because this philosopher was a contumacious heretic, for we shall show that he was not such, but because they would detract from the reputation of "the last of the fathers,"

(1) Bergier remarks that Mosheim seems to have taken all he says about Berengarius from Basnage (*History of the Church*, B. xxiv. c. 2.). We find in both "the same reflections, and the whole is founded only on the assertions of this heresiarch, convicted a hundred times of imposture and perfdy."

(2) *Dictionary*, art. *Abélard, Héloïse, Bernard*.

(3) *Cent.* xii., p. 2, c. 3., § 10.

St. Bernard, who was the ambitious professor's chief opponent. Before entering upon a narration of Abélard's aberrations and of the course of St. Bernard, we shall give a short sketch of our subject's life, for the popular version is in many respects inaccurate.

Peter Abélard was born in 1079, at Palais, a village about eight miles east of Nantes, in Brittany. His father was a soldier, but fond of letters, and hence the young Abélard was made, not a knight, but a scholar. When a mere lad, he became a real peripatetic, going from place to place, and disputing, wherever he found an opportunity, on dialectics. Arriving, at length, in Paris, he attended the lectures of the celebrated William of Champeaux, archdeacon of Paris, and one of the first philosophers of his time. William was at first greatly pleased with his new auditor, but he was soon vexed on finding that most of his scholars deemed the young Abélard more worthy than himself to occupy the chair. Already, in fact, the young man gave unmistakable signs of those qualities which were to prove the bane of his life. Not only his conduct, as we gather from his contemporaries, but his own writings, show him to have been vain, presumptuous, and jealous. He disputed, not so much for the sake of truth, as to enjoy the pleasure of conquering. Nothing pleased him so much as to weaken the reputation of other professors; to entice away their scholars. He was a handsome man, possessed a charming voice, and was a poet as well as a philosopher. But his own works show that he owed his success much more to his seductive externals, than to superior solidity of doctrine. He complains much, in his letters, of his many enemies and of their persecutions. Many cruel and unjust persecutors he certainly possessed, but it is too evident that many of these enemies were deliberately made such by himself, that he might defy and conquer them. Abélard was only twenty-two years of age when he opened a scholastic hall at Melun. His reputation became immense, and as he succeeded in combating the views of his old master, William of Champeaux, on certain scholastic questions, the lecture-hall of that unfortunate professor was soon deserted for the one at

Melun. After a while, Abélard removed to Corbeu, but hearing that William had resigned his chair in Paris, and had become a regular canon, he went to Mt. St. Geneviève, and there began to lecture. After a few years, he intermitted his lectures, and attended the theological course of Anselm of Laon (1), a famous professor of divinity. Here he undertook to lecture in opposition to his professor, but, his proceedings being interdicted, he returned to Paris, where he soon acquired great fame and much money. And here we must succinctly but accurately narrate the events which have excited so much sympathy for Abélard. Up to his thirty-fifth year he seems to have led an exemplary life. His affections, like his ambitions, had been purely intellectual. But his inordinate pride needed a check, and it received a severe one. About the year 1114, Abélard made the acquaintance of the canon Fulbert, a beneficiary of the cathedral of Paris. Through the canon, he came to know the canon's niece, a beautiful young woman, and renowned throughout France for her learning. He soon fell a captive to the attractions of Héloïse, and deliberately designed her seduction. Knowing that Fulbert was proud of his niece's mental acquirements, Abélard offered to reside in their house, and, besides paying his board, to act as tutor to Héloïse. The offer was accepted, and Abélard himself tells us, in delicate and eloquent terms, of the result of his plot, namely, that Héloïse became a too willing victim to his and her own passions. (2). In time, her condition compelled her to secretly leave her uncle's house, and to betake herself into Brittany, to the care of a sister of Abélard. There she gave birth to a son, who was named Astrolabius. When Fulbert discovered the state of affairs, he naturally insisted that marriage should take place between the parties.

Abélard, the reader must know, was free to marry, for, though a cleric, he was not in Holy Orders. He would have married Héloïse from the beginning, but he was am-

(1) This Anselm must not be confounded with *the* Anselm, namely, the saintly archbishop of Canterbury and one of the most learned men of the Middle Ages. This confusion is sometimes made. Thus, in Appleton's *Condensed Cyclopædia*, we are told that Abélard "studied divinity at Laon, under Anselm, whom he also eclipsed." As there were only two Anselms of very great name at that period, viz., the saints of Canterbury and of Lucca, this non-qualification of the name and the glorifying of Abélard with the term "eclipsed" would mislead the ordinary reader.

(2) ABELARD, *Letter to a friend, on the History of my Misfortunes.*

bitious of ecclesiastical preferment, and his overweening vanity led him to aspire to any height. If the alleged *Letters* of Héloïse are genuine, she herself encouraged him in this conduct, preferring "to be his mistress, rather than his wife," (1) if she could only see him idolized by the multitude. Be this as it may, Abélard now asked Héloïse to marry him. Her answer shows that, learned though she was, passion had completely warped her mind, and that much of the sympathy extended to her has been misplaced. She told Abélard that even by marriage she would not pacify her uncle; that it would be inglorious for Abélard to unite himself to one woman, when nature had made him for all; that matrimony was full of vexations, and that Theophrastes and Cicero had both declared that no man could wed both a wife and philosophy; "there was nothing in common between scholars and servant-women, between writing-materials and cradles, between books and distaffs, between pens and spindles;" that, finally, Abélard was a cleric, and it was unfitting that he should marry. In spite of these strange reasons, Abélard persisted, and at length Héloïse yielded. Returning to Paris, she was married to Abélard, her uncle consenting that the union should be kept secret, for the sake of the professor's ambition. But the foolish Fulbert, proud of having the great philosopher for a nephew, soon began to boast of the marriage; the servants of the house also began to talk. Then Héloïse denied that she was married, great scandal ensued, and finally Abélard persuaded his wife to quiet things by retiring for a time to the convent of Argenteuil, where she had been educated. She might put on the nun's habit, he said, but she was by no means to take the veil. When this came to the ears of Fulbert and his kindred, they imagined that Abélard had tired of Héloïse, and had ridden himself of an encumbrance. Maddened at the fancied insult, and burning for revenge, they attacked the unfortunate professor, and barbarously mutilated him. (2). Shortly after his recovery, the humiliated Abélard, moved, as he

(1) HELOÏSE, *Epistle to Abélard*, n. 2.

(2) For this outrage Fulbert was deprived of his benefices, and the actual perpetrators are said to have been punished by the same mutilation they had inflicted.

himself testifies, more by shame than by devotion, took the monastic habit in the famous Benedictine abbey of St. Denis. Hélcise took the veil at Argenteuil, and although, in the letters which she *is said* to have afterwards sent to Abélard, there are some expressions that savor of levity and even of a criminal hankering after the past, she seems to have finally settled into a contented and holy religious. In the course of time she became prioress of the convent at Argenteuil, and when the community was forced by the monks of St. Denis, who wished its house for themselves, to abandon Argenteuil, she took her nuns to the oratory of the Paraclete, which Abélard and his pupils, as we shall see, had constructed with their own hands, and afterwards ceded to Héloïse. While abbess of the Paraclete, Héloïse was visited by St. Bernard. The blessed Peter Mauricius, abbot of Cluny, greatly esteemed her, and in one of his letters he congratulates her as “a woman truly and entirely philosophical, who had chosen the Gospel instead of logic, the Apostle instead of physics, and the cloister instead of the Academy.”

Had Abélard become a monk simply for love of quiet, although that would have been a merely human motive, and therefore unworthy, he might not have been totally disappointed. But having done so in pure disgust and in shame, without any supernatural impulse whatever, it is not surprising that for many years his life knew but little of peace. Again, he seems to have brought into the monastery all the worldly spirit which had ever actuated him. His terrible experience had not lessened his pride of intellect, and when contradictions came, he knew not how to bear them. When Abélard first entered the monastery of St. Denis, his shame caused him to keep withdrawn from the gaze of the world, but his reputation was so great that many demands were made upon the abbot Adam, his superior to order him to resume his lectures. This order was soon given, and once more the multitudes of students hearkened to their idol's oracles. But in the year 1121, the great master was accused of heresy before the Synod of Soissons; a book he had written on *The Trinity* was con-

demned, because of errors on the omnipotence of God, and he was ordered to himself cast it to the flames. He was consigned to the custody of the abbot of St. Médard at Soissons; but the Papal legate, Conon of Palestrina, released him and sent him back to St. Denis. In a short time he became involved in trouble with the abbot Adam, owing to his agreement with Ven. Bede that the holy Areopagite was not bishop of Athens, but of Corinth. This touched the monks of St. Denis upon a tender spot; so furiously did they resent Abélard's theory, that they excited against him the ire of king Louis VI., telling the monarch that the honor of their St. Denis was the honor of France, and it would have gone hard with the unfortunate master, had not Stephen, the royal steward, obtained for him the privilege of leaving his monastery. He sought the protection of Théobald, count of Troyes, and having obtained permission from his abbot, he constructed, in a beautiful solitude given him by some admirers, a little oratory of reeds, where he proposed to reside. His former pupils learning of this, they came from all quarters to dwell around him and listen to his lectures. They built huts for habitations, and lived as they best could. During the intervals between the master's discourses, they all labored at a larger oratory, which would contain the hundreds of scholars drawn thither by the magic of his eloquence. When finished, it was dedicated to the Holy Trinity, and as Abélard had here found much consolation amid his vexations, he called it the Paraclete. After a residence here of a few years, he was chosen abbot by the monks of St. Gildas de Ruys, in the diocese of Vannes, in Brittany. By this time Abélard had advanced much in piety, and was therefore very zealous in the enforcement of discipline. The consequence was that he soon became an object of hatred to some of his monks, and several times they attempted his life. After his condemnation, in 1140, by the Synod of Sens, of which we shall soon speak, Abélard appealed to the Pontiff, Innocent II., and in the meantime claimed the hospitality of the venerable Peter, abbot of Cluny. He was cheerfully received, and for two

years edified that strict community by the manifestation of every monastic virtue. We shall have occasion hereafter to cite the letter which the venerable Peter of Cluny wrote to Pope Innocent II. in favor of Abélard, but we here give a portion of the letter in which the holy abbot informed the abbess Héloïse of "the master's" truly holy death: "I do not recollect of ever having seen his equal in humility; Germanus would not appear to the accurate observer more abject, or Martin poorer. When I compelled him to hold a superior position among our large number of brethren, he appeared to be the last of all. I was frequently thunder-struck when watching him in the processions, while he walked with the others, as is customary, before me, reflecting how so famous a man could so contemn himself. And while there are some religious who greatly desire that their dress should be sumptuous, he was very careless in such matters, and was quite content with simple garments, of any kind. He preserved the same system in his food, in his drink, and in every care of his body. And he condemned, in himself and in others, both by word and in practice, not only superfluities, but everything that was not really necessary. His study was constant, his prayer frequent; his silence never-failing, unless a conference of the brethren, or a sermon to them, compelled him to speak. He used to frequent the heavenly Sacraments, and as often as he was able, to offer to God the sacrifice of the Immaculate Lamb His mind, tongue, and actions were always occupied in divine things, or on philosophy, or on matters of erudition For recuperation, as he was troubled with an itch and other bodily evils, I sent him to Chalons, on account of its mildness of climate there, so far as his complaints would permit, he renewed his olden studies, and was ever at his books. As we read of the great Gregory, he allowed not a moment to pass unoccupied by prayer, or by reading, or by writing, or by dictation. The coming of the gospel visitor found him among these holy exercises, nor, like many, was he found asleep, but on the watch How devoutly, how holily, how like a Catholic, he made a confession of faith, and then of his

sins ; with what eager desire he received the Viaticum for his journey and the pledge of eternal life, the Body of our Lord the Redeemer ; how confidently he committed his body and soul to Him, for the present and forever, can be attested by all the religious of that monastery in which rest the body of the holy martyr Marcellus." With this truly consoling and edifying letter, the venerable abbot of Cluny sent to the abbess Héloïse the mortal remains of Abélard, and she interred them in her convent of the Paraclete. The letter of Peter of Cluny to Héloïse is sufficient testimony to the repentance and holy end of Abélard, but the reader will not be uninterested with the following, the first of two epitaphs which the holy abbot sent to be engraved on the tomb : " Abélard was the Socrates of France, the Plato of the West, our Aristotle ; equal, if not superior, to all the logicians who have ever lived ; known as the prince of learning throughout the world ; of varied genius, subtle, and acute ; mastering all by strength of reason and by artistic diction. But he triumphed the most, when he became a professed monk of Cluny, and cultivated the true philosophy of Christ. Here he happily completed the days of a long life, leaving us the hope that he is now numbered among true philosophers."

There is much sickening sentimentality abroad in connection with the names of Abélard and Héloïse ; thousands, who know nothing of the theologian and philosopher, sympathize with the unfortunate lover. Even certain serious historians play the school-girl, and manifest symptoms of hysteria when they touch on the " woes of Abélard and Héloïse." Listen to the grave Henri Martin ; declaiming how Héloïse offers to the world an example of real love, " of an entire surrender of one's self ;" insisting that the importance of Héloïse " in the moral history of humanity" is not due to her extraordinary learning ; telling us how, when buried in a nunnery, respected by the entire Church, she does not change " interiorly," does not undergo the mystic death of the cloister, never repents of her love, accepts not monastic asceticism, but, " eternally " protests in her heart, " which is so well formed for divine love ;"

declaring that this Héloïse, “inconsolable and unsubmitting,” appears like “a great veiled figure” at the entrance of the “moral world;” and finally flattering himself that “the just instinct of the French” has made of her “one of the national glories,” because she is “the great saint of love.” (1). Such ravings may suit the “Druidic school,” of which Henri Martin was the head, but they are not to be encouraged by a Christian. And whence this deluge of tears? Whether shed by Colardeau, Mercier, Saurin, Pope, or Martin, they are caused by the “immortal” *Letters* of Héloïse—letters which the last named author regards as “bearing the characteristics of no epoch,” but as “above all time;” as revealing “no accidental form of the soul,” but its very “eternal depth.” And yet, remarks a modern critic (2), it would seem that these *Letters* are no more genuine than those of Penelope to Ulysses, of Phedra to Hippolytus, of Briseis to Achilles, of Sappho to Phaon, of Helen to Paris, which Ovid has furnished to us. This prosaic truth has been well evinced by M. Lalanne (3), from whose essay we extract the following arguments: “These letters of Héloïse, so full of passion, contain many contradictions and impossibilities. Their tone is inexplicable. I can conceive how Héloïse could have said such things to Abélard during the first years following their separation; but fourteen years of religious life have passed before the first letter is written. And she speaks to a man now fifty-four years old; incapable, for fourteen years, of responding to her passion; exhausted by his theological combats, by his wandering life, by his persecutions, and who now aspires only to eternal repose. Nothing checks her; her passion is unspeakably vehement, and yet she is the woman of whom, shortly before the penning of the first letter, Abélard has said, in the *History of his Misfortunes*, that ‘the entire world admired her piety, her wisdom, and her inconceivable sweetness of patience in all circumstances; she seldom left her cell, but there devoted herself to holy meditation and

(1) *History of France*, vol. iii., p. 315, edit. 1855.

(2) LARROQUE, *Errors of M. Martin*, in his *History of France*, in the *Annals of Christian Philosophy*, Paris, Feb., 1863.

(3) In the *Literary Correspondence*, Paris, Dec. 5, 1856.

prayer.' But this is not all. Even if we admit—which is very difficult—that Héloïse, from the day of the catastrophe to the moment when, expelled from Argenteuil, she was welcomed by him to the Paraclete (1129), never met Abélard, it is certain that then she did converse with him, and not merely on one occasion, and that the consequent scandalous rumors caused Abélard to cease his visits. (1). How then can Héloïse complain that, from the date of their monastic profession, that is, from 1119 (or 1120), she has not enjoyed Abélard's presence or one letter from him? Nevertheless, she is said to have so expressed herself in 1133. Therefore I do not believe that she wrote these *Letters*. . . . Again, granting that Héloïse, and after her time, the nuns of the Paraclete, preserved the letters of Abélard to her; can we unhesitatingly admit that, during a wandering life and until his death, Abélard preserved her letters, which breathed a passion and an ardent sensuality which must have necessarily compromised that reputation for wisdom and holiness which she had acquired? . . . Finally, these letters of Héloïse are very labored; everything is arranged in order; the vehemence of their sentiments never, for a moment, interrupts their method. Their extreme length, their erudite and very exact quotations from the Bible, from the Fathers, and from Pagan authors, all convince me that they were not penned by a correspondent, but were leisurely elaborated, and with infinite art." (2).

(1) In the *History of his Misfortunes*, p. 36, edit. Duchesne, 1616, Abélard defends him elf from these charges.

(2) In regard to the famous tomb of Abélard and Héloïse at Père-Lachaise, an eminent archaeologist, Guilhermy (in the *Archæological Annals*, Paris, 1846), says: "We must deny our satisfaction from those who show, every day, so little consideration for historical iconography, in propagating errors which prescription will eventually raise to the rank of truths. Take, for instance, one of our most popular monuments in the cemetery of Père-Lachaise, the tomb of Abélard and Héloïse. How many illusions would vanish, if the pilgrims who here perform their devotions only knew that, in the construction of this elegant sepulchral chapel, there entered not one stone from that severe and learned abbey of the Paraclete which romancing troubadours have treated as a kind of temple of Venus. The columns, the capitals, and the decorations of the four facades, came from the cloister and some internal oratories of the monastery of St. Denis. The eyes of an expert are not required for the discovery that these sculptures were not originally destined for the same neighborhood. It was M. Lenoir, director of the Museum of French Monuments, who conceived the idea of putting some of the fragments placed at his disposal, so as to form a tomb fit to receive the ashes of the two illustrious lovers of the twelfth century. For the men who had thrown to the winds the venerable and glorious ashes of St. Geneviève, of St. Marcellus, of St. Bernard, of Suger, were clownishly sensitive when they opened the tomb of Abélard and Héloïse; they were of the opinion that honors rendered to these 'victims of the cloister' would give a rude blow to a fanaticism which the axe was not extirpating quickly enough; therefore, a casket, sealed by the republican municipality of Nogent-sur-Seine, brought to Paris the ashes taken from the tomb of the Paraclete. But before the remains were placed in their last resting-place, the amateurs of a new kind of relics were to be satisfied. It is said that one of the soldiers at Valmy wore a talisman made from the moustache of Henry IV. Well, atheists and philosophers, probably older

It is certain that Abélard fell into several errors of doctrine, but there were many points in which his manner of expressing himself, rather than his teaching, was to be condemned. (1). The first condemnation of any error on the part of Abélard took place at the Synod of Soissons, in 1121; he retracted what he was ordered to retract, and was sent back to his monastery by the Papal legate. But in after years, when he was endeavoring to discipline the unruly monks of St. Gildas, his adversaries accused him not only of teaching the already condemned doctrines, but of having put forth new errors. Abélard now saw in the ranks of his accusers the great St. Bernard, an adversary whose fame for sanctity and learning forbade his indifference. He therefore besought of Henry, archbishop of Sens, to afford him an opportunity of defending his doctrines in Bernard's presence. The prelate acquiesced, and a Synod was convoked at Sens, in 1140. Besides Henry of Sens and many other bishops, king Louis VII. and a large number of abbots attended. At first, the holy abbot of Clairvaux did not wish to be present, because it was improper, he said, to take up the consideration of opinions already condemned; but finally he yielded, lest the partisans of Abélard should boast that their leader's position was impregnable. When the Synod had met, certain extracts from Abélard's books were being read, when, to the surprise of all, the author arose, appealed to the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, and left the hall. Out of respect for the Holy See, the prelates then took no action in regard to the person of Abélard; nevertheless, they condemned his errors, and sent a report of their proceedings to Pope Innocent II., beseeching him to repress the innovator's audacity.

levelers of heads, seized upon the few teeth remaining in one of poor Héloïse's jaws, as safeguards in their lusts. A tooth of Héloïse cost a thousand francs; Abélard's were not valued so highly. . . . The tomb was completed in the following manner: They took a bas-relief representing the funeral cortege of Louis, son of St. Louis, and they decided that hereafter it should represent Abélard's funeral procession. The soul of the young prince, being carried to heaven by an angel, became that of the great doctor. Two medallions represented Abélard as a love, with curled moustaches, and Héloïse as a half-naked woman, about as decent as a Messalina. In the sarcophagus, you see two recumbent statues; one in clerical costume, and this is the Abélard so seductive above with his flowing hair and moustaches; the other is of a woman of the fourteenth century, and was originally on a tomb in the chapel of St. John of Beauvais, in Paris. How much this unknown lady has gained by her assumption of the name of Héloïse! The grisettes bathe her with their tears, and bury her in crowns of *immortelles*, for which they have paid ten cents at the gate of the cemetery; then the pitying creatures sit down, and read, as though they were prayers, two or three of the parodied letters of 'Loïse and Béard.' "

(1) ALEXANDRE, Cent. xii., diss. 7, art 6.

Samson of Rheims, Joscelin of Soissons, and other prelates, now sent a letter to the Pontiff, the style of which, Alexandre well observes, indicates that St. Bernard was its author. We give a part of it, because it plainly shows the impression which Abélard had made upon men of undoubted zeal and learning: "Peter Abélard tries to nullify the merit of Christian faith, for he thinks that he can comprehend, with his human intelligence, all that God is. He ascends even unto heaven, and descends into the abysses; nothing is hidden from him, whether it is in heaven above, or in the depths of hell. In his own eyes he is a great man, disputing *de fide* against the faith, dealing with great and wonderful things above himself, an inquirer into majesty, a fabricator of heresies. Some time ago he composed a book on the Holy Trinity, but as errors were found in it, it was given to the flames by order of the legate of the Roman Church. Accursed is he who rebuilds the ruins of Jericho. That book has arisen from the dead, and with it, many heresies which had died have arisen and appeared to many. At last it extends its shoots even to the sea, and pushes them even to Rome. This man boasts that his book is received in the Roman court, and hence his error is strengthened and confirmed, and he confidently preaches the word of iniquity on all sides. And when, in the presence of the bishops, the abbot of Clairvaux, armed with the zeal of justice and of faith, would press him concerning these things, he neither avowed nor denied them; but, without any provocation, and merely that he might lengthen his iniquity, he appealed from the day, place, and judge, he himself had chosen, unto the Apostolic See. . . . We have gone on in this affair, so far as we may dare. It is now for you, most blessed Father, to provide that the beauty of the Church be not stained by any mark of heretical foulness."

In his own name, St. Bernard addressed two epistles (nos. 189 and 190) to the Pontiff. In the first we read: "Foolishly did I lately promise myself rest, as though the fury of the lion had been appeased, and peace would return to the Church. It indeed rested, but I did not. We have escaped a lion, but we have encountered a dragon, who is not less

dangerous in ambush than the other roaring aloud. But he is not altogether in ambush ; would that his virulent pages were hidden in his desk, and were not read at the cross-roads! A new gospel, and a new faith, are proposed to the peoples. . . . Goliath advances his tall frame, equipped in all the panoply of war, and preceded by his squire, Arnold of Brescia. . . . While attacking the doctors of the Church, he gives great praise to the philosophers ; he prefers their inventions and his own novelties to the doctrine of the Catholic Fathers and the faith ; and while all fly from before him, he selects me, the least of all, for single combat At his request, the archbishop of Sens wrote to me, appointing a day for a meeting, in which he (Abélard), in the presence of the bishops, would establish, if possible, those wicked teachings against which I had dared to murmur. I declined, both because I am a boy, and he is a warrior from his youth, and because I judged it unworthy to submit to the agitation of petty human reason that faith which is surely founded upon certain and stable truth. I said that his writings were enough for an accusation against him ; that it was not my business, but that of the bishops, to judge of dogmas. Nevertheless, he, for this very reason, cried out the louder, called many together, summoned his partisans. . . . He reported everywhere that, on a certain day, he would reply to me at Sens ; every one heard it, and it could not escape me." The Saint then narrates the proceedings at Sens, and concludes : "You will judge, O Successor of Peter, whether he ought to find refuge in the See of Peter, who denies the faith of Peter. You, I say, friend of the Bridegroom, will know how to free the Spouse from wicked lips and from a deceitful tongue." St. Bernard also wrote on the cause of Abélard to all the Roman cardinals collectively, and especially to the cardinal Guido di Castello, who had been a disciple of that master. In his letter to this cardinal he says : "In his book master Peter introduces profane novelties of speech and of meaning. . . . he sees nothing as in a mirror and by enigma, but regards everything face to face. . . . When he speaks of the Trinity, he sounds like Arius ;

when of grace, like Pelagius ; when of the Person of Christ, like Nestorius." Writing to cardinal Ivo, the Saint thus depicts his adversary : "Master Peter Abélard, a monk without rule, a prelate without charge, neither holds any order, nor is held by order. He is a man dissimilar to himself ; within a Herod, without a John ; altogether ambiguous, having nothing of the monk but the name and the dress. . . . He passes the limits placed by our Fathers, writing and disputing on faith, the Sacraments, and the Trinity ; he changes, augments, or diminishes, just as he pleases. . . . He is ignorant of nothing in heaven or on earth, excepting himself." If some of St. Bernard's expressions seem harsh, we must remember that he was defending the cause of the truth, the interests of Catholic dogma, and therefore the interests of imperilled souls. In the mind and words of the true Catholic, there can be no compromise with heresy, and in dealing with Abélard, St. Bernard would have been foolish had he regarded him as an ignorant layman or a delicate schoolgirl under instruction. He was a "Goliath, equipped in all the panoply of war," and it was only the sharp pebble, sent straight at his brow, that was to bring him down. It is ridiculous for Mosheim to affect to believe that St. Bernard was jealous of Abélard. The Saint was one of the last to enter the lists against the innovator, and it was principally because of the pressure brought to bear upon him by William, abbot of St. Thierry, that he moved in the matter. Before the Council of Sens he wrote amicably and urgently to Abélard, begging him to correct his books. Abélard was condemned at Rome, as well as at Sens and are we to suppose that the Pope and the cardinals were actuated by jealousy ? Bernard was simply actuated by zeal for the truth, and the moment he found that his antagonist had retracted, he gave him a brother's hand, as we shall now see.

When Pope Innocent II. had received a report of the proceedings at Sens, he confirmed the condemnation of Abélard's errors, and enjoined upon the master, "as upon a heretic," perpetual silence. After leaving Sens, Abélard, as we have seen, started for Rome, but hearkening to the

fatherly voice of the venerable Peter of Cluny, he stopped in that monastery. Here he was reconciled to St. Bernard, as we are informed in the following letter, written by Peter to the Pontiff: "The master Peter, well known, as I believe, to your Wisdom, coming lately from France (1), passed through Cluny. We asked him whither he was journeying. He replied that he was greatly vexed by certain parties, who styled him a heretic, a name which he greatly abhorred, and that he had appealed to the Apostolic Majesty. We applauded the design, and we advised him to fly to the known and general refuge; and we told him that the Apostolic justice, which never failed a stranger or a pilgrim, would not be refused to him. We promised that he should receive mercy, if reason there were for it. In the meantime there arrived the lord Cistercian abbot, and he talked both with Abélard and with ourselves, concerning peace between him (Abélard) and my lord of Clairvaux, because of whom he had appealed. We, too, did what we could toward this reconciliation, and we exhorted Abélard to go with him (the Cistercian) to Bernard. And we also admonished him to remove from his books and words anything he might have said or written offensive to Catholic ears; and this, in accordance with his (Bernard's) exhortation, and that of other good and wise men. And so it was done. He went and returned, having, by the mediation of the Cistercian, accommodated his olden differences with my lord of Clairvaux, and had a peaceful interview. Meanwhile, being advised by us, or rather, as we believe, being inspired by God, he abandoned the tumults of school and study, and chose a permanent abode in your Cluny. Believing this to be fitting to his age, his weakness, and his religion, and deeming his knowledge, not altogether unknown to you, to be of great advantage to our large community of brethren, we assented to his request; and so, if it be pleasing to your Benignity, we have graciously and joyfully allowed him to remain with us, your children. Therefore I, whatever I may be, yet ever yours, do ask; and this convent of Cluny, most devoted to you, also asks; and

(1) Cluny was in Burgundy, which was not joined to France until 1477.

he himself asks, by these letters which he has requested me to write, and by us and the bearers of these letters, that you will order him to spend his remaining days, which perchance are few, in your Cluny; and that, by means of no one, he be expelled or removed from the house which, like a sparrow, he has found, or from the nest in which he, like a dove, rejoices; but that, as you ever cherish the good, and have loved even him, you will protect him with the Apostolic shield."

With regard to the errors of Abélard, the reader is referred to Alexandre's apposite dissertation, if he is desirous of examining them in detail. We merely give a brief summary of them, as described by St. Bernard (1), by the abbot of St. Thierry (2), and by Otho of Frisingen (3). First, he placed degrees in the Trinity, "modes" in the majesty, and numbers in the eternity of God. The Father is full power, the Son a certain power, the Holy Ghost no power. The Son is to the Father as a certain power is to power, as a species is to a genus, as man is to animal. Second, he asserted that the Holy Ghost proceeds indeed from the Father and the Son, but not from the *esse* of the Father, or from the substance of the Son. Third, he denied that the devil ever had any right in man, and that the Son became man to redeem man from the dominion of Satan. The Son died merely to show His love for us. Fourth, the Holy Ghost is, according to Abélard, the soul of the world. Fifth, he asserted that Christ, God and Man, is not the second Person of the Blessed Trinity. Sixth, he contended that we can wish and do good, without the aid of grace. Seventh, he taught that in the Eucharist the form of the prior substance remains in the air. Eighth, he held that only the punishment, not the guilt, of original sin descends to us from Adam. Ninth, he asserted there was no sin, unless in contempt of God. Tenth, he contended that ignorance always excuses from sin. Eleventh, he taught that diabolical suggestions often come from physical impressions, contact, etc. Twelfth, he defined faith as the acceptance of things which are not seen. Thirteenth, he assigned limits to the

(1) *Epist. 190 to Innocent II.*

(2) *Dispute against Abélard.*

(3) *Dccds of Frederick I., B. i., c. 47.*

DIVINE Omnipotence, asserting that God could do no more than He has done or will do. Fourteenth, he denied the descent of Christ into Limbo. Fifteenth, he said that the final judgment of men can be attributed also to the Father. Sixteenth, he doubted the power of binding and loosing. Seventeenth, he asserted that God never impeded evil, changing the will of man. Eighteenth, he contended that the executioners at the crucifixion did not sin. Nineteenth, he taught that the Spirit of the fear of the Lord was not in Christ, and that in the next world there would be no chaste fear of the Lord. Such were the propositions in reference to which St. Bernard wrote to the bishops and cardinals of the Roman court (1): "Read, if you please, the book of Peter Abélard, which he says to be on Theology. You have it at hand, for he glories that it is read by many in the court. See what he says therein about the Trinity, about the generation of the Son, about the procession of the Holy Ghost, and the many innumerable things he has foreign to Catholic ears and minds. Read also the other book, entitled his *Sentences*, and the one with the title *Know Thyself*, and observe how rank they are with the seeds of sacrilege and of error; see what he thinks of the soul of Christ, of His Person, of His descent into Limbo, of the Sacrament of the Altar, of the power of binding and loosing, of original sin, of concupiscence, of the sin of delectation, of that of infirmity and of ignorance, of the work of sin, and of the will of sinning. And if, indeed, you judge that I am justly moved, do you be moved, and lest you be moved in vain, act for the place you hold, for the dignity you possess, for the power you have received." In his *Apology*, or Confession of Faith, Abélard declared that these errors were all ascribed to him through ignorance or malice, and he denied that he ever wrote a book of *Sentences*; but if the reader will follow Alexandre, as he examines these nineteen propositions, one by one, he will find that many of them were distinctly taught by Abélard, although in some cases St. Bernard and the abbot of St. Thierry did not correctly apprehend the meaning of the

(1) *Epist.* 187.

master. As for Abélard's denial that he wrote a book of *Sentences*, he thereby descended to an unworthy and puerile equivocation, for though the book may not have borne that title, he did not disclaim the authorship of the passages to which St. Bernard objected, and which are found in that book. One great fault of Abélard was his proneness to the use of incongruous illustrations in explaining matters of faith. Otho of Frisingen (1) gives one instance, which will serve for many: "As the proposition, assumption, and conclusion are the same oration, so the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are the same essence."

Subjoined to the works of Abélard is to be found an *Apology* for the great master, written by Berengarius of Poitiers, who had been one of his disciples. The work of a young and ardent man, carried away by enthusiastic admiration for his teacher, it is extremely contumelious toward St. Bernard. Berengarius asserts that the Saint tried rather to discover occasion to rebuke Abélard, than to effect his conversion. But we are told by Godfrey (2) that Bernard, "with his usual goodness and benignity, desiring to correct the error, not to confound the man, privately admonished him: and so modestly and reasonably did he act, that Abélard was touched, and promised to correct all according to his wish. But he abandoned the good design." We are also told that Abélard, "whose mouth was the storehouse of reason, the trumpet of faith, and the lodging of the Trinity," was condemned at Sens, while absent and unheard. But he was contumacious, and had withdrawn himself from a judgment invoked by himself. Berengarius also attacks many points of doctrine which he alleges to have been put forth by St. Bernard, but in each case he misinterprets the Saint's meaning. In his more mature age, this enthusiastic defender of Abélard modified his opinions, condemned his master's errors, and acknowledged St. Bernard as "the Martin of our times, a shining light."

Abélard has often been stigmatized as a heretic, but unjustly. He did not pertinaciously adhere to his opinions, but ever professed himself willing to correct them, if

(1) *Loc. cit.*(2) *Life of St. Bernard*, B. iii., c. 5.

erroneous; and he did, in fact, confess so. In the *Prologue* to his *Introduction*, he plainly avows his willingness to accept correction, "by force of reason, or by Scriptural authority," and declares that he will imitate St. Augustine in his *Retractions*, "that if he cannot be free from the vice of ignorance, he may at least not incur the guilt of heresy; for ignorance does not make a heretic, but obstinate pride does make one." In his *Profession of Faith*, sent to Héloïse, he says: "I wish not to so be a philosopher, as to resist Paul; to so be an Aristotle, as to be separated from Christ. There is no other name under heaven, by which I can be saved. . . . And in order that trembling anxiety and all doubt may be removed from your heart, you may be sure of this in my regard, that I have founded my conscience upon that rock upon which Christ founded His Church. . . . I believe the Son to be co-equal to the Father in all things; in eternity, power, will, and deed; nor do I hearken to Arius, who, moved by his perverse genius, yea, seduced by a demon, placed degrees in the Trinity, teaching that the Father is greater, and the Son less. . . . I declare that the Holy Ghost is consubstantial and co-equal to the Father and the Son in all things. . . . I assert also that in Baptism all sin is remitted; that we need grace, both to commence good, and to perfect it. . . . As for the resurrection of the body, why should I speak of it, when I would in vain glory in being a Christian, if I did not believe I would arise again?" And in the last of his works, the *Apology*, dedicated *To All the Children of Holy Church*, he wrote: "Well known is the saying that nothing is so well expressed that it cannot be distorted; and, as St. Jerome has remarked, he who writes many books creates many judges. And I, who have written only a few little ones, and in comparison with others, books of no moment, have not been able to escape censure; although, as to the things of which I am seriously accused, I acknowledge, God knows, no fault of my own, and if there were any I would not obstinately defend it. I may have written some things which ought not to have been written; but I call God to witness, as the Judge of my soul, that I have not presumed anything in malice or in pride. I have

spoken much in many schools, and my doctrine has never been a sluggish stream or a hidden loaf. I have spoken openly for the establishing of the faith or of morals, what seemed to me to be salutary, and whatever I have written I have opened unto all, rather as to judges than as to disciples. If I have ever exceeded by much speaking, as it is written 'by much speaking thou shalt not avoid sin,' obstinate resistance has never made me a heretic, for I have been ever ready to give satisfaction, either by correcting or by destroying all wrong utterances, and in that mind I shall persevere to the end. . . . Therefore let fraternal charity recognize me, whatsoever I may be, as a son of the Church; one who entirely receives all that she receives, and who rejects all that she rejects; one who has never broken the unity of faith, although unequal to others in virtue." And then Abélard expressly professes the Catholic doctrines which are contrary to all his own errors, or to those imputed to him.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE CRUSADES : THEIR JUSTICE AND EFFECTS.*

During the first years of Islamism the Christian nations felt little reason for concern as to their own future. Regarding the new religionists as a mere horde of children of the desert, they could not realize that their own peace, still less their independence in the political order, would ever be seriously threatened from that quarter. And even if they had foreseen the great spread of Mohammedanism, and all the baneful consequences thence, of necessity, to ensue, they were just then in no condition to forestall the enemy's attack. As yet Christendom was not united in the new Western Empire : and when, in time, that effort of Pontifical statesmanship opened a new era of strength and prosperity to Europe, the arrogance, and afterwards the schism, of the Greeks prevented any unanimous action against the en-

* This Chapter appeared as an article in the "Ave Maria," vol. xxvi., no. 24.

emies of the Christian name. But in the eleventh century, the invasion of the Seljuk Turks, who had abandoned the religion of Zoroaster for Islamism, infused a Northern ferocity into the comparatively soft nature of the Arabs, and during the Pontificate of St. Gregory VII. the Crescent was frequently seen from the towers of Constantinople. From time to time Europe was horrified by accounts of the fearful oppression endured by the Christians of Palestine ; of bishops and priests being dragged from the altar to prison ; of brutal outrages upon persons of both sexes and of every age ; of the circumcision of thousands of boys, some to be enrolled in the army, and others to be mutilated, and to be assigned as guards to the seraglio. The schismatic arrogance of the Greeks was compelled to yield, and the emperor, Michael Ducas (*Parapinax*) begged for aid from the detested Latins. St. Gregory VII. heeded the cry, and although he knew that the promise was extorted by dire temporal necessity, and not by regard for religious unity, he was disposed to believe that Ducas was sincere in the avowed intention to put an end to the schism. All Christendom was invited to raise an army for the service of God, and the Pontiff declared in a letter to king Henry IV. of Germany that he hoped, "having pacified the Normans, to proceed in person to Constantinople, in aid of the Christians." (1). Fifty thousand warriors promised to follow him, but other interests prevailed, and the great enterprise was postponed, until Pope Victor III. had the satisfaction, in 1088, of seeing the Genoese, Pisans, and other Italians, receive from his hands the standard of St. Peter, and set out to fight for the Cross and for civilization. This first expedition to check the inroads of Mohammedanism was comparatively successful. Landing in Africa, it destroyed or disabled more than a hundred thousand Saracens, burned a city, imposed tribute on a Moorish king, and returned to Italy with many rich spoils, which were used to decorate the churches of the victors. (2). But this inroad into the

(1) *Epistles of St. Greg. VII.*, ii., 30.

(2) LEO OF OSTIA. This Leo (Marsicanus), a Benedictine of Montecassino, and cardinal-bishop of Ostia, author of a valuable history of Montecassino, and other works, should not be confounded with another Leo, also a Cassinese Benedictine, who was secretary to Pope Urban II., and was made a cardinal-deacon by Paschal II. This mistake was made by Baronio and by Possevin.

domains of Islam was merely a prelude to the great Crusades.

The impulse to the first Crusade (1096-1100) was given by an obscure individual, rude in feature and in manner, but who had been raised by solitude and prayer to such sanctity that he was popularly supposed to enjoy direct communication with Heaven. Known only as Peter the Hermit, he left his native Amiens in 1093, and made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Touched to the quick by the melancholy condition of the holy places, he seemed to hear, while prostrate before the Holy Sepulchre, the voice of Jesus commanding: "Arise, Peter; go and announce to My people the end of their oppression. Let My servants come, and the Holy Land shall be freed." He returned to Europe, and falling at the feet of Pope Urban II., he urged that Pontiff to carry out the design of his predecessors. The Pope blessed him, and commissioned him to preach a Crusade; he did so throughout Europe, travelling barefooted and bareheaded, clothed in sackcloth, crucifix in hand, and mounted on a mule. William of Tyre (*ob.* about 1180) tells us that Peter was "insignificant in person, but his eye was keen and pleasing, and he possessed an easy flow of eloquence." Everywhere he astonished people by his austerities, and moved their sympathies by his graphic picture of the woes of Palestine. He cried to sinners: "Soldiers of the demon, become warriors of Christ;" and all who had crimes to expiate, or injuries to repair, seized on this means of reconciling themselves with God. The feudatories, the younger sons of reigning families (all trained to war, and having scarcely any other means of occupying their time), joyfully volunteered.

While Peter was thus engaged, there came from Constantinople letters from the Greek emperor, Alexis Comnenus, begging aid from the Latins, as the "new Rome" was in imminent danger of falling into the hands of its enemies. In 1095 Urban II. convoked a Council at Piacenza to devise ways and means. Over 200 bishops, 4,000 priests, and 30,000 laymen listened to the Pontiff's discourse, which was delivered in the open air. Another assembly was ordered

to convene at Clermont in Auvergne, and, on November 18 of the same year, 238 bishops obeyed the summons. Here the Pontiff made use of every argument, religious and political, to further the cause. From his discourse, not as embellished by Michaud, but as it was recorded in its simplicity by William of Malmesbury, (1) who was present at its delivery, we take the following passages :

“Go, my brothers, go with confidence to attack the enemies of God, who—O, shame to Christians!—are so long in possession of Syria and Armenia. Long ago they mastered all Asia Minor; and now they have insulted us in Illyria and all the neighboring regions, even so far as the Straits of St. George. And they have done worse: they have robbed us of the tomb of Jesus Christ, that wonderful monument of our faith; they sell to our pilgrims permission to enter a city which would be open to Christians alone, if we had only a small portion of our ancient valor. Ought not our faces to blush with shame? Who, unless they envy the Christian glory, can suffer the indignity of not being able to share with the infidels at least half of the world? Christians, put an end to your own misdeeds, and let concord reign among you while in these distant lands. Go, then, and in this most noble enterprise show the valor and prudence you now display in your intestine contests. Go, ye warriors, and your praises will everywhere be heard. Let the well-known bravery of the French be shown in the van; followed by the allies, their very name will terrify the enemy. . . . If necessary, your bodies will redeem your souls. Do you, men of courage and of exemplary intrepidity, fear death? Human wickedness can invent nothing to injure you which is to be weighed against celestial glory. Do you not know that life is a misery to man, and that happiness is in death? The sermons of priests have caused us to receive this doctrine with our mothers' milk; and the martyrs, our ancestors, sustained this doctrine with their example. . . . The sanctuary of God repels the spoiler and the ribald, and welcomes the pious man. Let not the love of your relatives impede you: principally to God does man

(1) *Deeds of the English Kings*, B. iv., year 1095.

owe his love. Let not your progress be arrested by your affection for your native land; for the entire world may be regarded as a place of exile for Christians, and their real country is, just now, the entire world. Let no one remain at home because of his riches; for greater wealth is promised him—a wealth composed, not of those things which soften our misery only with vain expectation, but of those which perpetual and daily instances show us to be the only true riches . . . These things I publish and command, and for their execution I appoint the end of the coming spring.” Throughout the assembly was then heard the cry which the Crusaders were to render famous, “God wills it!” A cardinal recited the formula of general confession; all repeated it, and received absolution. Ademar de Monteil, bishop of Puy, received the Cross as Papal legate, and this emblem of the Crusade was then given to nearly all the barons and even to many bishops.

In the First Crusade, two different classes rushed toward the Holy Land—an enthusiastic, fanatical mob of worse than useless men, women, and children, and an equally enthusiastic, but disciplined, army of warriors. Pope Urban II. had vainly tried to temper the ardor which prompted the old, the infirm, and even childhood, to remain unsatisfied with aiding the holy cause with prayer; he had vainly ordered that women should not embark in the enterprise unless accompanied by husbands or brothers; in vain he had commanded that no monks or other ecclesiastics should don the cross without permission of their bishops. The hermit was convinced that prayer and zeal were sufficient, and in disordered ranks, carrying a cross before them, thousands set out, feeding on charity, for the goal of their hopes. So long as these hordes were in Western Europe, their indigence was not remarkable; but when they arrived at the Danube, they found the Hungarians and Bulgarians hostile and they were obliged to use force in order to obtain food. Finally, 100,000 starvelings reached Constantinople, where they committed such disorder, that Alexis was glad to transport them across the Bosphorus. Very soon they fought among themselves, and

nearly all of the survivors were slaughtered by the Islamites. But the Crusading army was of far different material, and was guided by competent persons.

The first Crusade lasted from 1096 to 1100 ; the second, from 1147 to 1149 ; the third, from 1189 to 1193 ; the fourth, from 1202 to 1204 ; the fifth and sixth, from 1218 to 1239 ; the seventh and eight, from 1248 to 1270. Frequent attempts were afterwards made to renew these Holy Wars, and many isolated expeditions were undertaken ; but, as Pomponne, minister of Louis XIV., remarked to Leibnitz, "since the time of St. Louis, such things have been out of fashion." Bacon wrote a dialogue on the Holy War. Mazarin left 600, 000 livres to help a Crusade. The famous friar Joseph, the Franciscan counsellor of Richelieu, composed on this subject a Latin poem, which Pope Urban VIII. called the Christian *Æneid*. In 1670 Leibnitz tried to induce Louis XIV. to conquer Egypt, and in his design, reduced to writing, he said : "Then Europe will rest, will cease to tear her own bowels, and will fix her attention where she may find honor, victory, advantage, and wealth, with a good conscience, and in a manner pleasing to God. Then men will not rival one another in robbery, but in reducing the power of the hereditary foe ; each one will strive to extend, not his own kingdom, but that of Christ Let us suppose that the emperor, Poland, and Sweden, proceed together against the barbarians, and seek to widen the limits of Christendom, having no other designs, and fearing no enemies in their rear : how the blessing of God would show itself in favor of so just a cause ! On the other hand, England and Denmark would find themselves in front of North, and Spain before South America ; Holland, before the West Indies. France is destined by Providence to be the guide to Christian armies in the East, to give to Christendom her Godfreys, her Baldwins, and especially her SS. Louis, who will invade that Africa just opposite her shores, to destroy a nest of pirates and to conquer Egypt—she wants neither the soldiers nor the money necessary to become the mistress of that land Behold a way to acquire a lasting glory, a tranquil conscience, universal ap-

plause, certain victory, immense advantages. Then will be attained that hope of the philosopher, that men will make war only on wolves and other wild beasts, to which the barbarians and infidels may now be compared." (1)

Those who desire, in the matter of the Crusades, details of fact, causes, and effects, should consult the *Deeds of God through the Franks*, by William of Tyre, and the *History* written by the imperial Anna Comnena. Among moderns, he may read with profit the *Spirit of the Crusades*, by De Maillet, and the *History of the Crusades*, by Michaud, which, although full of prejudice, is the most complete of all works on this subject. Much information may also be gained from the *Life of Innocent III.*, by Hurter; and from Prat's *Peter the Hermit and the First Crusade*. The French Academy of Inscriptions published, in 1841, a collection of all the Latin, Greek, and Oriental historians of the Crusades; the Greek portion being composed of fragments from the writings of Nicephorus Briennus, Anna Comnena, Nicetas Coniates, John Phocas, and Michael Attaliates. As for the modern English authors who have written on the Crusades, some are pretentious, few recommendable. Of all who, in any language, have treated this subject, Cantù is the most impartial, and by far the most appreciative of the spirit which prompted and sustained one of the most salient features of the Middle Ages; he will also fully satisfy the reader's curiosity as to chivalry, tournaments, "courts of love," the oaths customary at the time, the military religious orders, the *trovatori*,—an acquaintance with all of which matters will greatly facilitate a comprehension of the events of the Crusades.

Many causes have contributed to an unjust appreciation of

(1) Dissertation by Guhrauer, in *Memoires of the Institute of France*, Vol. I—Cantù agrees with Leibnitz: "Suppose that the lion of St. Mark and the dragon of St. George had made a permanent home on the banks of the Bosphorus, the Jordan, and the Tigris. A civilized population would now enjoy that beauty which of old made them envied centres of culture; Selencia, Antioch, Bagdad, would be the London and Paris of Asia; where now a pasha, with flail and scimitar, treads the peoples before the caprices of a despot, and where the Bedouins practise robbery and piracy with impunity, would now flourish governments founded in order and liberty; from the most beautiful city under the sun would flow streams of culture and of love over Asia and Europe, united in affection and in progress to improve the North, and spread the light of truth in the heart of Africa and in the furthest regions of the East. If a hermit had not raised that cry, if the Popes had not taken it up, the growing civilization of Europe would have succumbed to the Arabs; the religion of love and of liberty would have yielded up our countries to one of blood and of slavery, and over the beautiful lands of Italy and France would reign a brutal domestic and political tranny, a haughty immobility, a fatal indifference, a systematic ignorance."

the value of the Crusades, but they may all be referred to the difficulty experienced by the average modern mind in appreciating the spirit of the Middle Ages. Add to this the fact that these Holy Wars were pre-eminently the work of the Roman Pontiffs, and therefore a natural object of carping criticism to all the foes of Catholicism, and you will be surprised when you find, now and then, a Protestant or an infidel writer who can see in them aught else than cruel injustice to both Christian and Islamite ; or at best, anything better than sublime folly. In defending the policy that prompted these Crusades, in upholding their justice, in contending that they were necessary, humanly speaking, to the very existence of Christianity, we do not apologize for each and every action of their leaders, or of the rank and file of their participants ; it is but too true that, as in other noble designs, many of the instruments were found to be full of flaws. We must distinguish the motives of the Crusaders. The Popes, most of the kings and princes, and nearly all the leaders who took part in these expeditions, were impelled by the desire of banishing the infidel from the places sanctified by the life and death of the God-Man.—by the desire of freeing a Christian people from a slavery that was cruel to the body and threatening to the soul. They felt the necessity of arresting the progress of an inexorable and barbarous enemy, who menaced that Christian civilization which the Catholic Church had developed in nearly the whole, and was then planting in the rest, of Europe ; they knew that the most efficacious means of doing this was by carrying war into Asia and Africa, by convincing Islam that Christendom could fight as well as pray. These motives were certainly noble. But among the masses, while the religious motive undoubtedly predominated with the immense majority, so that it may truly be said to have furnished the life and soul of the expeditions, other motives were sometimes mingled—some of them base, some indifferent. Many who groaned at home under the feudal system hoped to find another lot awaiting them in the East : some were impelled by a curiosity to see those lands about which pilgrims had told

such wonderful stories; some, undoubtedly, were incited by mere love of adventure. If these latter classes were guilty of excesses—nay, if even some of the leaders acted more like *condottieri* than like soldiers of Christ,—the good name of the cause should not suffer.

Those who affect horror at the sacrifice of two millions of Christian lives during the two centuries of the Crusades, do not, as a general thing, descant upon the great loss of life that purely secular wars have entailed, and yet entail, upon mankind. And how great is the difference between these and the Holy Wars, both as to causes and effects! In the former, in nearly every case, men are taken from their firesides to kill and be killed, without knowing the reason for it; in the latter, they knew, thoroughly appreciated, and heartily applauded the reason. But, we are told, this knowledge, this appreciation, was that of superstition, and the hope of success was a folly. The Crusaders were certainly guilty of superstition, if a vivid and life-sacrificing devotion to one's faith, if a hearty reverence for everything connected with that faith, be superstition—we need not here pause to show that Christianity, felt and outwardly professed, is not superstition.

But what about the folly of these wars? Not that supernatural effervescence which is known as the folly of the Cross—for if that be understood, the Crusades *were* a folly—but a sheer absurdity is here intended. Well, now that the holy fever is at an end, and we can calmly criticise each and every one of its symptoms and consequences, many errors of management are discoverable; but at the time the attack on the strongholds of Islam was decreed, every reason, military and political, could be adduced for the success of the project. Common sense assured the Western nations that the Byzantine sovereign, bearing the first brunt of the Mussulman attack, would cordially and gratefully assist the enterprise; who could have foreseen the insane treachery of the entire schismatic tribe?

But what of the justice of the Crusades? The Islamites were pronounced religious and political enemies of the European nations. It was of the very essence of their

religion—and too well did they practise it—to spread their faith by fire and sword, to enjoy the earth and its fulness. They had already subjugated the once flourishing Christian states of the East, and in many of them had almost destroyed every vestige of the Christian religion ; they had conquered a great part of the Iberian Peninsula ; they had devastated a large portion of Italy, and, for a time, had even threatened France ; in fine, to the Mussulman every war against a Christian state or community was holy. Where was the injustice of warring against such a race of men ? Consider also that war, and war to the knife, was the only means by which Europe could save herself from barbarism, her women from degradation, her children from slavery.

Our age affects to detest mere sentiment, and is pre-eminently utilitarian. For this very reason it should admire the Crusades. The first great advantage they brought to Europe was frequent internal peace where intestine war had been the order of the day ; the Christian swords, that had so often crossed one another in unworthy strife, were now turned against the common enemy of the Christian altar and of every Christian government. The Normans and other ferocious Northerners, who would have impeded the progress of civilization along the shores of the Baltic and the German Ocean, found an outlet for their warlike enthusiasm in distant Asia : and “ this expedition ” (the second Crusade), says Krantz, “ at least effected the freeing of Germany from a set of men who lived by robbing others.” (1). Many a district hitherto living in awe of some petty tyrant, who, like an eagle from his eyry, had been wont to pounce down upon it on an errand of rapine, thanked the campaigns of Asia and Africa for affording such men an opportunity of satisfying their tastes away from home. Thousands of serfs, by taking the Cross, threw off the yoke of what was little less than slavery ; for the Crusader became a servant of God and of the Church, and a freeman. Strangers who took up their abode in the domains of some petty lord used to become his serfs : now the pilgrim was sacred.

(1) *Sax.*, c. 13.

Industry was advanced by means of the Crusades. The silks of Damascus were coveted by the Westerns, and Palermo, Lucca, Modena, and Milan became noted for the fabrics they wove for the lords and ladies who were no longer satisfied with the skins of beasts for clothing. The glassware of Tyre was introduced by the Venetians, and soon the ingenious sons of the Republic manufactured the beautiful and delicate crystals which have given its artisans celebrity to our own day. Windmills, till then not known in Europe, were copied from those in Asia Minor, where they were necessary, owing to the want of running waters. The goldsmith's art received an impetus from the numerous relics and gems brought from the Orient, and which had to be richly set and mounted.

Another advantage of the Crusades was the better administration of justice; when intestine war had become rare, order reappeared; the great ones of the earth commenced to consider their followers as their dependents, and not as their slaves; for these inferiors were now freed from local servitude, and began to unlearn the customs of hereditary selfdom. Government was better developed; communes and republics came into existence, and elevated public over private power. The common people, during the long absences of the lords, depended upon the superior power of the kings; and thus was prepared, for the ultimate good of the nation, the fall of feudalism.

Still another good effect of the Crusades is thus described by Cantú: In the fragmentary society of feudalism, each one's country was bounded by the hedge that enclosed his field; it was expensive and dangerous to cross the bridge that spanned the neighboring little torrent, in sight of the castle of the next proprietor. But suddenly the barriers fall, and whole nations enter on roads hitherto closed. Then the Northerners beheld in Italy the relics of ancient, and the commencement of a new, civilization; at Bologna they heard lectures on the *Pandects*; at Salerno and Montecassino they attended medical academies; at Thessalonica they visited schools of fine art; at Constantinople they inspected libraries and museums. James de Vitry expresses his

wonder at finding the Italians 'secret in council, diligent, studious of public utility, careful for the future, detesting the yoke of another, ardent defenders of their liberties. In Sicily and in Venice, whither they came to embark, they found more regular forms of government, and their astonishment on seeing all the citizens of Venice convoked to give assent to the decrees of the doge, inspired ideas of a liberty very different from that known in the North. When they were established on the new soil, they gave attention to a proper jurisprudence, which should not be imposed by force, but should be discussed by the reason of nations who deemed themselves equal, and who desired their own real advancement. The 'Assizes' that were then compiled became models for princes and communes; St. Louis profited by them for his *Establishments*, and perhaps the English found in them the idea of their boasted jury. From the method of gathering tithes, then imposed by the Church, kings learned a regular system of taxes, which, if they became perpetual, at least ceased to be arbitrary and multifold.'

With reference to the effects which the Crusades produced on the arts and letters of Europe, the same author says: "Since it is certain that the Crusades retarded the fall of Constantinople, I believe that literature profited by them; for Europe was not yet sufficiently mature to receive the classics there preserved, as she did in the fifteenth century. In fact, of two rich libraries which then perished, no chronicler makes any mention, of so little account were they deemed; masterpieces of art were brutally ruined, unless when the Italians, especially the Venetians, preserved them to decorate their own cities. Look at Pisa, Genoa, and the Norman edifices in Italy, and you will find them rich in columns and statues transferred from the East,—a fact which reveals a resurrection of the sentiment of the beautiful, and explains the sudden development of the arts among us. Literature came forth from the sanctuary, when all took part in universal enterprise; style was elevated, when history passed from municipal events to prodigies of valor; poetry found in reality that at which, by mere imagination, it would never have arrived." (1).

(1) *Univ. Hist.*, B. xii., c. 18.

The Crusades were also of great benefit to commerce. The commercial cities of Italy made immense profits by transporting warriors and pilgrims; and they obtained great privileges in the conquered lands, establishing banks in Syria and along the Ionian and the Black Seas. Then began the commercial prosperity of what are now Belgium and Holland, of the south of France, of Bremen and Lübeck. Citizens became wealthy, and were soon so powerful that they were able to exact rights and privileges. The sugarcane, used by the Crusaders at Lebanon to assuage their terrible thirst, was transplanted to Sicily, thence carried by the Saracens to Granada, and from there taken by the Spaniards to America. Europe became acquainted with alum, indigo, and many other valuable drugs and spices; afterward, while engaged in a search for a quick passage to the land that produced them, an Italian navigator discovered a new world.

The Crusades failed of their main object—the freedom of the Holy Land,—but they checked the progress of Mohammedanism, and permitted the continuance of the work of civilization in Europe. They need no apology; had they fully succeeded, Europe, Asia, and Africa would now, in all probability, be entirely Christian. Their main idea was both politic and just. It was certainly good policy to give rest to a state by transporting its disturbers beyond the seas, to turn this fury against the barbarians. It was certainly just to combat a ferocious people, an article of whose religion was to exterminate Christians, and who had already ravaged all Southern Europe.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE TRUCE OF GOD.*

Among the many institutions of the Middle Ages which may well claim the attention of the student, one of the most interesting is the "Truce of God." During the first period of feudalism—unless we except the reigns of the Gothic

* This Chapter appeared as an article in the *Age Maria*, vol. xxv., no. 22.

Theodoric, the Lombard Liutprand, and the Frank Charlemagne,—the want of an arranging hand, of a competent ordaining authority, is plainly felt. Only this absence, says the judicious Semichon, can explain the terrible, even though exceptional, barbarities of that time. Heruli, Goths, Vandals, Lombards, Franks, Visigoths, Huns, Danes, Saxons, and Normans, had overthrown the Western empire, and the miserable populations knew no human power but that of the sword; they rejoiced, in fact, when some one barbarian was sufficiently strong to crush his rivals, and to give society that kind of rest which comes from the rule of a single tyrant. When one reads the horrible descriptions of such a chronicler as Glaber Rudolphus (1040)—narratives not only of wholesale murder and universal rapine, but of cannibalism and ghoulism,—he does not wonder that duels and private wars became the means by which society, in the first period of the Middle Ages, tried to preserve the rights which civil government failed to secure it. In the feudal system of that day, remarks Cantù, “there being no confidence, recourse was more willingly had to such guarantees as were conformable to the condition of society; and duels and private wars became a necessity in such a state of affairs.”

However, society benefited little by the introduction of such remedies for its woes. Brute force remained its guiding influence; and no matter under what guise it may be exercised, brute force is conducive neither to civilization nor happiness. On every side were anarchy and chaos, and not unfrequently men imagined that the days of Antichrist were at hand. But if the abomination of desolation was nearly everywhere visible, the mercy of God was about to cut short its work of destruction. There remained on earth one power which men really revered,—one power, the influence of which was moral, and was therefore felt not merely by the lower nature of man, but by his mind and soul. Lombard and Italian; Frank and Roman; Gaul, Vandal, and African; Visigoth and Iberian; Saxon and Norman and Briton; all alike—barbarous and cultured—respected the Catholic Church. In that period, which, despite

its failings, was pre-eminently an age of faith, the influence of religion was paramount over the most terrible warriors and the most unmitigated tyrants. This, then, was the power which was to bring order out of chaos; this Church of God, which had but lately converted the barbaric hordes, and had begun the work of forming a new society on the ruins of the old, was about to appeal to the Christian sentiments of her new children, and to give a new life to the world.

But how was the Church to insure obedience to her injunctions? In her mission of protecting society, of substituting government for anarchy, how could she hope to succeed where even the sword—that generally successful argument over the purely natural man—had shown itself to be of no avail? But the Church possessed a weapon more powerful than the sword—the power of excommunication,—an arm which, as Semichon rightly observes, has been the origin of all modern social progress; for it convinced the barbarian that force could not prevail over right. It must be admitted that individual prelates—generally those who were the products of that system of royal “investiture” which the mediæval Pontiffs combated—often launched ecclesiastical censure for their own unworthy purposes; but such were exceptional cases. Still, as a rule, whenever this weapon was adopted in causes not purely religious, it was used in the interest of humanity. The Church had determined to convince her converts from Paganism that men might be of various conditions in the social scale, but that they were all equally obliged to revere and defend the right, and to uphold the good of society. Starting on her mission to abolish the state of universal warfare around her, the Church of the tenth century continued to preach the Gospel of peace; but she also began to construct a social edifice, and she defended her work with her peculiar weapon.

The first step toward the introduction of the Truce of God was taken in 988. Gondebald, archbishop of Aquitaine, in a Council of his suffragans at Charroux, pronounced anathema against all who robbed farmers or the poor of

their flocks, or destroyed implements of husbandry. Many other Councils prosecuted the same object, and soon the prelates began to inveigh against the arrogance and tyranny which the lords, both great and small, were wont to exercise toward the weak, especially toward monasteries, peddlers, and rustics. Excommunication, and even interdict—that most depressing of all punishments to those who were not lost to all sense of religion (1)—were often launched against the titled ruffians who formed the higher society of the day. The influence of these clerical assemblies was exerted, too, against other social evils than robbery and like forms of license. Their efforts were also directed to prevent the recurrence of war. Our modern philanthropists, who periodically hold a Congress of Peace, in the vain hope of inducing rival governments to reduce their monstrous standing armies, and thus diminish the burdens of the taxpayer, should cease to extol the nineteenth century as having originated the idea of arbitration. At the time of which we write, the cities of Narbonne, Limoges, Sucilanges d' Auvergne, Poitiers, and many others, had Synods which put that idea into practice. The nobles were conjured and commanded to swear, on the relics of the saints, that, when differences arose between them, they would not have recourse to arms until they had first tried to arrive at a pacific understanding in the presence of their respective bishops.

Such movements, however, were only the first attempts to satisfy the aspirations of a society satiated with bloodshed. According to Glaber Rudolphus (b. 5, c. 1), the year 1051 saw Aquitaine in the full enjoyment of "The Peace and the Truce of God," and in a short time the institution spread throughout France. The "Peace" exempted from all the evils of war all churches, clergymen, monasteries and convents, cemeteries; women, children, pilgrims, husbandmen; all implements of agriculture, and all farmers'

(1) And to those, also, whose religious sentiments were dead or dormant: for during an interdict, says Hurter, "music and festivity, assemblies of all kinds, all ornaments and frequently even the ordinary cares of the body, disappeared. A universal fast was observed, all business ceased, and no communication was held with those who were deemed unworthy to belong to Christian society." In such a state of affairs, it is no wonder that "the revenues of the suzerain suffered a notable diminution, owing to the paralysis fallen on every industry." — *Life of Innocent III.*, vol. i., B. 4.

cattle, fields, vineyards, etc. The "Truce" directly tended to habituate to a peaceful life men to whom war was as their life-breath; to give time, at any rate, for angry passions to subside; to allow sober second-thought entrance into minds which acted too readily on impulse.

Realizing the inopportuneness, nay the futility, of an entire prohibition of war (1), the Church contented herself with forbidding it during Advent, Lent, and on the greater festivals. Then, when men had formed the habit of checking their angry passions, and of suspending their satisfaction, the limits of the "Truce" were extended. Four days of the week were consecrated to peace; for the "Truce" went into effect every Wednesday evening, and terminated only with the Sunday. Nor was war entirely forbidden merely during Advent and Lent: the Christmas season was soon added to the former, and the whole Paschal time to the latter. The reader will perceive that this salutary "Truce" covered, if the feasts be also considered, more than two-thirds of the year. In carrying out this beautiful idea, the Church found a powerful auxiliary in the chivalry of Christendom—that association which, according to Semichon, has given us a synonym for much that is noble and grand in human relations. Christian warfare assumed a character of justice and humanity it had never before known, and then was recognized a right the existence of which Paganism ignored—the right of the weak to be respected by the strong.

Glaber Rudolphus, who had witnessed the development of the Truce of God, writes as follows: "At this period divine grace initiated a movement which was founded on the love and fear of God, first in Aquitaine, and by degrees in every part of Gaul. From the evening of Wednesday until the dawn of Monday, no man should presume to offer any violence to another, or to exact satisfaction from any enemy whomsoever, or even to demand forfeiture from a

(1) Modern philanthropists, forgetting that God often commanded war to be waged, tell us that war is the greatest of evils. God ordered a war of extermination in the case of the Canaanites, a civil war against the Benjamites, and a religious war against Antiochus. According to St. Thomas, the great evil of man and of society is not physical suffering, but moral disorder. In accordance with the claims of moral order, the ruler of a state protects the honor of God from insult, watches over the public weal, and shields the weak and the poor from the oppression of the great and strong. (2a 2æ, q. 40, art. 1.)

security. If any one did any of these things he was forced to compound for his life, or was banished from the land, and made an alien in Christian society. This system was commonly styled the Truce of God. It was upheld not only by human safeguards: very frequently it was sanctioned by the terrors of divine interference; for quite often, when maddened audacity had transgressed the law, either God's indignation showed itself, or the sword of man punished the crime. It would be impossible for us to adduce all the instances of God's manifestations of His approval of this institution. And such manifestations might have been expected; for as the Lord's Day is venerated because of His resurrection, so the fifth, sixth, and seventh days ought to be free from evil deeds, on account of reverence for the Lord's Supper and His Passion."

Orderic (Vitalis) informs us that in the year 1080 (1) William the Conqueror sanctioned a law passed by the bishops and barons at a Synod of Isle Bonne, whereby the "Peace and Truce" were promulgated in Normandy and England. The decree reads: "Let the 'Peace,' commonly styled the Truce of God, be strictly observed, as Prince William ordered in the beginning; and let it be renewed in every parish, under pain of excommunication. If any person contemns it, or violates it in any way, the bishop will do justice according to the laws now in force. If any one disobeys his bishop, that prelate will inform the lord of the territory, and that lord will subject the culprit to the episcopal justice. But if the lord should neglect this, his duty, the bishop will recur to the viscount of the king, who will ignore every excuse, and will attend to the affair." In 1060 count Raymond Berengarius, of Barcelona, published the "Truce" in his dominions. In 1095 Pope Urban II. and the Synod of Clermont, and in 1102 Pope Paschal II., confirmed these decrees of William and Raymond. In 1102 William, archbishop of Auchel and apostolic legate, promulgated the "Truce" in his province, in accordance with the statutes of Urban II. Finally, in 1139, the Tenth General Council (Second of the Lateran) gave, in its Canon

(1) Hist. Eccl., B. v.

XI., the official approbation of the Universal Church to one of the most beneficial institutions of the Middle Ages.

But, the reader may ask, in thus promulgating the Truce of God, did not the Church arrogate to herself a power which belongs only to the civil authority? Well, we reply, with Semicon, where and what was the civil authority at that time? The Church has never been disposed to encroach upon the province of legitimate and competent civil government, and she has always restrained her clergy when intemperate zeal has led them to pass the limits of their own jurisdiction. But at the time of which we write, human law was almost entirely ignored, and it became not merely the right but the duty of the Church to remind men of their obligations, and to use her God-given powers to secure their observance. For more than half a century illustrious men have been endeavoring, by appealing to justice, compassion, and *interest*, (1), to put an end to war; but in spite of their zealous apostolate, the latter half of this "thinking" nineteenth century has seen standing armies doubled in number, public debts increased beyond measure. The self-constituted, impartial arbitrators speak to the deaf; public opinion demands peace, but cannot obtain it. The impotency of mere philanthropy to effect lasting good in society is here made evident. And how much more easy is this modern task, which philanthropy has assumed, than the one essayed and executed by the Church when she abolished private warfare! Philanthropy vainly struggles for universal peace among nations already civilized and cultured. On the contrary, the abolition of private war was undertaken by the Church, during an epoch of barbarism and confusion, among thousands of haughty and untamed barons, whose sole wealth was booty, whose sole hope of aggrandizement was conquest; and nevertheless, the Church succeeded in this, as in all of her endeavors to mollify the dispositions of the human wolves whom she was appointed to save. It was the Abbé Saint-Pierre, in the last century, who first

(1) When some of these apostles of peace waited on King Louis Philippe, he characteristically encouraged them, saying, "War is so expensive nowadays that the civilized world may hope to soon see the last of it." And since his time!

inspired men with the conception of a "universal peace," and the famous cardinal Fleury styled his hope "a dream of a worthy man." Certainly outside of the Catholic idea, independently of the idea of God—and the Congresses of Peace have hitherto ignored it—permanent peace among nations is a vain aspiration.

CHAPTER XX.

NINTH GENERAL COUNCIL : FIRST OF THE LATERAN.

When Pope Calixtus II. found that at length the emperor Henry V. was willing to relinquish his claim to investitures, he addressed him a congratulatory letter, and prayed him to send, as soon as possible, his "orators" to Rome, that they might represent him at the General Council then being prepared. "Come therefore, my dear son," he said; "mayest thou rejoice in us, and we in thee, in the Lord! May thy imperial excellency reflect upon the great harm that has been caused to the faithful of Europe by the discord between the Church and the empire, and upon the great increase of good that will accrue to them, with the help of the Lord, from our concord . . . In regard to those things that thou hast committed to thy faithful ambassadors, to be communicated to us by word of mouth, we shall inform thee, by the same means, of what seems proper to us and our brethren. Commending, then, to thy benevolence those our legates who are now with thee, we ask that thou wilt, the Lord granting, send them quickly to us, as the Council convoked by us is at hand. So instruct, however, thy own ambassadors, that, according to thy promise, they may fully restore her regalia to the Roman Church." Baronio assigns the year 1122 as the date of the Ninth General Council, but Cossart observes that the year 1123 must be the correct date, since Suger of St. Denis says that he attended the Council as abbot of St. Denis, "the year after his elevation," and we know that his predecessor, Adam, died in 1122. Again, Robert de Monte and Falco of Benevento give 1123 as the date.

All previous General Councils having been held in the East, the Roman Pontiffs had presided over them by means of their legates. In this Ninth Council, held in the Lateran basilica, and hence called "the First of the Lateran," Pope Calixtus II. presided in person. Over 300 bishops and nearly 700 abbots attended. (1). When the imperial orators had been heard, so great was the joy of the prelates on perceiving that the question of investitures was finally terminated, that many of them applied to Henry's ambassadors the scriptural words, "how beautiful the feet of those who announce good things." The Council then confirmed the compact of Worms, thus definitely restoring the concord between Church and empire.

The prelates then turned their attention to the formation and issuing of Canons for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, and for the encouragement of the Crusades in Palestine and in Spain. The business of the Council was transacted in two sessions, and twenty-two Canons were promulgated. The *First* Canon prohibits all simoniacal ordinations or promotions, under pain of loss of the grade or dignity obtained, and is taken, word for word, from a Canon of the Synod of Toulouse, celebrated under Calixtus II., in 1119. The *Second* Canon, also taken from those of Toulouse, orders that provosts, arch-priests, and deans be taken from the ranks of the priesthood; archdeacons to be selected from among the deacons. The *Third*, taken from the Canons of Nice, interdicts to priests, deacons, and subdeacons all concubinage or use of married life, or residence in the same household with any woman not one's mother, sister, aunt, or such as concerning whom "there can arise no just suspicion." The *Fourth* prohibits, as sacrilege, all princes or any laymen from giving away the possessions of the Church. The *Fifth* condemns as infamous certain marriages of persons related by blood. The *Sixth* degrades all those who were ordained or consecrated by the anti-Pope Bordinio (Gregory VIII.), or by persons consecrated by him. The *Seventh* prohibits, under pain of excommunication, any provost, archpriest, archdeacon, or dean, from conferring a

(1) Suger says there were more than 300 bishops, and Pandulph says there were 997, partly bishops and partly abbots.

benefice without the sanction of his bishop. The *Eighth* excommunicates all invaders of the Papal principality of Benevento; that district, owing to its isolation from the Roman States, being liable to suffer from the periodical wars of Southern Italy. The *Ninth* ordains that no bishop shall communicate with a person excommunicated by another prelate. The *Tenth* and *Eleventh* grant indulgences to Crusaders and to all who aid their enterprise; they receive their families and properties under the protection of St. Peter, excommunicating all who injure them; they order all who have assumed the cross, and have neglected to join the Crusaders in Palestine or Spain, to do so within a year, under pain of anathema, and interdict all sacred offices, excepting baptism and penance, at the hour of death, in the dominions of all princes and lords who are delinquent in this matter. The *Twelfth* abolishes the right, hitherto exercised, and probably usurped, by the Prefect of Rome, to seize the goods left, at his death, by an intestate *Porticanus*. For many centuries there had been established, for strangers, a number of porticoes, in the district reaching from St. Paul's to the city walls, and in that now known as the *Borgo*, extending from St. Peter's to the castle of St. Angelo. (1). These strangers were called *Porticani*, and the Prefect of Rome, a vassal of the emperor down to the time of Innocent III., had usurped a special jurisdiction over them. By the twelfth Canon Pope Calixtus took a step toward the relegation of the Prefect to his proper place, and Pope Innocent III. (el. 1198), took the last step when he forced the Prefect to receive, instead of a sword from the emperor, a mantle from his own Pontifical hands, by way of investiture, thus doing away with the last shadow of the imperial pretence to suzerainty. The *Thirteenth* excommunicates the violators of the "Truce of God." The *Fourteenth* prohibits laymen from appropriating offerings made to the Church, and from regarding churches as part of their domains. The *Fifteenth* anathematizes coiners and circulators of false money, as oppressors of the poor and disturbers of the state. The *Sixteenth* excommunicates all

(1) PROCOPIUS; *Gothic War*, B. ii.

who molest pilgrims to Rome or other holy places, or who exact tolls from them. The *Seventeenth* prohibits monks from administering the Sacraments to the sick, and from singing public masses: "Following in the footsteps of the holy fathers, we establish by this general decree, that monks shall be subject, in all humility, to their respective bishops; and that they shall show, in all things, due and devoted obedience to the bishops, as to the teachers and pastors of the Church of God. They shall never celebrate solemn public masses. Let them entirely abstain from public visitation of the sick, from anointing, and from penance; for these things are not at all in their province. In the churches where they are allowed to officiate, they will receive, from the hands of their bishop, priests who shall be answerable to him for their care of souls." The *Eighth* orders that the bishops appoint all pastors; that they who receive tithes, or take charge of churches, at the hands of laymen, without the consent of their bishop, be visited with canonical punishment. The *Nineteenth* confirms the custom, originated in the time of St. Gregory VII., of monasteries and their churches contributing to the support of Church and state. The *Twentieth* excommunicates all who molest ecclesiastical persons or goods, or peasants and laborers attached to the service of churches or monasteries. The *Twenty-first* is a repetition of the Third Canon. The *Twenty-second* declares null and void all alienations of property belonging to the church of Ravenna, and reiterates the sentence already passed against the simoniacally ordained or consecrated.

CHAPTER XXI.

THE TENTH GENERAL COUNCIL: SECOND OF THE LATERAN.

This Council was convoked by Pope Innocent II. for three purposes: to remedy the evils caused by the schism of Peter *Leonis*, to condemn the heresies of Peter de Bruis and Arnold of Brescia, and to draw more tightly the reins

of ecclesiastical discipline. The Council was opened on April 8th, 1139, and was attended by about a thousand bishops. (1). We give a summary of the teachings of the Petrobruisians, as recorded by the venerable Peter of Cluny, in a letter to the archbishop of Arles and other prelates. Peter de Bruis first disseminated his errors in the province of Arles, about 1120. He denied that baptism was of any use, when administered to a person not yet arrived at the use of reason; for, said he, "he who *believes*, and is baptized, shall be saved." He contended that no temples be built for divine worship; that those existing should be razed to the ground or devoted to other purposes, because "God hears one pray in a tavern as well as in a church; as well before a stable as before an altar." He taught that the crucifix should be broken to pieces and burnt, because "that instrument by which Christ was so cruelly tortured, on which He was so cruelly killed, is unworthy of any veneration; rather should it be treated with every contumely, cut with knives, given to the flames, in revenge for Christ's suffering and death." He not only denied the Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist, but he asserted that it is nothing whatever, and should not be offered to God. He ridiculed all sacrifice, prayer, alms, etc., offered for the dead, and said that "not in the least can they help a soul departed." He rejected tradition and the authority of the Fathers. These errors, and those of Arnold, were condemned by the Tenth Council in its Twenty-third Canon, couched in these terms: "Those who, simulating the appearance of piety, reject the Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood, the baptism of infants, the priesthood and other Holy Orders, and legitimate marriage, we expel, as heretics, from the Church of God, and condemn them; and we command that they be coerced by the civil power. We include their defenders in the same condemnation.

In its Thirtieth Canon, the Council decreed that all who had been ordained or consecrated by Peter *Leonis* (2) and

(1) OTHO OF FRISINGEN, *Chronicle*, B. vii., c. 23. *Chronicle of Benevento*.

(2) On the death of Honorius II., in 1131, a cardinal named Peter (styled *Leonis* after his grandfather Leo, a wealthy and influential Jew) compassed his own election by a faction, after the legitimate proclamation of the cardinal Gregory dei Mattei as Innocent II. The

his followers should be debarred from the exercise of their order. The disciplinary Canons are twenty-eight in number. The *First* deposes all simoniacs. The *Second* condemns every kind of traffic in Sacraments and all holy things, especially reprobating that in ecclesiastical dignities. Those who simoniacally acquire honor or position are deprived of the fruit of their iniquity, and, together with the traders, are branded as infamous: "All custom to the contrary notwithstanding, nothing can be exacted or given, either before or after." The *Third* prohibits a bishop from receiving a person excommunicated by his own ordinary. The *Fourth* deprives of his benefice any cleric who, after being admonished by his bishop, shows himself a fop, or is otherwise extravagant or peculiar in his dress, hair, etc. The *Fifth* orders the observance of that decree of the Council of Chalcedon whereby it was sanctioned "that the goods left by a prelate, at his death, be seized by no man whosoever, but remain, for the use of the diocese and the successor, in the free power of the treasurer and of the clergy. Let there be an end to that detestable and cruel rapacity. If, however, any one presumes hereafter to exercise it, let him be excommunicated." The same punishment is decreed against those who seize the goods of the inferior clergy. This Canon, the Twenty-second of Chalcedon, had been already enforced by the Synod of Rheims, of 1131, under the presidency of Innocent II. The *Sixth* deprives of benefice, and of the right of officiating, all subdeacons, deacons, and priests, who marry or have concubines. The *Seventh* renews the decrees of Gregory VII., Urban II., and Paschal II., prohibiting attendance at the mass of a married or concubinary priest. It declares null the marriages of those in Holy Orders, and of Canons Regular and professed monks. The *Eighth* nullifies the marriages of nuns. The *Ninth* forbids to all monks and Canons Regular the practice of medicine or of civil law, if exercised for the sake of gain. If any bishop or abbot

intruder took the name of Anacletus II. : Pope Innocent fled to the fortified palace of the Frangipani, and afterwards to France. After Innocent's restoration to Rome, the anti-Pope continued to hold the Leonine City until a miserable death overtook him, in 1138. Then his partisans gave him a successor, styled Victor IV., but St. Bernard, who was then in Rome, soon converted this anti-Pope and led him to the feet of Innocent II.

permits such practice, he is to be deposed and excommunicated. The *Tenth* anathematizes all who appropriate the tithes of a church. If the guilty do not make restitution, they commit sacrilege and "incur eternal damnation," even though they have been countenanced in their robbery "by bishops or by kings." This Canon also condemns the practice, which had become quite common, of conferring deaneries and archidiaconates on young persons, and commands that such offices be assigned only to persons of known prudence and merit. It also reproaches the custom of some bishops, who gave parishes to wandering priests. In reference to the first portion of this Canon, that relating to lay-appropriation of tithes, we may observe that many of the nobles of Normandy and England had been accustomed, for a long time, to take to themselves a third of all the church tithes collected in their domains. The Conqueror forced them all to make restitution, but after he had died the custom was resumed. Hence a Synod of Rouen, in 1096, had condemned the practice, and the decree was repeated by a Synod at Poitiers, over which the legates of Paschal II. presided. The Tenth Council confirmed these decisions, "because tithes were designed for the uses of piety;" and such has ever been the mind of the Church. When the state was in difficulty, the Church frequently offered it help in the shape of a concession of all or a part of her tithes, and sometimes the beneficiary neglected to resign a possession which was of so much profit. The *Eleventh* and *Twelfth* Canons regarded the celebrated "Truce of God," of which we have treated in a special chapter. The *Thirteenth* is very severe on usurers. It declares usury to be "prohibited by divine and human law, in the Old and New Testament," and deprives its votaries "of all ecclesiastical consolation." They are not to be absolved, "unless with great caution," but are rather "to be regarded as infamous, during their entire lives; and unless they repent, are to be deprived of Christian burial." The *Fourteenth* regards the custom to which soldiers were addicted, of frequenting fairs and such places and occasions, for an opportunity of exhibiting their skill and valor. These fairs, in fact, had

become so many gladiatorial shows, and combats to the death were not uncommon. By this Canon, a gladiator mortally wounded on one of these occasions was denied Christian burial, even though he lived long enough to confess, and to receive the Holy Viaticum. The *Fifteenth* excommunicates those who lay violent hands on a cleric or a monk, and reserves their cases, unless they be in danger of death, to the Holy See. From the most ancient times, persons guilty of the most heinous crimes had gone to Rome for an absolution denied them at home, but this Canon seems to have reserved expressly, for the first time, any particular crime to the sole judgment of the Pontiff. The *Sixteenth* denies that the possession of an ecclesiastical benefice can be a matter of hereditary right, "for the honors of the Church are given, not to a certain blood, but to merit; and the Church has no heirs by hereditary right, or according to the flesh, but rather seeks for honest, wise, and religious persons to occupy her posts of government and to fill her offices." St. Bernard, commenting upon the passage of the Gospel "behold, we have left all things," gives a fearful picture of this abuse, as not uncommon in his days. The *Seventeenth* condemns as incestuous marriages within certain degrees of kindred, and says they are "detested by the Fathers and by the Holy Church of God." The civil law of that time regarded the fruit of such unions as infamous, and debarred it from the rights of heredity. The *Eighteenth* excommunicates and deprives of Christian burial all incendiaries, this evil having greatly increased, owing to the prevalence of private feuds and vendettas. Absolution for this crime could not be accorded unless the injury was repaired, and only then on condition of a year's service with the Crusaders in Palestine or Spain. The *Nineteenth* suspends for one year, and obliges to a reparation of the injury committed by the culprit, any bishop who absolves an incendiary without insisting on the conditions of the previous Canon. The *Twentieth* declares that the Council does not wish to interfere with the secular power, in its actions against the crime of incendiarism. The *Twenty-first* forbids to the sons of priests all ministration at

the altar, unless they embrace the monastic life. The *Twenty-second* admonishes confessors against false or illusory repentance. "There is a false repentance when the penitent does not give up an office or a business which he cannot fill or conduct without sin, or when he bears hatred in his heart, or when he does not repair an injury or forgive one, or when he bears arms in an unjust cause." The *Twenty-third*, as we have seen, regards the Petrobruisians and the Arnoldists. The *Twenty-fourth* prohibits the exaction of money for the Holy Chrism and Oils or for Christian burial. The *Twenty-fifth* commands that no ecclesiastic receive a benefice from a lay hand, and deprives such a recipient from his position, since, according to the decrees of the holy Fathers, laymen, be they ever so religious, have no right to dispose of the goods of the Church." In the previous century, many Synods had condemned this abuse. By this decree, however, the Council did not interfere with the legitimate "right of presentation" enjoyed by certain lay patrons, and which was derived from their (or their ancestors) having founded and endowed the benefice in question. The Council merely denied the right of absolute collation, without any approval of ecclesiastical authority, which certain magnates had arrogated to themselves. The *Twenty-sixth* anathematizes those women who, living in private houses and wearing the habit of religious, although professing no recognized rule, receive men as guests. The *Twenty-seventh* prohibits nuns and monks from chanting the Office together, in the same choir. The *Twenty-eighth* provides that no episcopal see remain vacant for more than three months. The *Twenty-ninth* prohibits the use of cross-bows against Christians.

The decrees of the Tenth Council were eminently wise, and Pope Innocent II. was justified in expecting that great good would accrue to the Church by their means. But the evils of the time were so deeply seated, that most of the Council's designs were frustrated.

CHAPTER XXII.

POPE ALEXANDER III. AND THE LOMBARD LEAGUE.

Conrad III. having died in 1152. the German throne was mounted by his son Frederick, called, on account of his red beard, Barbarossa. At this time Pope Eugenius III. was experiencing great trouble with the Romans, who were powerfully agitated by the teachings of Arnold of Brescia, and were ambitious to restore the ancient glories of the S. P. Q. R. Eugenius in vain implored the assistance of the French in restoring order in his turbulent capital, and albeit unwillingly, now turned to Frederick I. The German king was but too glad to avail himself of the Pontiff's request as a pretext for his own aggrandizement, for the imperial claims in Italy were just then nearly entirely ignored. He eagerly promised to restore Eugenius to his temporal throne, and accordingly that Pontiff departed from France, where he had taken refuge, and advanced as far as Tivoli, where he hoped to be met by Frederick. Here he suddenly died, in July, 1153. The next Pope was Anastasius IV., but after a short reign he was succeeded, in December, 1154, by Adrian IV. Adrian renewed his predecessor's application to Frederick, and promised him, as a reward, the imperial crown. Having arranged his German affairs, the Red Beard now descended into Italy at the head of a formidable army, and before he gave any aid to the Pontiff, proceeded to restore the imperial power in the North. His first venture was made against Milan, but finding it impossible of reduction, he spent his fury upon the surrounding country, and having sacked and burnt Asti, Chieri, and Tortona, he entered Pavia, where he received the iron crown of Lombardy. Pope Adrian and Frederick met at Viterbo, and were there waited upon by a deputation from Rome, promising obedience to the Pontiff. A few days afterward, having peacefully entered the city, Adrian placed the imperial crown upon the head of Frederick. The peace of the city was soon disturbed, for the Romans,

indignant at the contempt which Barbarossa showed for them, and disgusted with the brutality of the German soldiery, arose in arms, and after a long and bloody fight the emperor, accompanied by Adrian, withdrew his army to Tivoli. Sickness soon decimated his forces, and he ordered a retreat to Germany. Attacked on all sides by the infuriated Lombards, whom he had injured, he finally, almost alone, crossed the frontier. But in 1158, Frederick took his revenge. With more than a hundred thousand men he laid siege to Milan, hunger finally caused a capitulation, and the heroic bulwark of Lombard independence was compelled to swear fidelity to the German. With the acquisition of Milan and the consequent reduction of all Northern Italy, Barbarossa flattered himself that the imperial power was better consolidated than it had been since the days of Charlemagne. But dissensions now arose between Pope Adrian and the conqueror. The Pontiff had many grievances against Frederick, and to obtain redress of these, he commissioned as legates the cardinals Octavian, Henry, William, and Guido. Through them Adrian insisted, firstly, that the emperor should desist from all communication with the Romans, unless through the Pontiff, because the government of the Roman states belonged only to the latter. Secondly, he demanded a cessation of the contributions of hay and straw, levied on the Romans for the imperial cavalry, contending that such could be permitted only on the occasion of an imperial coronation. Thirdly, he required that Italian bishops should be asked to give no homage, but only an oath of fidelity, to the emperor. Fourthly, he protested against the custom of lodging and entertaining imperial messengers, which had been forced upon the bishops. Fifthly, he demanded the cession to the Roman See of the territories of the Countess Matilda, donated by her to that See, and of all the territory between Aquapendente and Rome, of the duchy of Spoleto, and of the islands of Sardinia and Corsica. Adrian also complained that Frederick had broken his promise not to cede any Italian territory to the Greeks, also his agreement to make no peace with the king of Sicily without the consent of the

Pope. (1). To these demands and complaints the emperor gave no satisfaction. With regard to the inheritance of Matilda, he said he would leave that to the decision of wise and impartial men, and to this the legates replied that the dignity of the Pontiff permitted no recourse to an inferior's judgment. Foreseeing a struggle, and realizing that the imperial power was waxing too strong in Italy, Pope Adrian negotiated with Milan, Piacenza, Cremona, and other cities which were impatient of a foreign yoke. The enraged Frederick now rushed into Italy to crush this alliance, but he had scarcely arrived, when he heard of the death of Adrian.

At this time the Sacred College, then numbering thirty cardinals, was divided into two parties. The larger and more influential, led by the cardinal Roland Bandinella, chancellor of the Roman Church, was very averse to the German emperor, and had constantly urged the late Pontiff to make peace with William of Sicily, regarding him as likely to prove a faithful defender of the Holy See against the machinations of Frederick. The other party, under the guidance of the cardinal Octavian, was devoted to the emperor, and so pronounced had this devotion become, that Pope Adrian IV. had besought the cardinals not to elect any of that faction to the Papacy, since its servile regard for the imperial crown was a treachery to the Church. When the Conclave was held, twenty-three cardinals voted for Bandinella, and five for Octavian. The former was accordingly proclaimed as Alexander III. Octavian, however, relying upon the aid of the Roman senators, Ghibellines to the core, dragged the Pontifical vestments from Alexander, and presented himself to the people as Victor IV. Fearing for his life, Alexander fled to the castle of San Angelo, and for nine days was besieged by the schismatics. But the people soon learned the truth, and led by Hector Frangipane, they routed the insurgents and freed the Pontiff. Both parties having notified the emperor of their accession, Barbarossa presumed to convoke a Diet at Pavia to decide the question, and Alexander having refused to attend

(1) RADEVIC, *Epistle of Eberard Ramburg to the Archbishop of Salzburg*, in B. xi., c. 30.

it, fifty bishops satisfied the emperor by recognizing Octavian as legitimate Pontiff. (1). In a Nazarene Synod held in 1160, the Eastern churches recognized Alexander, and in 1161, the English bishops did the same at Newmarket, and the French acquiesced at Beauvais and Toulouse. In the meantime, the cities of Milan, Crema, and Brescia, indignant at the Redbeard's violations of the terms of their capitulation, and driven to fury by his extortions, had commenced another war. The emperor resolved to make a terrible example of the rebellious cities. First came the siege of Crema, the faithful narration of which causes horrible repulsion to the reader. Exhausted at last by six months of fatigue and inexorable hunger, the Cremaschi were obliged to open their gates. All the inhabitants were expelled, and in a few hours Crema was a smoking ruin. When the news of the imperial action at Pavia reached Pope Alexander, he was residing at Anagni. He immediately excommunicated the anti-Pope, Frederick, and all their abettors. Then he proceeded to Terracina, from which place he tried to influence William of Sicily to draw the sword in defence of the Holy See. That prince, however, had forgotten his warlike youth, and was loth to forsake the lap of luxurious indolence, unless for his own immediate interests. Alexander therefore sailed to Genoa, where he was received with great respect and joy. He afterwards went to France. The Milanese, undeterred by the frightful fate of the Cremaschi, were now in full insurrection against the German power. The imperial army, and such Italian cities as favored Barbarossa, suffered immense losses, and in one battle the emperor was wounded. But by force of gold and fair promises, Frederick greatly augmented the number of his Italian allies, and the Milanese were finally compelled to withdraw within their own walls. Famine at length brought about their surrender, and the entire population was driven forth, literally beggars for a crust of bread to sustain life. Ten days afterwards, a heap of stones and bricks showed the traveller where had stood the proud and magnificent Milan. (2). The spectacle of so many thousands of people,

(1) RADEVIC, *Deeds of Frederick I.*, B. ii., c. 64.

(2) Of the innumerable monuments of the ancient Roman, and of their own more modern

all the Milanese and a great number from Piacenza, Brescia, and Bologna, reduced to absolute mendicancy, did more than anything else to bring forth and nourish that celebrated Lombard League, which was destined to crush for a time, and to diminish forever, the imperial power in Italy. When Frederick learned that most of the Lombard cities were uniting to oppose him, he marched on Verona, but growing suspicious of the fidelity of the Italian allies yet following his banner, he suddenly raised the siege and returned to Germany for a new and larger army.

Pope Alexander III. had now returned to Rome, the anti-Pope having died, in 1164, and had been received with joy by the Romans, whose imperialistic tendencies had been greatly modified by the excesses of Barbarossa. He exerted all his influence to develop and confirm the Lombard League, and aided the scattered inhabitants of Milan and Crema to settle amid the ruins of their homes, and to commence the rebuilding of their cities. Enraged at the patriotic efforts of the Pontiff, Frederick recrossed the Alps and marched on Rome to enthrone his anti-Pope, Paschal III., whom he had caused to be chosen as successor to the defunct Victor. He took the Leonine City by assault, reduced the fortified basilica of St. Peter's by fire, and renewed the ceremony of his coronation. The new anti-Pope was then enthroned, and Frederick turned his attention to the Romans. Flatteries, fair promises, and above all, gold, were given in profusion to both nobles and people, and many of them were corrupted. Pope Alexander, on the approach of the emperor, had fled to the strongly fortified palace of the Frangipani, which was well calculated to withstand a siege, even from the imperial army. The princely head of the Frangipani was faithful and brave, but the Pope's counsellors, nevertheless, advised him to retire to the Papal principality of Benevento. Having disguised their persons, Alexander and his cardinals stole out of the city by night, rode to Terracina, where they embarked for Gaeta, and finally were safely housed in Benevento. But Barbarossa.

artistic and architectural grandeur, the Milanese could now rejoice in the possession of only one, and that endures to this day. It stands in front of the church of St. Lawrence, is a portion of a majestic marble portico, formed by a row of sixteen immense columns. How it escaped the otherwise universal destruction, is not recorded.

could not remain long in Rome. The climate was not favorable to the brutal intemperance of his soldiers, and immense numbers of them were buried. He therefore returned to Germany with the wreck of his army. The Lombard League, solemnly arranged on Dec. 1, 1167, was now firmly cemented, and, under the active patronage of Pope Alexander, was an object of fear to Frederick. It united together the cities and territories of Venice, Verona, Vicenza, Padua, Treviso, Ferrara, Brescia, Bergamo, Cremona, Milan, Lodi, Piacenza, Parma, Modena, and Bologna. Genoa and Pisa, however, were too embittered by their commercial rivalry to lay down their arms, and they continued their foolish struggle, involving also Florence and Sienna, on the side of Pisa, and Lucca and Pistoja, on the side of Genoa. Pavia also, and the powerful marquis of Monferrato, remained hostile to the League, and patiently awaited the next return of the Germans into the peninsula. This occurred in 1173. The Redbeard entered Piedmont by Mt. Cenis, stormed and burned Susa, and laid siege to the new city of Alessandria, founded, in 1168, in honor of the back-bone of the League, Pope Alexander III. A great number of houses had already been erected, but their roofs were as yet only thatched with straw. Rightly regarding the name of the city as having been given in token of defiance to the Germans, Frederick swore to so use fire and sword, that not a trace of Alessandria should perpetuate the memory of the Pontiff. His oath seemed easy of fulfilment, for the new city had no walls, and no other defence than a deep ditch. Nevertheless, his assaults were again and again repelled, and although he used all the military engines then known to offensive warfare, he found his army daily decreasing, and the city no nearer reduction. At length, taking advantage of a night of unusual darkness, the Alessandrini made a sortie, which resulted in an immense slaughter of the imperialists, and the destruction of nearly all their war machines and provisions. This blow, followed by the news that the Leaguers were advancing in force to the relief of the city, induced Barbarossa to retreat on Pavia. From this strong position,

while dispatching to Germany orders after orders for reinforcements, he tried to gain time by making overtures to the League. They were heeded, and for a long time Frederick prolonged the negotiations, but taking care to put forth such exorbitant pretensions as would insure their rejection. By the time the Leaguers had discovered their enemy's trick, and had cut short the parleying, the emperor had received his fresh troops, provisions, munitions, etc. Therefore, in the spring of 1176, he started for Como, while the Leaguers, then composed of troops from Milan, Lodi, Novara, Piacenza, Brescia, and Vercelli, marched toward the Ticino, and encamped near Legnano. On May 26, reconnoitring parties crossed swords, both armies came up, and then ensued one of the bloodiest and most important battles of the age. The Italians were victorious, and, leaving on the field his own lance, shield, banner, and cross, his military chest, and an immense spoil in arms, horses, etc., abandoned by his panic stricken troops, who scattered in every direction, Frederick barely succeeded in throwing himself into the arms of his faithful Ghibellines of Pavia. He now realized that the time had arrived for submission to the Pontiff. (1).

At the suggestion of the emperor, representatives of the Holy See and of the Lombard cities met the imperial legates at Bologna, to consider the conditions of peace. The congress was soon transferred to Venice, and Pope Alexander, escorted by a Sicilian fleet, arrived to take part. The emperor and the Leaguers could here agree only upon a truce of six years, but shortly after, a conference was held at Constance, in which the independence of the Italian re-

(1) The learned Benedictine historian, Tosti, in his *History of the Lombard League*, Montecassino, 1848, p. 345, thus comments on the battle of Legnano: "The battle of Legnano was one of those of which we often read, in both ancient and modern history, as having decided the destinies of an entire people. They are prepared beforehand by many circumstances of time and of men, as though by a special Providence of Heaven; and hence, when they are fought, men may expect to see some crown disappearing forever, or some people arising and writing, in the codex of justice, the date of its acquisition of freedom. As yet the Lombards had never contended, sword in hand and in pitched battle, against the emperor; a reverence for Caesar was still written in their hearts—it was not yet wiped out by the tears of slavery. At Pontida they leagued together, and prepared to fight; but in their public documents of the day, there always appears a superstitious reverence for the emperor, in the words *salva tamen imperatoris fidelitate*. At Legnano they crossed swords with, and routed the imperialists; they despoiled Caesar of everything, and carried off his standard; with all of his prestige, disappeared all the influence of the successor of Charlemagne and of Otho. That battle was not merely a victory of the Lombards over Frederick Barbarossa; it was a defeat of the empire by the Italian republics, and on that day was destroyed that which had made the people resigned to their servitude—a religious respect for the empire."

publics was acknowledged, on condition that their chief magistrates should receive their investiture from the emperor. As to his differences with the Holy See, Frederick now had too much at stake to allow him to give way to his native arrogance; above all things, it was necessary for him to break the union of the Guelphs, by separating from their cause that of the Pontiff. He therefore manifested much humility and docility in acceding to the demands of Alexander. He immediately procured the abdication of his last anti-Pope, Calixtus III. (1), whom he had caused to be substituted, in 1170, for the defunct Paschal; as to the territories donated to the Holy See by the countess Matilda, he promised to yield them. Certain imperialistic and many Protestant authors have shed a very theatrical light upon the audience in which Pope Alexander III. restored Frederick I. to the communion of the Church. They assert that, as the emperor prostrated himself at the feet of the Pontiff, Alexander placed his heel upon the monarch's head and cried out, in the words of the Psalmist, "Thou shalt walk upon the asp and the basilisk, and thou shalt trample under foot the lion and the dragon;" that the humiliated Frederick protested that those words were said of Peter alone, and that the elated Alexander replied, "of me, and of Peter." The absurdity of this story is evident; that it is unfounded in fact, is proved by the silence of all the contemporaries and quasi-contemporaries of Alexander who wrote about his Pontificate. Thus, Romuald, archbishop of Salerno, who was present at the absolution of Frederick, and who wrote a *Life of Alexander*, says nothing of this scene; neither does Matthew of Paris (2), nor William of Tyre (3), nor Roger of Hoveden. (4).

The peace concluded at Venice had for result, so far as the Italian republics were concerned, a confederation very similar, apparently, to that which was formed, two centuries afterward, in the mountains of Switzerland; in substance, however, there was a great difference between the

(1) This intruder humbly begged pardon of Alexander, in 1178, and we are told by Romuald of Salerno that the Pontiff that day seated him at his own table. So much for the arrogance of Alexander III., a favorite theme of certain writers.

(2) *English History*, year 1177.

(3) *Holy War*.

(4) *Annals of England*, year 1177.

two. The Lombard confederation acknowledged as head, either elective or hereditary, a foreigner, who, aided by foreign troops and by almost inevitable internal discord, might, at any moment, become a tyrant. But Frederick obtained many advantages by the same treaty. He filled his exhausted treasury, and being hailed as sovereign *de jure* of Lombardy, he could patiently await an opportunity of becoming such *de facto*. His reconciliation with the Italians enabled him to delay the cession of Tuscany to the Holy See, if, indeed, he ever sincerely intended to obey the will of the countess Matilda, and to fulfil his own oath. Another great advantage accruing to Frederick from peace with the Pontiff and the northern Italians, was an opportunity to carry out a long designed scheme to establish a branch of his family on a royal throne in Italy. William II, king of Naples and of Sicily, had no children, and Frederick proposed a marriage between his son Henry (afterward the Sixth of Germany) and the princess Constance, aunt and sole heiress of William. Pope Alexander III, and after him, Pope Lucius III., and Urban III., being displeased with Barbarossa because of his tortuous policy and his contempt for his obligations, and unwilling that a foreigner, already on the way to become ruler of Northern Italy, should become sovereign of the South, opposed all their power against this marriage, but in vain. We shall notice its results, when we come to treat of the Pontificate of Innocent III. During the next few years after the peace of Venice, Frederick remained comparatively quiet; with the exception of a short war with the duke of Saxony, Henry the Lion, tranquillity pervaded his dominions. But in 1189. the fall of Jerusalem having caused Pope Urban III. to proclaim a new Crusade, Frederick received the Cross from the hands of the cardinal Henry, bishop of Albano, and led a considerable army toward Palestine. By June of the following year he reached the banks of the Calycadnus, in Cilicia, and while trying to ford the stream in his heavy armor, was drowned.

We cannot close this chapter without a few words in defense of the conduct of Pope Alexander III., in making a

separate peace with Frederick, without, it is said by some, more consideration for his allies. Many Italian historians have also blamed him for not taking advantage of the imperial misfortunes, thus assuring the independence of their country. But in his treaty with the emperor, Alexander III. entered into no arrangement which could reasonably displease the Lombards, and there was no likelihood that the confederates would have helped the Pontiff to the extent of annihilating the imperial power in Italy. It is certain that the Leaguers, even in their most prosperous moments, did not dream of absolute withdrawal from the empire; the ideas of those days were very different from those of the present time. The Italian enemies of Barbarossa merely contended for "home-rule," and they willingly acknowledged the supremacy or primacy of the suzerain created and anointed by the Holy See. This is well proved by the following passage of Romuald of Salerno, giving a Declaration made by the chiefs of the League to the Pope, in 1177: "Your Holiness and the imperial government must know that we will gratefully receive the peace of the emperor, if the honor of Italy be secured; and that we wish to recover his friendship, providing that he will guard our liberties. We desire to satisfy all the obligations of Italians toward him, according to the ancient usages; we do not reject any of the olden laws; but we will never consent to forego that liberty which we inherited from our forefathers, and we will lose it only with our lives, for the death of a freeman is sweeter to us than the life of a slave." Why then should Alexander have prolonged the war? Again, by an annihilation of the imperial power, the Pontiff would have undone the work of his predecessor, who had created that power, and had confided to it the temporal supremacy of Christendom. Even when an emperor became a rebel to the Pontiff, Rome never thought of abolishing his office, but only of substituting a more religious and more docile incumbent.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE ELEVENTH GENERAL COUNCIL : THIRD OF THE LATERAN.

During the years 1177 and '78, Pope Alexander III. sent subdeacons to all the ecclesiastical provinces, summoning the bishops to a General Council at Rome in the following year. (1). Such was the manner, in those days, of convoking a Council. (2). The letter of convocation says : " As we see there are many things in the Church of God which need correction, many improvements to be made, and many things to be made known to the faithful which will help to their salvation ; we have resolved to summon ecclesiastics from all parts, that, by their presence and counsel, what is healthful may be established, and what is good may be provided, according to the custom of the ancient Fathers, and be confirmed by many. If this were effected by each one individually, it would not easily attain its end. Therefore, by these Apostolic Letters, we command that you co-operate with this our arrangement, and, the Lord leading, that you come to the city of Rome on the first Sunday of the coming Lent, so that, with the aid of the grace of the Holy Ghost, we may decide, by our common care, what is to be done in the correction of abuses and in the establishment of what will be pleasing to God ; that we may, with one shoulder, support the Ark of the Lord, and with one tongue, give honor to God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." The reasons for holding the Council were, first, to remedy the evils caused by the anti-Popes whom Frederick Barbarossa had sustained, and, in two instances, created ; second, to condemn the Waldensian heresy ; third, to invigorate ecclesiastical discipline. Pope Alexander, in person, presided over the Council. Matthew of Paris says there were present 310 bishops, but William of Tyre, who

(1) The year 1179 is assigned as the date of the Eleventh General Council by Otho of Frisingen (*Chronicle*, B. vii.), Matthew of Paris, William of Tyre, Roger of Hoveden, Helmold, and Albert Stadensis. And nevertheless, and although Alexander III. died in 1181, the abbot of Ursperg, in his *Chronicle*, says : " In the year of the Lord 1182, Pope Alexander held a General Council in the Lateran basilica, about the Calends of April ; although some say the Council was held in 1179. But it may be that at this latter date he celebrated a Synod with some of the bishops of Italy."

(2) ROBERT DE MONTE, *year* 1179.

was one of the synodals, puts the number at 300. The Council was opened in the Lateran basilica, on March 5th, 1179, and its business was completed in three sessions.

In its *First Canon*, the Council decreed that hereafter a two-third's vote of the Sacred College would elect a Pontiff. It reads as follows: "Although our predecessors issued Constitutions which sufficiently guard against discord in the election of a Supreme Pontiff, the Church has frequently suffered grievous rupture on account of the audacity of wicked ambition; hence, to avoid this evil, we have decreed, by the advice of our brethren and with the approbation of the holy Council, to add something to those Constitutions. We therefore decree that if, by the enemy's sowing of nettles, there be not full concord among the cardinals in their choice of a Pontiff, and if two thirds agree, and the other third will not yield, but presumes to declare another Pontiff for itself, he shall be the Roman Pontiff who is elected and acknowledged by the two thirds. And if any one, not being able to attain his end, relies upon the nomination by one third, and usurps the name of Pontiff, he and all who recognize him are excommunicated, deprived of the exercise of their order, and even the Communion shall be denied to them, unless they are at the point of death. If they do not repent, let them have their lot with Dathan and Abiron, whom the earth swallowed alive. Again, if any one be chosen by less than two thirds, and no better agreement be reached, he will incur the above punishment, unless he humbly retreats. However, this decree imports no prejudice to the Canonical and other ecclesiastical Constitutions, in which the sentence of the larger and better part ought to prevail; because if any doubt arises in such cases, it can be settled by the decision of a superior. In the Roman Church there is a peculiar condition of things; in its regard, there can be no recourse to a superior." By a decree of Pope Nicholas II., in 1059, the election of a Pontiff had been confined to the cardinals, "the consent of the remaining clergy and of the people following; so that those most religious men are to be the leaders in the election, and the rest followers." From the

reign of Alexander III., the two thirds system has constantly obtained. The *Second Canon* declares the nullification of all appointments made by the late anti-Popes, Octavian, Guido, and John, and prohibits the exercise of their order to all ordained by them or theirs. It also prescribes the following form of abjuration, to be sworn to before a schismatic can be received into the Church: "I anathematize and reject every heresy which asserts itself against the Holy, Roman, Catholic Church; especially the schism of Octavian, Guido, and John; and I regard the ordinations of these as null, and reject them. (1). And I swear that hereafter I shall obey and prove faithful to, the Holy Roman Church and my lord Alexander and his legitimate successors; that I shall serve them, without any evil mind, and according to my order, against all men. The counsels he may give me, in person or by writing, I will reveal to no man, even though my limbs or life be in danger; I will honor the legates of the Roman Church, guide them and dismiss them, and contribute to their expenses. So help me God, and these His holy Gospels." (2).

The second reason for the celebration of the Eleventh Council was the condemnation of the Waldenses. As we shall devote a special chapter to these heretics, we here detain the reader only a few moments. While Pope Alexander III. was in France, he had held, in 1163, a Synod at Toulouse, the fourth Canon of which prohibited any one from harboring the Waldenses or Albigenses, and from holding any commercial relations with them. By its 27th Canon, the Eleventh Council confirms the decree of Toulouse: "As blessed Leo says: Although ecclesiastical discipline is content with the sacerdotal decisions, and takes no bloody revenge, nevertheless it is assisted by the decrees of princes, in order that men may seek a salutary remedy, when they fear an imminent corporal punishment. Therefore, since in Gascony, in the territory of Albi, and in the district of Toulouse, the condemned wickedness of those heretics who are variously styled Catharians, Paterines, Publicans, etc., has so developed, that they no longer

(1) Illicit, that is, not invalid.

(2) ALBERT STADENSIS, *Chronicle*. ALBERT KRANTZ, *Metropolis*, B. vii., c. 3.

manifest their iniquities in secret, as others do, but even openly avow their errors, and thus seduce the weak and simple; we pronounce anathema on them, their defenders, and their harborers; and under pain of the same anathema, we prohibit all persons from harboring them in houses or territory, and from cherishing them, or transacting any business with them. If they die in their sin, let no offering be made for them, or burial among Christians be accorded them, notwithstanding any privilege conceded by us to any one whomsoever, and notwithstanding any other pretext." With regard to the severity of this and similar Canons, we shall take occasion to vindicate their justice and necessity when we come to treat of the Albigenses. In another part of the same 27th Canon, the Council condemns the predatory bands of Belgians, Arragonese, Navarrese, Basques, Cotterels (1), and Triaverdins, who had joined the Albigenses for the sake of pillage and lust, "who respected neither churches nor monasteries; sparing not orphans, women, or old age; but looting and desolating everywhere;" and orders that "for the remission of their sins, all the faithful courageously oppose these ravages, and defend Christians against such wretches." The Canon then grants indulgences "at the discretion of the bishops," of greater or less extent, according to their term and kind of service, to those who don the Cross in the Holy Wars.

The third object of the Eleventh Council was the invigoration of ecclesiastical discipline. Simony was rife in the churches and monasteries: the clergy were, to a great extent, stained with avarice, and addicted to pompous display; among the laity, usury had become a notorious evil. The Council therefore issued, besides the three Canons already noticed, twenty-four others. The *Third* prescribes "that no person be made a bishop, unless he is thirty years of age, born of legitimate matrimony, and is shown to be commendable in life and in learning." No one can be made a dean, an archdeacon, a parish-priest, or receive any care of souls, unless he has reached his twenty-fifth year, and is of approved knowledge and morals. In the twelfth

(1) De Marca says these were so called because their favorite weapon was a long knife, called by the Toulousans a *cotterel*.

century, the promotion of young persons, on account of court influence, to ecclesiastical dignity, had become a frightful abuse. St. Bernard (1) says: "Schoolboys, not yet arrived at the age of puberty, are promoted, because of their family dignity, to ecclesiastical offices; they are taken from under the master's rod, and assigned to govern priests." William of Newburg (2) reproves archbishop Roger of York because, "instead of the worthy persons who once shed light upon the church of York, he appointed beardless youths, better fitted to play at odd-and-even, or to straddle the hobby-horse." The *Fourth* protects the clergy and bishops from undue expenses, while their superiors are making a visitation. A cardinal may have twenty-five horses at such a time, if he is not also a bishop: an archbishop shall be content with forty or fifty; a bishop may be followed by thirty; an archdeacon will find five or seven a sufficiency; a dean must be satisfied with two. This programme, however, is only for the poorer places; if a very rich place be visited, the Council "tolerates" the visitor's exercise of discretion. The *Fifth* prohibits any ordination without a "title," whereby the ordained may live until he be provided with a benefice. In this Canon, occurs the first mention of the patrimonial title. A bishop who ordains a person without a title, whereby he may live, is obliged himself to support that person until he receives a benefice. In consequence of this Canon, Pope Innocent III. ordered the bishop of Zamora, whose predecessor had ordained a certain subdeacon, to support him until he assigned him a benefice, threatening to compel the bishop by ecclesiastical censure. The *Sixth* prohibits any suspension or excommunication before the issuance and reception of the formal canonical admonition. It orders a certain time to be assigned for the prosecution of an appeal, if the aggrieved party desires to make one; if the appeal is not made within that time, "the bishop may exercise his right." Monks and religious are prohibited to appeal "against the regular discipline of their superiors or Chapters." The *Seventh* condemns all charges for the administration of

(1) *Epist'le 42, to Henry, archbishop of Sens.*

(2) *English Affairs*, B. iii., c. 5.

Sacraments, for the granting of benefices, and for the Sacred Oils. This Canon is transcribed in the *Decretals*, B. V., tit. iii., on *Simony*. It also decrees that if any person, being in danger of death, leaves his property to a religious order, his parish church shall receive its canonical share; if, however, a man in good health does the same, the will stands. The *Eighth* prohibits the promising a particular benefice, when it shall become vacant, "lest one may seem to desire the death of the occupant." A prebend or benefice must be conferred within six months of the day it becomes vacant. If the collation belongs to the bishop, and he neglects to confer it, the right devolves on the Chapter, and *vice versa*; if both neglect, the metropolitan must provide. The *Ninth* rebukes the Knights Templars and the Knights Hospitalers of St. John, and some other orders, for exceeding the privileges conceded them by the Holy See, and decrees, first, that they receive no churches or tithes without the consent of the bishop; second, that they avoid all excommunicated or interdicted persons; third, that in all churches, not theirs by "full right," they present their priests for installation by the bishop; fourth, that, if they come to an interdicted church, they can only once in the year be admitted to the ecclesiastical Office, and not even then can they bury the dead in the said church; fifth, that those persons who live in religious houses, although not really belonging to the order, cannot partake of the immunities granted to the members. The *Tenth* forbids the reception of a monk or religious, "for money." It also decrees that a monk who keeps or possesses any money, "unless given him by the abbot for a definitely assigned purpose, be deprived of Communion, and if he be found at his death, to have had money, he shall not be prayed for, and he shall not be buried with the brethren." The *Eleventh* regards the continency of the clergy, and is a repetition of previous enactments. The *Twelfth* prohibits clerics from conducting cases before secular tribunals, unless the case be of the Church, or their own, or for a miserably poor person. The *Thirteenth* condemns "spiritual polygamy," that is, the holding of more than one benefice by

one person. The *Fourteenth* treats of the same subject, and then forbids the clergy, under pain of degradation, from receiving churches from lay hands, without the authorization of the bishop. It also excommunicates any layman who compels an ecclesiastic to appear before a lay tribunal. The *Fifteenth* prohibits a cleric from transmitting to his heirs what he has acquired by virtue of his ecclesiastical office. What he has received "by inheritance, through his own labor, or by his learning," he may dispose of as he pleases. This decree is inserted in the *Decretals*, B. III., tit. 21, *Wills and Last Wishes*. The *Sixteenth* regards Capitular dissensions, and decrees that "unless something reasonable be alleged by the minority, the decision of the majority shall stand, without appeal." The *Seventeenth* orders that, when a right of presentation to a benefice belongs to many, and they cannot agree upon a candidate, the majority's opinion be respected. If this would cause any scandal, the bishop must arrange the matter. He will also take the affair in his own hands, if a dispute arises as to who possesses the right of presentation, and it is not settled in four months from the date of vacancy. (*Decretals*, B. III., tit. 39, *Right of Presentation*.) The *Eighteenth* decrees that in all cathedral churches a fitting benefice be assigned for the support of the master of the cathedral school, whose principal duty it is to give gratuitous instruction to poor scholars. The *Nineteenth* excommunicates magistrates and consuls who impose burdens on churches and diminish ecclesiastical jurisdiction, unless "the bishop and the clergy see that there is such great necessity or utility, that the church ought to come to the aid of the community. (*Decretals*, B. III., tit. 49, *Immunity of Churches*.) The *Twentieth* repeats the decree of the Tenth Council against tournaments where life is endangered, gladiatorial shows at fairs, etc. The *Twenty-first* and *Twenty-second* regard the *Truce of God*, of which we have already spoken, and are inserted in the *Decretals*, B. I., tit. 33, *Truce and Peace*. The *Twenty-third* establishes a pastor, church, and cemetery, for every community of lepers, and exempts it from tithes. The *Twenty-fourth* excommunicates all who furnish munitions of war to the

Mohammedans, or become navigators in their ships. The same penalty is launched against all pirates and wreckers. The *Twenty-fifth* is against usury. The *Twenty-sixth* excommunicates Christians who have become domestics, etc., in the service of Jews. The *Twenty-seventh* proclaims a Crusade against the Albigenes.

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE CAUSE OF ST. THOMAS A BECKET, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

Henry II. mounted the throne of England in 1154. By the death of his father, he inherited Touraine and Anjou ; through his mother he was lord of Normandy and Maine ; in marrying Eleanor of Poitou, he received as dowry Poitou, Saintogne, Auvergne, Perigord, the Limousin, Angoumois, and Guienne. Thus, although a vassal of the king of France, he became, on his accession to the English crown, a more powerful prince than his suzerain (1). Six Popes, Adrian IV, Alexander III., Lucius III., Urban III., Gregory VIII., and Clement III. occupied the chair of St. Peter during the reign of Henry II., but we shall have occasion, in this chapter, to allude only to Alexander. The other principal sovereigns contemporary with Henry were the emperor Frederick I. ; in France, Louis VII. and Philip Augustus ; in Spain, Alphonsus VIII., Sancho III., and Alphonsus IX. When Henry II. commenced to reign there was no one to whom he owed so much as to Theobald archbishop of Canterbury, and he soon promoted that prelate to the first place at the council-board. Worn out by age and sickness, Theobald wished to retire from political life, but his great love for Henry prompted him to leave his place to some one capable of guiding the young king, and he chose his own arch-deacon, Thomas à Becket.

(1) We are told by Gerald of Cambrai, Peter of Blois, and William of Newburg, that Henry II. was comparatively well read, and that he was generally well-mannered ; but the cardinal Vivian, after a long interview with him, said : " I have never witnessed the equal of this man as a liar," and king Louis VII. told Henry's ambassadors that it was impossible to put faith in their master.

Henry became greatly attached to the arch-deacon, appointed him chancellor, (1) made him preceptor of the heir apparent, warden of the Tower, castellan of Berghamsted, and assigned to his service one hundred and forty knights. Becket was a warrior. at this time, as well as a counsellor. During the French campaign of 1159, he fought at the head of seven hundred knights and their retinues; at the close of the war, he was maintaining twelve hundred knights and four thousand cavalry. In 1161, the highest dignity in the English church became vacant by the death of archbishop Theobald. For thirteen months Henry allowed the vacancy to continue, as the revenues of Canterbury were welcome to his pocket. At the end of that time, the Chapter and the prelates met at Westminster; every vote was cast for Becket, and prince Henry, in his father's name, gave the royal assent (2). The ostentation of the chancellor henceforth gave place to the modesty of a Christian bishop; he immediately resigned his secular offices, and dismissed his large train of noblemen, keeping near his person only a few of his most virtuous and most learned priests. (3). It was on account of his care for the poor, as well as for the sake of the sacred principle involved, that he now insisted upon the restitution of those revenues of his diocese which had been appropriated by laymen. It is not easy to determine whether this action of Becket was the first cause of dissension between him and the monarch; but it is certain that, for more than a year before the open collision. Henry had cooled toward his former favorite, and that the envious noticed a change, and misrepresented his actions. An opportunity was offered to these gentry in 1163, by a dispute regarding the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts. (4). The first attack on these tribunals was made on their

(1) The chancellorship was one of the few offices that could not be bought. It was a sure stepping-stone to a bishopric, and hence its occupier avoided incurring the impediment of simony. LINGARD, *History of England*, vol. ii. c. 3.

(2) When the king informed Becket of his intention to promote his election, the chancellor smilingly pointed to his armor, and said that such was not the dress of a bishop. He then declined the honor, saying that he could not do his duty as archbishop and, at the same time, retain Henry's favor; but, at the entreaty of the legate Henry of Pisa, he accepted the nomination.

(3) Protestants have called this change hypocrisy; but, remarks Lingard, had Becket been a hypocrite, he would have been both chancellor and archbishop, would have flattered the king, and would have been absolute in church and state.

(4) "When the imperial government ceased in other countries," says Lingard, "the natives preserved many of its institutions, which the conquerors incorporated with their own laws; but our barbarian ancestors eradicated every prior establishment, and trans-

criminal jurisdiction. Because of the presumed light sentence of one Philip de Brois, a canon of Bedford, convicted of manslaughter, and condemned to a money indemnity to the relations of his victim, and afterwards punished by whipping for insulting a judge, Henry summoned the bishops to Westminster, and demanded that hereafter in all similar cases, the culprit should be punished by the secular tribunals, if convicted by the spiritual court. The prelates refused, and the king then asked if they would promise to observe the ancient customs of the realm. As these customs had not been defined, the archbishop replied affirmatively, "saving his order." Henry then put the question separately to each bishop; with the exception of the bishop of Chichester, all repeated the answer of Becket. The prelates soon realized that the word "customs" was meant to cover an attack on most of the clerical immunities. But the archbishop of York, Roger de Pont l'Eveque, who had always been jealous of Becket, proposed to temporize; Becket refused, and wrote to Pope Alexander about the state of affairs. The Pontiff, who was then at Sens, answered with a most encouraging letter, bidding the English prelate not to yield one iota of the Church's rights. But before the Pope's missive arrived, the zealous archbishop had found himself deserted by nearly all the clergy. He was pressed on all sides to yield, and finally, knowing that Henry had sworn never to attack the Church immunities, he promised to withdraw that obnoxious reservatory clause:

planted the manners of the wilds of Germany into the new solitude which they had made. After their conversion, they associated the heads of the clergy with their nobles, and both equally exercised the functions of civil magistrates. It is plain that the bishop was the sole judge of the clergy in criminal cases (*Saxon Laws*, 83); that he alone decided their differences (*ibid.*, 51), and that to him appertained the cognizance of certain offences against the rights of the Church and the sanctions of religion; but as it was his duty to sit with the sheriff in the court of the county, his ecclesiastical became blended with his secular jurisdiction, and many causes, which in other countries had been reserved to the spiritual judge, were decided in England before a mixed tribunal. This disposition continued in force till the Norman conquest, when the two judicatures were completely separated, and in every diocese 'courts Christian,' that is, of the bishop and his archdeacons, were established, after the model and with the authority of similar courts in all other parts of the Western church. . . . The proceedings of the former (ecclesiastical courts) were guided by fixed and invariable principles, the result of the wisdom of ages: the latter were compelled to follow a system of jurisprudence confused and uncertain, partly of Anglo-Saxon, partly of Norman origin, and depending on precedents, of which some were furnished by memory, others had been transmitted by tradition. The clerical judges were men of talents and education: the uniformity and equity of their decisions were preferred to the caprice and violence which seemed to sway the royal and baronial justiciaries; and by degrees every cause which legal ingenuity could connect with the provisions of the Canons, whether it regarded tithes, or advowsons, or public scandal, or marriage, or testaments, or perjury, or breach of contract, was drawn before the ecclesiastical tribunals. A spirit of rivalry arose between the two judicatures, which quickly ripened into open hostility. On the one side were ranged the bishops and chief dignitaries of the Church, on the other the king and barons." *loc. cit.*

“saving his order.” Henry then declared that, as his honor had been publicly injured, the reparation should be made before the estates of the kingdom.

The bishops, barons, etc., met the king at Clarendon, on January 25th, 1164. Henry immediately demanded that the prelates should fulfil their promise, and Becket once more requested that the reservatory clause might be retained. The answer of Henry was a threat of exile or of death; a door was thrown open, revealing to the astonished bishops a party of knights with drawn swords. Two Templars then knelt before the primate, and begged him to yield; the bishops joined with their entreaties, and finally Becket promised to observe the “customs,” but quite naively asked to be told what they were. A committee of inquiry presented sixteen Constitutions as the customs of England. “The care of all vacant dioceses, abbeys, and priories, was to be given to the sovereign, and all their revenues, during the vacancy, to be paid to him; the election of a new incumbent could be made only in pursuance of a royal writ, and should be held by the chief clergy in the royal chapel, with the royal consent, and by the advice of such prelates as the king might summon.” The first portion of this Constitution refers to a custom introduced by William Rufus, but renounced by him and all his successors, including Henry II. himself. It was ordered, by the *third* Constitution, that, when a cleric was a party to a suit, the royal justices should decide in what court it should be tried; if it was decided to send the case to an ecclesiastical court, a civil officer would make report of the proceedings, and the defendant, if convicted, could claim no “benefit of clergy,” that is, exemption from punishment by the secular authority. This, says Lingard, ought not to have been called an “ancient” custom, for it was an innovation, overturning the law as it had stood since the days of the Conqueror, and not restoring the judicial process of the Anglo-Saxons. The *fourth*, also derived from the Conquest, ordered that “no archbishop, bishop, or other person, should leave the kingdom, without the royal consent;” before going, they were to give security that they would work

nothing against his majesty or his kingdom. The *seventh* Constitution prescribed that "no chief-tenant of the king, no officer of his household or demesne, could be excommunicated, or his lands interdicted, without the king's permission, or that of the grand-justiciary." The pretext of this custom, introduced by the Conqueror, was that, as all men were obliged to avoid an excommunicated person, the king would lose the services of an excommunicated vassal. By the *eighth*, appeals were ordered to proceed "from the archdeacon to the bishop, from the bishop to the archbishop;" if the metropolitan did not decide the cause, it was to be carried "to the king," that he might command it to be terminated "in the archiepiscopal court," and no other judge was to be had, "without the royal assent." King Henry I. had tried to prevent appeals to the Pope, but Henry II., some time after the Clarendon affair, denied that such was his intention. His creature, Gilbert Foliot, bishop of London, said that "the king claims that no one shall leave the kingdom, *for a civil cause.*"

Of these Constitutions three copies were made, and they were signed by Henry, the bishops, and thirty-seven barons. On the king's demanding that the prelates should affix their seals to the documents, Becket said that he had fulfilled his promise, and would do no more. "His conduct on this trying occasion," says Lingard, "has been severely condemned for its duplicity. To me he appears more deserving of pity than of censure. His was not the tergiversation of one who seeks to effect his object by fraud and deception: it was rather the hesitation of a mind oscillating between the decision of his own judgment, and the opinions and apprehensions of others. His conviction seems to have remained unchanged; he yielded, to avoid the charge of having, by his obstinacy, drawn destruction on the heads of his fellow-bishops." Scarcely had the Clarendon convention been dissolved, when the primate became the prey of remorse. Immediately after his arrival at Canterbury he voluntarily ceased to officiate as bishop, and despatched a report to Pope Alexander, begging absolution from any censures he had incurred. In his reply the Pontiff encour-

ages Becket, grants the absolution from censure, and orders him to resume his functions. In vain king Henry now tried to work on the fears of Alexander, causing it to be reported that he was about to recognize Barbarossa's anti-Pope. But being foiled, Becket was finally summoned before a council at Northampton, to answer a series of charges. When the archbishop appeared, Henry accused him of contempt for the royal authority, because he had answered a citation of the royal court, not in person, but by attorney. The court "amerced" the archbishop, that is, put him "at the king's mercy" to the extent of his entire property. After many iniquitous and absurd demands had been made by the king, the zealous archbishop thus protested against the decisions of the court: "Future ages will pass judgment upon your sentence; it is a new kind of decision, but perhaps in conformity with the new Canons of Clarendon. It has never been heard that an archbishop of Canterbury could be judged, for any cause whatsoever, in a court of the king of England; that is forbidden by the dignity of his church and by his personal authority, and because he is the spiritual father of all the rulers in the kingdom, and is to be always obeyed by all." The bishops now consulted together. Foliot of London urged Becket to resign his see, saying: "If you remember, father, whence the lord king lifted you up, and what he has conferred upon you; and if you consider the evil state of the times, and what ruin you are preparing for the Catholic Church and for us, in case you resist the king in these things, you will resign, not only the archbishopric of Canterbury, but ten of them, if you had them. Then, perhaps, if the king sees you so humble, he may give everything back to you." Henry of Winchester bravely sustained the primate: "Such advice, so pernicious to the Catholic Church, affects and confounds us all. If our archbishop, the primate of all England, sets us the example of yielding up, at the beck, and because of the threats of the king, the care of souls entrusted to him, what will be the condition of the Church? Nothing will be done according to law; everything will be in confusion." The bishop of Lincoln, whom the chronicler well styles "a

simple man, and rather imprudent," gasped out: "It is evident that they seek the life of this man. He must yield up his diocese or his life. What good the archbishopric will do him without his life I cannot see." The other bishops followed, all urging Becket to yield.

On the morning of October 13th the primate celebrated mass, and then proceeded to the court. The bishop of Exeter soon entered, and kneeling, begged Becket to have pity on both himself and his brethren. The primate answered: "Fly, if you wish; you do not appreciate the things of God." The other prelates then came to the primate, and Hilary of Chichester, in their name, delivered himself of this speech: "Once you were our archbishop, and we were bound to obey you. But since you, having sworn fidelity to the king, that is, having promised to guard his life, members, and earthly dignity, and to observe the customs adduced by him, now try to destroy them; therefore we pronounce you a perjurer, and a perjured archbishop we will not obey. We place ourselves under the protection of the lord Pope, and call you to his presence to answer for these things." Becket simply answered, "I hear." The lay barons then entered the hall, and Leicester, reluctantly compelled to deliver the sentence of the court, told the primate to hearken to the decision. Becket arose, and said: "My sentence? Son and earl, first hearken to me. You know how faithfully I have served the king, and how hesitatingly I accepted this office in order to please him; you know how I was declared free from all secular claims. I ought not, and will not, answer for what occurred before my consecration. As the soul is more worthy than the body, so you are bound to obey me rather than an earthly monarch. Neither law nor reason permits children to contemn or to judge a father: hence I decline the tribunal of the king, yours, and any other, being amenable, under God, to the lord Pope alone, to whom, before you all, I now appeal, placing the church of Canterbury, my order, and my dignity, with all pertaining to them, under God's and his protection. As for you, my brothers and fellow-bishops, who obey man rather than God, I summon you all to the

presence and judgment of the lord Pope ; and, strong in the authority of the Catholic Church and of the Apostolic See, I depart hence." He immediately left the castle, and the people, who had heard that he had been murdered, accompanied him with shouts of joy to his quarters. Here, however, his knights and pages tearfully begged to be released from their fealty, and to be dismissed ; and he cheerfully granted the prayer. At midnight, disguised as a monk, he left the monastery, with three companions, and after three weeks of perilous adventure, he reached Gravelines, in France, and hastened to pay his respects to king Louis VII., and to Pope Alexander, then at Sens.

When Henry found that Becket had fled, he wrote to Louis, begging him not to allow "the late primate" to remain in France. When Louis read the epistle, he remarked : "He is king of England, and I also am a king ; but I would not depose the least one of the clerics of my kingdom. It has ever been a glory of the French crown to defend exiles, especially ecclesiastics, from persecution." Becket soon visited Pope Alexander at Sens. He found that a number of English bishops and barons had worked so well for Henry, that not a few among the cardinals were prejudiced against the primate. Having handed the Pontiff a copy of the Clarendon Constitutions, Becket delivered to him the episcopal ring, and declared he would long ago have resigned his diocese, had he not considered it unbecoming to do so at the whim of a king. Alexander returned the ring, and exhorted him to persevere in the good fight. Having read the Constitutions, the Pontiff said : "Among these abominable things, there is nothing good ; but there are some which may, in some way, be tolerated by the Church. The greater number of them, however, have been already condemned by ancient Councils, as directly opposed to the sacred Canons." From the Vatican Codex in which, after the famous *Quadripartite Life of St. Thomas*, the Constitutions are recorded, we learn that ten of them were absolutely condemned. With regard to the eighth, which prohibited appeals to Rome, St. Anselm had already told William II. that "to swear to that is to abjure St. Peter ;

and he who abjures St. Peter, undoubtedly abjures Christ, who made him prince of His Church." Even Henry II. was glad to recognize the Pontiff's right to receive appeals when, a short time after the exile of Becket, he dreaded lest the primate would excommunicate him, "and was compelled," says Becket (*Epistles*, B. i., no. 135), "to have recourse to the See of Peter and to invoke the name of the lord Pope, which he had before commanded not to be invoked." When Pope Alexander dismissed the archbishop of Canterbury, he recommended him to the hospitality of the Cistercian abbot of Pontigny, and it was gladly accorded. During the year 1165, Henry was occupied in a disastrous campaign in Wales, and could pay no attention to Church matters. But when, covered with infamy (1), he re-entered London, he turned his mind to vengeance on Becket. All the primate's estates were confiscated; all the clergy who had countenanced his late actions were deprived of their revenues; all of his relatives and friends, without distinction of age or sex, were banished, and compelled by oath to visit the primate, and recount to him their sufferings. We may imagine the anguish of Becket when four hundred of these unfortunates, among them his own sister and her infants, upbraided him as the cause of their woes. (2). Henry also wreaked his vengeance on the hosts of the archbishop, by threatening to expel all the Cistercians from his dominions, both British and French, if they continued their hospitality. To save them, Becket left their monastery, and King Louis assigned him a residence in Sens. In June of 1166, he resolved to bring things to a crisis, and accordingly issued a decree, excommunicating the ministers of Henry who had communicated with the anti-Pope, and those who had framed the Clarendon Constitutions, or who had appropriated Church property. He also wrote a strong, though affectionate, letter to Henry, from which we take the following passages: "Christian princes have been accustomed to obey the Church, not to

(1) As a consolation for his failure in this war, Henry satiated his thirst for blood on his hostages, the children of the first families of Wales. The eyes of all the males were plucked out and the noses and ears of all the females amputated.

(2) Pope Alexander, King Louis VII., and the queen of Sicily amply relieved the necessities of all these people. The sister of Becket found an asylum at Clermont, for which the Pontiff thanked the abbot. *Epistles of St. Thomas*, ii., n. 112.

think first of their own power; they have always bowed their heads to bishops, and never presumed to judge them. Two powers rule the world, namely, the sacred authority of the Pontiff, and the royal power; and of these the priestly authority is of the greater weight, inasmuch as, at the divine judgment, priests have to render an account of the kings themselves. You should have known for certain that you depend upon the sacerdotal authority, and that it ought not be made to bend to your will. Many Pontiffs have excommunicated both emperors and kings. I write these things only, for the present, my lord, passing certain others in silence, until I see what effect my words produce. If they excite in you a worthy repentance, I shall rejoice with those who will tell me that my son, the king, was dead, but now lives, that he was lost, but is now found. But if you do not hearken to me, who always pray for you, with abundant tears and deep moans, before the Majesty of the Body of Christ, I shall certainly there cry out against you, and shall call upon God to arise and to judge His cause, to be mindful of the injuries heaped daily by the king of England and his upon God and His. Where are the emperors, kings, and princes, the archbishops and bishops, who have preceded us? They have labored, and others have taken up their labors. Thus passes the world and its glory. Remember your last end, and you will never sin, or, if you do sin, you will repent, while yet alive." Pope Alexander now appointed the archbishop of Canterbury Apostolic legate for all England, excepting however, the archbishop of York from the legatine jurisdiction, because, to please Henry, the Pontiff had, some time since, made that prelate legate to all, excepting the primate. When Becket had received this appointment, he at once commenced its functions. He condemned the Constitutions of Clarendon, especially certain six chapters which he recites in his condemnatory letters to the English bishops. He excommunicated all the observers and promoters of the Constitutions, and absolved the prelates from their oath to observe them. He also excommunicated by name those who had communicated with the German schis-

matics, and those who had invaded the property of the church of Canterbury. In these letters to the English prelates, Becket is especially severe on the following chapters of Clarendon. 1st, that no appeal should be taken to the Apostolic See, unless with permission of the king. 2d, that no prelate should visit the Supreme Pontiff without royal license. 3d, that no king's man could be excommunicated, and no royal domain or king's man's domain be interdicted, without the royal consent. 4th, that no bishop should prosecute any one for perjury or heresy. 5th, that clerics should appear before secular tribunals. 6th, that the king, or any layman, should treat of cases concerning tithes, etc. Pope Alexander confirmed the action of his legate and wrote a warning letter to Henry, in which occurs this passage: "We have not thought it proper to shut our eyes to your obstinacy any longer; nor shall we again close the mouth of the aforesaid bishop, but shall allow him to freely do his duty and to punish you, with the arms of ecclesiastical severity, for the injuries done to him and to his church." (1).

The mighty Henry affected indifference at the threats of the Pontiff and of the primate; but he gave orders for the searching of every person entering England, and for the seizure of all letters coming from Pope Alexander or Becket. (2). He also decreed the most terrible punishments for the bearers of such missives, and compelled all freemen to swear to obey no censure against king or realm. (3). He even threatened to recognize the new creature of Barbarossa, the anti-Pope Guido of Crema; but, bad as many of the English prelates were, they were not prepared for schism. Hence Henry disavowed the promise made to Barbarossa, and even prevailed upon his ambassadors to deny that they had given it. (4). The king now tried to purchase friends at Rome, and throughout Italy. The Pontiff spurned his gifts; a few of the cardinals, and some of the Roman barons, also some of the magistrates of the

(1) ROGER OF HOVEDEN. *Annals*.

(2) *Epistles of St. Thomas*, ii., 249.

(3) *Gervase*, 1400.

(4) John of Oxford, a favorite of Henry, and ever foremost in any dirty work for his master, was sent to Rome, and there swore to Pope Alexander that the king had done nothing contrary to the honor of the Pontiff. BOSEHAM, ii., 256.

republics, accepted them, but the money was thrown away. During the years 1167–70 Henry tried many expedients; he even gave audience to Becket on two occasions, during his own sojourn in France, but each time promised to respect the rights of the Church only “saving the royal dignity;” while the primate always professed himself willing to obey the king, “saving the rights of the Church.” For several years the barons of Henry’s continental dominions had been appealing, according to the feudal jurisprudence, to their own and Henry’s suzerain, the king of France; and Louis, quite naturally, had not been slow to aid them; but in 1169, a peace was concluded, and in 1170, Henry promised king Louis that he would be reconciled with the archbishop of Canterbury. (1).^{*} Pope Alexander having at length resolved to excommunicate the obstinate monarch, Henry proposed that the primate should return to England. All his rights, lands, etc., were to be restored. The Pontiff consented, but sent to Henry the bishops of Rouen and Nevers, to inform him that if his promises were not fulfilled in forty days from date, their orders were to publish an interdict in all his continental dominions. In vain Henry threatened and fawned by turns; he finally consented to meet Becket at Fretivalle, on the Touraine frontier.

On July 22d, Henry and Louis were conversing in a meadow near Fretivalle, when Becket, accompanied by the bishops of Rouen and Nevers, was seen coming towards them. Putting spurs to his horse, Henry uncovered and advanced to meet his former friend. Immediately he commenced to chat familiarly, and when he said, “I shall treat as traitors those who have betrayed us both,” Becket dis-

(1) In an interview between Louis and Henry, at which the primate was present, Henry complained of Becket’s constant use, in his profession of fidelity, of the clause, “saving the rights of the Church.” He said to Louis, “Listen to this, my lord, if you please. Whatever displeases him is, he says, contrary to the honor of God. He claims all that is mine for himself. But, lest I may appear to go against God’s honor, or to resist him too much, I make this offer: What the greatest and holiest of his predecessors accorded to the least of mine let him accord to me, and I am content.” Becket still refused to yield the clause, “saving the rights of the Church,” and for a time Louis was so displeased that it seemed he would withdraw his countenance from the primate. But he soon sent for Becket, and falling at his feet, exclaimed: “My lord and father, you alone see this thing rightly. We were blind when we counselled you, in your cause, or rather in that of God, to abandon God’s honor to the whim of man. We are sorry, father; forgive us our sin. I offer to God and to you, myself and my kingdom, and from this hour, so long as God grants me life, I shall not be wanting in aid to you and yours.” *Quadrip. Life*, B. ii., c. 27 and 28. *Ger vase*, 1406. *Epistles of St. Thomas*, B. iii., no. 79.

mounted, and would have knelt, but the monarch made him remount, and continued, "My lord archbishop, let us renew our old affection, but do me honor before those who now watch us." It was then understood that the archbishop should remain for a few days in the court of Henry, that the world might be convinced of their reconciliation. But in spite of this parade of submission, Henry delayed the execution of his promises, and it was only on Nov. 12th, when the interdict was on the very point of being launched, that he restored the lands of Canterbury see; and then the rents had been collected, and the cattle and corn removed. Before Pope Alexander heard of the above reconciliation, he had issued letters of suspension against the English bishops who had lately officiated, in defiance of Becket's prohibition, at the coronation of young prince Henry. In the interests of peace, the primate resolved to make no use of the Pontiff's decree, trusting to Alexander's good sense for excuse. But it happened that the three prelates concerned were informed of its being in the hands of Becket, and they dispatched a body of soldiers, under Ranulph de Broc, to seize it when he should land. When the primate reached Whitsand, he heard of this proceeding, and sent the decree ahead of himself by a courier, who publicly handed it to the prelates involved, and they immediately departed for Normandy to excite the anger of Henry. On Dec. 3d, Becket was joyfully received by the clergy and people of his see of Canterbury; on Christmas he preached, and toward the end of his discourse he remarked that his enemies would soon be satiated with his blood. On the 28th, Reginald Fitzurse, William Tracy, Hugh de Moreville, and Richard Brito arrived from Normandy, and assembling their followers at the Broc manor of Saltwood, prepared to silence forever the zealous archbishop. They had heard Henry, enraged because of the representations of the three bishops condemned by Pope Alexander, cry out, "Of all the cowards whom I have benefited, is there not one who will free me from this troublesome priest?" On the afternoon of the 29th, the four knights presented themselves at the archiepiscopal palace, saying that they had a message from

the king to the primate. When admitted to audience, they ordered the archbishop to absolve the prelates of York, London, and Salisbury. Becket answered that the king had consented to his publication of the Pontifical letters suspending these bishops; that the case of Roger of York was reserved to Rome; that he was ready to absolve the bishops of London and Salisbury when they swore to submit to the decisions of the Church. The knights then declared that he must leave England. Becket replied, "No. If I am allowed to perform my duty, well and good; if not, the will of God be done." Fitzurse then ordered all the household, in the name of the king, to watch lest their master should escape. The closing scenes of the tragedy are thus described by Lingard: "At the departure of the knights, the archbishop returned to his seat apparently cool and collected. Neither in tone nor in gesture did he betray the slightest apprehension, though consternation and despair were depicted in every countenance around him. It was the hour of the evening service, and at the sound of the psalmody in the choir, a voice exclaimed, 'To the church, it will afford protection.' But Becket had said that he would await them there, and refused to move from the place. Word was now brought that the knights had forced their way through the garden and made an entrance by the windows. A few moments later they were heard at no great distance, breaking down with axes a strong partition of oak which impeded their progress. In a paroxysm of terror the archbishop's attendants closed around him, and, notwithstanding his resistance, bore him with pious violence through the cloister into the church. The door was immediately closed and barred against the assassins, who were already in sight. Becket walked leisurely along the transept, and was ascending the steps which led to his favorite altar, when he heard the cries of the knights demanding admission at the door. Without hesitation he ordered it to be thrown open, saying that the house of God should not be made a military fortress. Immediately his attendants, monks and clergy, dispersed to conceal themselves, some behind the columns, others under the altars.

Had he followed their example, he might have saved his life ; for it was growing dark, and both the crypts and a staircase before him, which led to the roof, offered places of concealment. But he turned to meet his enemies, and, stationing himself with his back against a column, between the altars of St. Mary and St. Bennet, waited their approach. The four knights and their twelve companions rushed into the church with drawn swords, and loud cries. ‘To me, ye king’s men,’ shouted their leader. ‘Where is the traitor?’ exclaimed Hugh of Horsey, a military subdeacon, known by the characteristic surname of Mauclerc. (1). No answer was returned ; but to the question, ‘where is the archbishop?’ Becket replied, ‘Here I am, the archbishop, but no traitor. What is your will?’ They turned to him, and insisted that he should immediately absolve all he had placed under ecclesiastical censures ; to which he replied, that, until they had promised satisfaction, he could not. ‘Then die,’ exclaimed a voice. ‘I am ready,’ returned the prelate, ‘to die for the cause of God and His Church. But I forbid you in the name of Almighty God, to touch any one of my household, clerk or layman.’ There seems to have been some hesitation on the part of the murderers. They would rather have shed his blood without the church than within its walls. An attempt was made by some of them to drag him away ; but he resisted it with success, through the aid of a clergyman called Edward Grim (2), who threw his arms around the archbishop’s waist. ‘Reginald’ said Becket to Fitzurse, ‘how dare you do this? Remember that you have been my man.’ (3). ‘I am now the king’s man,’ replied the assassin, aiming a blow at the primate’s head. Grim interposed his arm, which was broken and severed in two ; still the sword passed through Becket’s cap, and wounded him on the crown. As he felt the blood trickling down his cheek, he wiped it away with his sleeve, and having joined his hands, and bent his head in the attitude of prayer, said : ‘Into Thy hands, O Lord, I

(1) That is, the wicked cleric.

(2) When John of Salisbury, Fitzstephen, and others, afterwards boasted that they had stood by their lord to the end, Grim declared that all but himself ran away.

(3) That is, he had been the primate’s liege-man or vassal.

commend my spirit.' In this posture, with his face to his murderers, and without shrinking or speaking, he awaited a second stroke, which threw him on his knees and elbows. The third stroke was given by Richard Brito, with such violence that he cut off the upper part of the archbishop's head, and broke his own sword on the pavement. The murderers were retiring, when Hugh of Horsey, turning back, set his foot on the neck of the corpse, and, drawing the brain out of the skull with the point of his sword, scattered it around. 'Fear not,' he said, 'the man will never rise again.' They returned to the palace, which they rifled, taking away with them spoil, as it was estimated, to the value of two thousand marks."

William of Newburg (1), an author contemporary with St. Thomas of Canterbury, thought that the primate acted imprudently in sending into England the letters of Pope Alexander suspending the bishops of York, London, and Salisbury: "He was fervent in his zeal for justice, but whether it was prudent, God knows. It is not permitted to our littleness to rashly judge of the acts of so great a man. However, I think that the most blessed Pope Gregory would have been more lenient when the relations with the king were so strained, and that, for the sake of peace, he would have borne with what might have been tolerated, without danger to the Christian faith." With regard to the saint's prudence, there was scarcely any room for its exercise in the premises. The suspensory decree was issued by his superior, the Roman Pontiff, and it was his duty to promulgate it. He did, indeed, at first, intend to suppress the letters, but the infamous brigandage of the three prelates showed that justice, not mercy, had to be exercised. As for the danger of rekindling the ire of the king, we know that Henry had approved of the execution of the Papal sentence. This is attested by the authors of the *Quadripartite Life of St. Thomas*, viz., Becket's clerk Herbert, John of Salisbury, William of Canterbury, and the monk Alan, all of whom were intimate with the primate, and better informed than was William of Newburg. Nor, says

(1) *English Affairs*, B. ii, c. 25.

Alexandre, would the great St. Gregory have acted as this chronicler would have had the archbishop act, if his probable course can be conjectured from the rule he lays down in his *Morals*, B. xxxi., c. 14: "Often we could rest quiet and unshaken, if we avoided the exercise of justice against the wicked. But if our souls are filled with the desire of eternal life, if they regard the light of truth, if the flame of holy fervor is kindled in them, we will offer ourselves for the defense of justice, to the extent that the cause demands, and even though they do not seek us, we will oppose the wicked who work injustice."

The reader will not be displeased or uninterested, if we conclude this chapter with the beautiful apostrophe by Alexandre, which is placed at the end of his lengthy and exhaustive dissertation on St. Thomas of Canterbury: "To thee, most holy bishop and martyr, I now direct my words, and suppliantly beseech thee, that with the God whom thou enjoyest thou wilt intercede, that the Church, the Spouse of Christ, whom thou lovedst as He did, and for whom thou didst give thy life, may have perpetual peace; that the Roman Pontiffs and bishops may be endowed with sanctity, and with zeal for the liberty and discipline of the Church; that the secular and regular clergy may despise the world, and be pious and fervent; that the most serene king of Great Britain and the whole kingdom may return to the true faith and the communion of the Roman Church, which it enjoyed in thy times; that an overflowing abundance of heavenly gifts, a long life, and lasting happiness, may be granted to the most Christian king, the great Louis, rightly styled by the holy Pope Innocent XI. 'the extirpator of heresy;' that tranquillity and prosperity may ever be the portion of the French church and of the French kingdom, from which, while thou wast an exile in these parts, thou didst receive consolation, support, and protection." (1).

(1) St. Thomas of Canterbury was, said the late Frederick Faber, "the apostle of high principle, the saint whose every word and work was a condemnation of cowardice, of time-serving, of timidity, of pusillanimity, of all unworthy concession, of all trembling in the face of power, of all bartering of principle for peace or gain, of all circuitous roads to a rightful and a godly end; in a word, of every profane weakness that ever afflicted the Church from within or without, from her children or her foes. . . . While the men of St. Thomas's day found fault with his want of discretion, and blamed him because he allowed his rude, uncouth, grotesque austerities to appear amid the splendors of Henry's court,

CHAPTER XXV.

THE WALDENSES.

About the year 1160, a certain citizen of Lyons having suddenly fallen dead, one of the spectators, Peter Waldo by name, was so affected with terror, that he immediately gave most of his goods to the poor, and began to exhort his neighbors to lead a more perfect life. He soon formed quite a large association, the members of which practised voluntary poverty. At first, there seems to have been nothing reprehensible in the doctrine or conduct of the Waldenses, or "Poor Men of Lyons," as they were sometimes called; they seem to have regarded themselves as a kind of religious order in the Church, and were by no means hostile to her hierarchy or any of her institutions; in 1212 they even applied, but in vain, to Pope Innocent III. for an approbation of their rule, an imitation of that of the Friars Minor of St. Francis of Assisi, then commencing their apostolic career. In fact, even when they had fallen into doctrinal error, the *pure* Waldenses were noted for apparent integrity of morals, and an external manifestation, at least, of evangelical simplicity, which greatly added to their numbers. One of the first innovations of the Waldenses was the free and promiscuous interpretation of the Scriptures. According to Reinerius Saccho (1), who had been a bishop among them, they were thoroughly logical and consistent in their application of the new principle: "I knew a rustic who could recite the Book of Job, word for word, and I met

yet all the while they were allured and attracted by them What was it, in the manner of his strife, whether with the crowned king upon his throne, or the rude barons, or even, which was harder still, with his courtly brother-bishops, what was it that so offended men? It was the seeming hypocrisy, it was the apparent double facedness of all that he did, it was that holy double spirit which the Church has in her, and which all the saints of God possessed; that he was humble, with what the world called an affectedly servile humility, to the poor, and lowly, and fallen, and little ones of Jesus; but in the face of the rude king, and in the face of human power and intellect, he seemed proud and arrogant and presumptuous, drawing himself up within himself, and not stooping to make the slightest concession The ashes of St. Thomas, scattered to the winds far and wide, (by the Reformers, in 1533), brought down God's curse upon the land. They have brought down the curse of littleness, of pusillanimity,—a curse the very characteristic of which is lowering and degrading, even as the curse that came down on the Egyptians' land." *Notes on Doctrinal Subjects*, p. 3, sect. 2, c. 8.

(1) Reinerius Saccho abjured the Waldensian heresy about the year 1254, and entered the Order of Preaching Friars just founded by St. Dominic. He wrote a treatise *On Heretics*, in which an account is given of the Waldenses and of their numerous progeny of sects.

many who knew perfectly the entire New Testament ; but as they are ignorant laymen, they interpret the Scriptures falsely and corruptedly. Thus, that passage of John i., 'and His own received Him not,' they explain, saying, 'that is, the swine ;' and that of the Psalmist (lxvii. 31), 'Rebuke the wild beasts of the reeds,' they read as 'Rebuke the wild beasts of *the swallow.*'" (1). When the Waldenses, or Poor Men of Lyons, were reproved for taking upon themselves the right of explaining the Bible without authority, they replied that they were sent by God. Pope Innocent III., in an epistle to the faithful of Metz (2), therefore wrote : "The office of teacher ought not to be indifferently assumed by any one ; for, according to the Apostle, 'how shall they preach, if they be not sent?' And the very Truth commanded the Apostles, 'pray the Lord of the harvest to send laborers into His harvest.' . . . Since this interior mission is hidden, it is not enough that any one assert that he is sent by God ; any heretic may assert this of himself." With regard to the French version of the Bible used by the Waldenses, Pope Innocent III. says that he has written to the bishop and chapter of Metz (3), ordering them to inquire : "Who is the author of said translation ? What was his intention ? What is the faith of those who use it ?" But the Waldenses would not abandon their practice of independent teaching ; and their leaders began to assert that the clergy, many of whom were leading far from blameless lives, were jealous of the Poor Men, and felt the purity of these to be a reproach to themselves. Reinerius Saccho says of the original Waldenses (4) : "They present an appearance of piety ; for they lead good lives before men, believe rightly about God, and hold all the articles of the Creed ; but they blaspheme against the Roman Church and the clergy, and the multitude lend them ready ears. . . . In their habits they are composed and modest, with no vanity of dress, for they use no precious clothes, nor very abject materials. They do not trade, for fear of falling into lies, oaths, and fraud ; they live, like artisans, by labor. Even their teachers are weavers. They do not accumulate

(1) That is, they read *harundinis* as *hirundinis*.(3) *Epistle to the Cistercian and Morimond Abbots.*

(2) B. II., epist. 131.

(4) *Loc. cit. c. 4 and 7.*

riches, but are content with necessaries, they are chaste, especially the Leonists, and are temperate in food and drink, going not to taverns, or dances, or other vanities. They refrain from anger. They are always working, learning, or teaching; hence they pray very little. They go to church, offer, confess, communicate, and hear sermons, but in order that they may trap the preacher in his discourse. They are known by the precision and modesty of their words; they abstain from scurrility, detraction, levity, lies, and oaths; nor will they say 'truly' or 'certainly,' for they deem such words to be oaths. Rarely will they answer questions; if they are asked if they know the gospel or the epistle, they will reply: 'Who would teach us them?' Or they may say: 'These things are for men of profound intellect.'"

But the Waldenses did not long confine themselves to malignant criticisms of the clergy, and a pretence of superior sanctity; very soon gross errors of doctrine began to circulate among them, denying, as they did, the exclusive magistracy of the teaching Church. We learn their errors from Saccho, their ex-bishop; from Claude Seyssel, archbishop of Turin in 1517 (1); from Bernard of Font-Cauld (2); and from Eberhard of Bethune. (3). They taught that the Roman Church was not the Church of Christ, but "a church of the malignant, which had been introduced by Pope Sylvester I., when he allowed the Spouse of Christ to be poisoned by the possession of temporal goods." The Waldenses alone were the children of Christ. The Roman church, was a sink of foulness, and the whore of the Apocalypse; the Pope was the head and front of all error, and the bishops were Scribes, while monks were Pharisees. God, not prelates, was to be obeyed. All in the Church are equal, for does not Matthew say (xxiii. 8), "All of you are brethren?" Tithes ought not to be paid, for the primitive Church had none. The clergy should have no possessions, for do we not read in Deuteronomy XVIII. 1, "The priests shall have no part or inheritance with the rest of Israel?"

(1) *Against the Waldensian Sect and its Errors.*

(2) *Against the Waldenses*, c. 1 and 2.

(3) *Anti-Heresy.*

It is a sin to endow a church or a monastery. All the clergy should labor with their hands. The Waldenses admitted only two Sacraments, Baptism and the Eucharist. They did not regard the former as necessary for salvation. They denied the real presence, unless at the moment of Communion. Matrimony was not a Sacrament. The use of matrimony was prohibited, as a mortal sin, to a couple whom experience had taught that the wife was barren. Orders they admitted in no sense; any good layman, any good woman, could be a minister. They rejected the doctrine of Purgatory. There was no such thing as venial sin.

In a short time the pure Waldenses had nearly disappeared. Following the inevitable law of heresy, they gave rise to numerous sects, the chief of which were the Runcarii, Sciscidenses, Ortlibenses, Ordibarii, Cathari, Patarini, and Passagini. 1. The Runcarii had for a distinguishing error the doctrine that no sin could be committed by means of the body from the waist down, for, do we not read in the Bible, "From the heart proceed fornications?" 2. The Sciscidenses differed from the other Waldenses, in that they received the Eucharistic doctrine. 3. The Ortlibenses avowed a belief in all the articles of Faith, but gave them a mystic interpretation. They admitted a Trinity, but only as existing after the conception of Christ. From the seed of Joseph, Mary had a son, Jesus, whom she brought up in the sect of the Waldenses, and thus he became the Son of God. A third person afterward came into existence, namely, St. Peter, who, co-operating with Jesus, became the Holy Ghost. The world is eternal. There will be no resurrection of our bodies. The last judgment will be held when the Pope and emperor become Waldenses. They denied the passion and death of Christ: the cross which He carried was merely a life of penance, that is, a life spent as an Ortlibensian Waldensis, which life cannot admit of sin. Matrimony is good, if the parties lead continent lives; but the conjugal act is an evil thing. 4. The Ordibarii held that Christ was the son of Joseph and Mary, and he was saved only because he restored the Waldenses. 5.

The Cathari, themselves subdivided into Albanians, Cantorezenes, and Baganolese, held, as a fundamental principle, that the devil is the author of the world and all in it. All the Sacraments are of his invention. Matrimony and its use are sinful; all flesh is unclean, because of the sexual union. The souls of men are rebel spirits expelled from heaven. The Albanians, principally Lombards, were themselves divided into two factions, each with distinctive errors. The first, headed by Gelesinanza of Verona, were very clear in their profession of Manicheism; they taught that each Principle had created its own world and angels; that the devil and his angels had mounted to heaven, there fought with the archangel Michael, and pulled out of heaven a third part of the good Principle's angels; that these spirits are put into the bodies of men and brutes, pass through various kinds of existence, and finally return to heaven; that the Son of God became man, died, etc., only in appearance; that all the patriarchs and the Baptist were ministers of the devil; that the Old Testament was the work of Satan, excepting the books of Job, Psalms, Solomon, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the Prophets, some of which were written in heaven; that the world will have no end; that the last judgment has already been held; and that, outside this world, there is no punishment. The second faction of the Albanian Catharian Waldenses, led by John of Lyons, held that the good Principle produced good creatures from all eternity, as the sun emits rays; the good God is not omnipotent, but finds His efforts frustrated by the evil Principle; that Christ could have sinned, but that the good Principle would not permit Him to do so: that all the Scriptures were composed in heaven, and that Adam and Eve were formed there; that the patriarchs and the Baptist pleased God, but were men of the other world; that Christ really died, but in that other world. The Cantorezene Cathari believed that God created the angels and the four elements from nothing; that the devil made all visible things, among them the first human bodies, into which he put angels who had sinned; that everything in the Old Testament, excepting what Christ and his Apostles

praised, was the work of the devil; that the nature of Christ was angelic, and (according to some of them), Mary was an angel; that Christ laid aside His body when ascending to heaven, but will resume it on the last day, when it will be resolved into matter; that the souls of Mary and the saints, like the body of Christ, remain in space until the last day, when, unlike Christ's body, they will enter into glory. The Bagnolese Cathari held that God created human souls before He created the worlds; that then they sinned; that Mary was an angel, and the body of Christ celestial; in other things they agreed with the Cantorezenes. 6. The Patarini, who created much trouble in Northern Italy, differed from the pure Waldenses only in asserting that the devil created all visible things, and that matrimony was as bad as adultery. 7. The Passagini held that the Mosaic Law should be strictly and literally observed; that the three Persons of the Trinity are not consubstantial. The reader will bear in mind that, although the above-mentioned sectarians were offshoots of the pure Waldenses, yet, both in doctrine and morals, they differed much from the Poor Men of Lyons. These enthusiasts did not at once fall away from the faith, but only when they failed (as the abbot of Ursperg tells us) in obtaining the approval of Pope Innocent III. After the third Council of the Lateran, being contumacious, they became schismatics; the next step to heresy, was, of course, very easy. The Waldenses were condemned in various provincial Synods held between the years 1163 and 1179. In the latter year, the Eleventh General Council (Third of the Lateran), in its Fourth and Twenty-Seventh Canons, condemned the Waldenses and Albigenses, then split up into numerous sects, some of which had either themselves degenerated into mere predatory bands, or had furnished cutthroats with a cloak under which to follow their trade. Among the writers who defended the orthodox faith against the attacks of the Waldenses, the principal were the following: Egbert, the Abbot, brother of St. Elizabeth, abbess of Sconauge, wrote, at the close of the twelfth century, thirteen sermons against the Carthari. At the same time, Eberhard of Bethune wrote his

Anti-Heresy, and Bernard of Font-Cauld his treatise. In the next century, Ermengard wrote a book entitled, *Against the Heretics who say and believe that this world and all visible things were not made by God, but by the devil*. Reinerius Saccho wrote his book on *Heretics* in 1254. Peter Polichdorf wrote against the Waldenses in 1444. (1). Claude Seyssel, archbishop of Turin in the sixteenth century, was the author of a valuable book on this subject.

Of modern authors who have treated the Waldensian heresy, the most satisfactory is Andrew Charvaz, bishop of Pinerolo in Piedmont. (2). Many Protestant authors, such as Leger (3). Munston (4), and Peyran (5), have endeavored to ascribe a very ancient origin to the Waldenses, thus hoping to connect their own sects with antiquity, for they claim that these heretics were the forerunners of the Reformation, that they were, in fact, a species of Protestants. If protesting against the authority of the Catholic Church constitutes Protestantism, then the spiritual progeny of Luther, Calvin, Zwinglius, Cranmer, etc., may claim kinship with even those heresies of the early centuries the teachings of which they would hesitate to mention before their wives, mothers, and sisters. Scarcely had the clouds shut off the ascending Body of the Saviour from the view of His disciples, when heresy commenced to rend the seamless garment of Christ, and from then to the sixteenth century not a dogma or usage of the Church escaped attack from one or another sect. One by one these sects had disappeared, when the Lutheran movement was initiated, and, little by little, its followers embraced nearly every error of the past; excluding, however, God be thanked, the more disgusting and lunatical ravings, a revival of which would have shocked the then cultivated world. But although each and every error in the conglomeration known as Protestantism had been taught at some time by some particular heretic, it would be folly to ascribe to that heretic

(1) These authors were edited by the Jesuit Gretser, and are all found in the Library of the Fathers.

(2) *Historical Researches on the True Origin of the Waldenses and on the Character of their Primitive Doctrines*. Paris, 1836.

(3) *History of the Waldenses*. Leyden, 1667.

(4) *History of the Waldenses of the Valleys of Piedmont*. Paris, 1835.

(5) *Considerations on the Waldenses*.

the origin of a system which teaches many things that he believed, and rejects many things that he held. So with the Waldenses ; many of their errors had been promulgated before ; but their system, in its entirety, was a new one. So with the many sects called Protestant, which can trace their origin to the Reformers of the sixteenth century, or to some of their spiritual descendants. We have said that, one by one, the ancient heresies had disappeared, when the turbulent monk of Saxony disturbed the unity of Christendom. Some of the Waldenses, however, had taken refuge in the valleys of Piedmont, and the dukes of Savoy, by successive grants, allowed them the free exercise of their religion, on condition that they would remain within certain limits, namely, the four districts of Angrogna, Villaro, Bobbio, and Rorato ; and here the Reformation found them, mixed up with other heretics, who had been known, before the time of Peter Waldo, as Vaudois or Valdesi, from the valleys they inhabited. These Waldenses or Vaudois, for they had become amalgamated, exchanged their doctrines for Lutheranism, at first, and then for the creed of Geneva. Other Waldenses, expelled from Germany, had found a home in Bohemia, "to which country all heretics were wont to fly," (1) and there the Reformation found them, with doctrines considerably different from those of their ancestors. (2).

In order to show that the Waldenses had their origin in the twelfth century, Charvaz adduces the testimony of the following authors : Bernard, abbot of Font-Cauld, who lived in that century ; Alanus, abbot of Larivoir and bishop of Auxerre, called "the universal doctor," of the same period ; Eberhard of Bethune, and Peter of

(1) *History of Bohemia*, by DUBRAV, Bishop of Olmütz, B. 14.

(2) In their anxiety to effect a union with the Reformers, the Bohemian Waldenses re-arranged and mollified their system. In their Confession, offered to Ferdinand in 1535, we read in Art. XIII., "Concerning the Lord's Supper, it is to be believed and confessed that the Bread is the true Body of Christ, which was given for us, and that the Chalice is His true Blood, which was shed for us in the remission of sin, as the Lord Christ plainly said : 'This is My Body, this is My Blood,' etc. In their Profession sent to Vladislav, king of Hungary, they say : "When a properly ordained priest utters the words of Christ, immediately the Bread is the Body of Christ, the natural Body, taken from the most chaste Virgin, which He was about to yield up." They denied, however, that the bread was changed into the Body of Christ *substantially* ; it was, they said, only changed efficaciously and potentially. Luther, Melanchthon, and Bucer approved of these documents ; but not so Calvin, who answered two Bohemian messengers, applying for recognition : "We remain of opinion that your Confession cannot be accepted without danger." See Melanchthon's *Epistle to Benedict*, and the other *Waldensian Brethren in Bohemia*, and Bucer's *Book entitled, Two Writings against the Robber*, etc.

Vaux-Cernay, also of the twelfth century; Stephen of Belleville, a Dominican and an Inquisitor of that time; the Dominican Moneta, who lived in the thirteenth century; Conrad, abbot of Ursperg, who wrote his book against the Waldenses in 1212; Reinerius Saccho, a convert from the Waldensian heresy and an Inquisitor in 1250; Peter Polchdorf, also of the thirteenth century, and many others. All of these authors agree with Stephen of Belleville, whose testimony Palma thus condenses. He testifies that the Waldenses received their name from one Waldo, and that afterward, on account of their profession of poverty, they were called the Poor Men of Lyons. Stephen says that what he writes concerning these innovators he learned from a Bernard Ydras, a Lyonese priest, who had transcribed the first books of the Waldenses, written in the Romance or French language. Waldo, a rich Lyonese citizen, induced Ydras and another priest, named Stephen Ansa, to translate the Bible into the vernacular. He then sold all his goods and distributed the proceeds to the poor; after which he commenced to preach, and gathering many followers, he commissioned them, women as well as men, to preach the Gospel. Reproved by John, archbishop of Lyons, they would not listen to him; then they were condemned by the Third Council of the Lateran, and, being contumacious, were declared schismatics. They then joined the heretics of Provence and Lombardy, and were declared heretics. Moneta says of their origin: "If they say they are from a time anterior to Waldo, let them give proof of their assertion; that they have never been able to do." And in their own petitions of the year 1573, 1585, and 1599, the Waldenses themselves say that their sect is only a few centuries old. Peyran endeavors to show that the Waldenses were in existence before the time of Waldo, by the citation of a *Treatise on Antichrist* bearing the date of 1120, in which are given the causes leading to the Waldensian schism. He also quotes a vernacular codex of 1100, entitled *La Nobla Leizon*, in which the term Waldensis is used to signify a good Christian. As to the first book, Munston shows that there is no proof that it is genuine; and Perrin,

the author of a *History of the Waldenses*, ascribes it to Peter de Bruis, the father of the Petrobruisians. Charvaz proves that this *Treatise on Antichrist* contains the errors, not of the pure Waldenses, but of the Cathari. But the antiquity of the work is at once exploded when we observe that it cites the book *Milleloquium*, ascribing it to St. Augustine, when it was written by Augustine Triumphus, who was born in 1243. As for Peyran's second authority, the *Nobla Leizon*, experts testify, says Charvaz, that it belongs to the thirteenth century. Reinerius Saccho is adduced as admitting that the Waldenses come down from the days of Pope St. Sylvester I, if not from apostolic times. But Reinerius says no such thing. These are his words: "For firstly, *they assert*, the Roman Church is not the Church of Jesus Christ, but of the malignant; the former having fallen away in the time of St. Sylvester, when the poison of temporal possessions was infused into the Church; and *they say* that they are the Church of Christ, since they observe, in word and deed, the doctrine of Christ's Gospel and of the apostles." The same is said by Polichdorf, whose words Leger corrupts. Some Protestant authors have tried to trace the origin of the Waldenses to Claude of Turin, in the ninth century; but we know that Claude admitted all the Sacraments, rejected the private interpretation of Scripture, and accepted the authority of Tradition; that he had no other errors than those of Adoptionism, and of opposition to the invocation of saints. The Waldenses were sometimes called Leonists, and Leger asserts that they were named after a certain Leo, who resisted St. Sylvester's willingness to receive donations from Constantine. History makes no mention of this Leo; and Leger stamps his own story as a fable, when he assigns the said Leo to the eighth century, while Sylvester lived in the fourth. Even Mosheim admits that the Waldenses originated with Peter Waldo, when he says: "Those who assign to the Waldenses a different origin, and, in the first place, to the valleys they inhabited, many centuries before the days of Peter Waldo, have no authority for their opinion, and are refuted by all historians." And speaking of the olden heretics of the

Piedmontese valleys, he says : " These Vallenses are to be distinguished from the Waldenses, or followers of Peter Waldo, whom all writers derive from Lyons, and who received their name from that Peter." (1).

The Vaudois of the thirteenth century, inhabiting the valleys of Piedmont, were a very different people from the Waldenses of France and other countries, and their doctrines were very different from those of the Vaudois of our day. The old Vaudois regarded the Roman Church as the true Church of Christ, but deemed her corrupted and disfigured ; they admitted the seven Sacraments, held that the Church could legitimately possess temporal goods, and would not separate from Rome, if they were allowed to retain their own belief. But the Waldenses called the Roman Church the whore of Babylon. Some authors have made the mistake of confounding the Waldenses with the Albigenses. These latter were true Manichæans, which the pure Waldenses never were, although in time some of their offshoots, such as the Albari and Cantorezene Cathari, became such. The Albigenses were known in France from 1021, and in 1147, before Peter Waldo appeared, St. Bernard had tried to instruct and convert them. Again, the pure Waldenses and old Vaudois of Piedmont were remarkable for simplicity and mildness ; but of the Albigenses, even in their infancy, Peter of Cluny wrote to the bishops of Embrun, Die, and Gap : " They profane the churches, overturn the altars, burn the crosses, scourge the priests, imprison the monks, and force them, by threats and tortures, to take women." (2). It is the fashion with Protestant writers to draw a beautiful picture of the simple Waldenses entering the hitherto uncultivated valleys which lie between Provence and Dauphiny, and, with incredible fatigue and patience, redeeming the waste around them, and enriching their lords with their labor. But even Hannibal found the valleys of the Alps, both on the Italian and French side, in a state of cultivation ; and the district has always been attractive for its isolation from the troubled life of

(1) Cent. XII., p. 2, c. 5.

(2) FLEURY, B. 69, n. 24.

the plains, and for its purity of air. When the snows have melted, the soil is excellent for farming.

Pope Innocent III. has been reproached with having cruelly persecuted the Waldenses, in spite of their innocence and simple habits. But the Crusade directed by this Pontiff, in 1208, was against the Cotterels, Triaverdins, and other robbers and murderers whose hands were against every man, wretches similar to, if not worse than, the Ribalds of the thirteenth century, and the Circumcelliones of the Donatists. (1). The pure Waldenses and the Vaudois of Piedmont were not persecuted, so long as they conducted themselves in a peaceable manner. The following remarks of Bergier are worthy of the reader's attention: "If we reflect a little upon the conduct of these sectarians, we will see that they were constant in nothing, save in a gross and blind hatred of the Catholic clergy; this was the only fruit they gathered from the reading of that Scripture which they were incapable of understanding. Not at all scrupulous in matter of dogma, they changed their doctrine when their interest seemed to demand a change, and they joined all the sects of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, without being at all embarrassed at a difference of faith. Supple, timid, hypocritical, when they felt themselves weak they covered themselves with a Catholic exterior; contending that swearing, for justice's sake, was wrong, they nevertheless perjured themselves, to hide their belief; condemning all war, they took up arms against their sovereign; often they stained their hands with the blood of the missionaries sent to instruct them." (2). Here we may remark that the cynical and ostentatious affectation of poverty, on the part of the original Waldenses, was the occasion of the institution of one of the greatest glories of the Catholic Church, those Mendicant Orders, which have done so much to confirm the spirit of true religion

(1) These sectarian furies of the fourth century pretended to revenge injuries done to society and individuals, and to establish equality among men, and were called by Donatus, "the chiefs of the saints." Their horrible crimes are narrated by St. Augustine and St. Philaster. See BARONIO, y. 331. The name of Circumcelliones was also given to certain German fanatics, who sustained the cause of Frederick II. after his excommunication by Innocent IV., and who taught that the bishops and priests of the Roman Church had lost their sacerdotal character, because of their wickedness, and that all those who took up arms for Frederick would alone attain salvation.

(2) Dictionary, Art. Vaudois.

in Christian lands, and to evangelize Pagan countries. St. Francis of Assisi, laying the first foundations of his Order in 1209, wished to show the Waldenses that a humble, austere, and laborious life could be led within the bosom of the Church, and without any ribald declamations against the clergy; how well he succeeded, is a matter of history, and may be seen, to this day, in every part of the Christian, and nearly every part of the Pagan world.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE PONTIFICATE OF INNOCENT III.

Like that of St. Gregory VII., the Pontificate of Innocent III. has been a target for the shafts of all those historians, whether Gallican, courtier, Jansenist, parliamentarian, philosophical, or rationalistic, who have beclouded or belied the true character of the civilization of the Middle Ages. We shall have occasion to notice the varied judgments of these gentry, but the reader must first take a rapid view of the principal events of Innocent's reign. By the death of Frederick Barbarossa, and that of William II. of the Two Sicilies, (1190) Henry VI. became the most powerful prince in Europe. He had, it is true, great difficulty in securing the dominion of Southern Italy, for Tancred, a natural son of Roger II., was well able to protect his own claims: but on the death of this prince, Henry received the aid of Genoa and Pisa, and was thus enabled to master Sicily, and to crush the barons of Calabria and the Puglia. The Sixth Henry was a man of beastly ferocity, and capable of the lowest kinds of perfidy. (1). His first victims were Sibilla, the widow of Tancred, and her young son William, who, having been induced by magnificent offers to capitulate, were robbed of everything, personally insulted, and doomed to a long and harsh imprisonment. Nor did he

(1) For instance, his treacherous conduct towards Richard the Lion-Heart. For this crime Henry was excommunicated by Pope Celestine III., and received as penance the task of an expedition to Palestine. When about to depart, he died at Messina (1197), and by his will, restored the ransom he had extorted from Richard, as well as the possessions he and his predecessors had stolen from the Roman Church. WILLIAM OF NEWBURG, B. V., c. 20.

keep faith with the Genoese and Pisans, to whose help he principally owed the conquest of Sicily; when their ambassadors demanded the fulfilment of his engagements, he replied with indecent jokes, and then scornfully showed them the door. He did not gain the good will of his Sicilian subjects; his insatiable avarice prompted him to invent conspiracies against his rule, that he might blackmail the wealthy barons, and many of these saw their patrimonies confiscated, and were themselves subjected to torture, and sent to the scaffold. Henry soon became an object of horror even to his own wife Constance. She was the daughter of Roger II. of Sicily, and it was as her husband that Henry claimed the Two Sicilies; she could not be other than indignant when she saw the most conspicuous families of her kingdom reduced to penury, and the treasures accumulated by her ancestors taken from their splendid palaces and packed off to Germany. But Henry did not long enjoy the imperial crown, which he had received (as Henry V.) from Pope Celestine III. He died, apparently repentant, in 1197, enjoining upon Constance, in his will, to beseech from the Holy See a confirmation of his son's rights to the Sicilies, and decreeing that, if that prince should die without heirs, those rights should accrue to the Roman Church. (1). Immediately after the death of her husband, Constance, anxious for her child's inheritance and knowing the horror of the Sicilians for the Germans, ordered the seneschal Markwald and all his countrymen to leave the island forever. She then sent three Neapolitan counts to bring the baby Frederick from Jesi (his birth-place), and in May, 1198, she had him crowned in the cathedral of Palermo as king of the Sicilies. She immediately sought for him the protection of the Holy See, sending ambassadors to the new Pontiff, Innocent III., to receive from him, in the name of Frederick, the kingdom of Sicily, the duchy of the Puglia, and the principality of Capua, under the conditions heretofore subsisting between the Holy See and its Sicilian vassals.

(1) GIANNONE ignores this will, but it is mentioned in the *Gesta*, c. 27. See BARONIO, y. 1197, no. 9. HURTER, however, doubts its authenticity: *History of Innocent III.*, B. 1. It must be admitted that Innocent never invoked it, even when events seemed to demand such action.

At this time Northern Italy was being lacerated by civil war. The Guelph cities raged against the Ghibelline, and the communes were ferocious in their determination to no longer submit to the tyranny of the feudal lords, who, by virtue of imperial concession, rendered citizen and peasant life a torment. Little by little, the castles were reduced or stormed, and their noble owners forced to lead the life of private, though titled, citizens. In all upper Italy, the only nobles who preserved their dominion were the count of Savoy and the marquises of Este and Monferrato. Venice had become very powerful, owing to the development of her commerce by the Crusades, and was the only really independent state in Italy. Genoa and Pisa were better disposed toward the emperor than toward the Pontiff. Among the cities of the Lombard League, there now prevailed a feeling of hostility, rather against the Hohenstaufen family, than against the empire itself. In France reigned Philip Augustus, in the fulness of strength, and devoted to the consolidation of the royal power. In England reigned the half-savage hero, the lion-hearted Richard, trampling upon the rights of all, and not sparing even the clergy who had given the precious ornaments of their churches to procure his ransom. The Scandinavian kingdoms were just commencing a civilized life; Denmark alone, thanks to her strict relations with Rome, was pretty well advanced in culture. In Eastern Europe, but lately converted from Paganism, Poland and Hungary were entering the European family of states, which their heroism was one day to save from destruction. In the Orient, the only prosperous state was Armenia. The Byzantine throne, occupied by Alexis III., existed only by the sufferance of the Bulgarians and the precarious good will of the Varangian guards. The kingdom of Jerusalem had become a little district of a few square miles around Acre. Such was the situation of Christendom when, on January 10, 1198, the Sacred College chose, as successor to Pope Celestine III., the cardinal Lothaire Conti (1), of the counts of Segni. The first studies

(1) Although not so noisy as the Orsini, Colonna, Frangipani, and some other houses, the Conti were one of the oldest and most distinguished families of Rome. They became extinct in 1808, with the duke Michel Angelo. The last cardinal of the family was Innocent, secretary of Briefs to Pius VI.

of the young Lothaire were made in the schools of St. John Lateran ; his theological course at Paris ; he finally made one of the ten thousand students of law at Bologna. Returning to Rome, in his twenty-first year, he received minor orders, and soon afterward, the diaconate. When thirty years of age, he was made a cardinal-deacon by Pope Clement III., (1190). As cardinal he was simple in his habits, severe in his morals, a rigid censor of luxury, and absolutely free from cupidity ; some of his best works were composed while he wore the purple. When the cardinals met to choose a successor to Celestine III., they had many things to consider. " The power of the Hohenstaufen," says Hurter (1), "menaced the Church more than it had under Frederick ; in Italy it had developed more than ever. . . . The Pope, surrounded by the domains of this house, or by provinces held by the Germans to strengthen their pretensions upon those territories, would have been exposed, as indeed the last emperor had designed, to become a mere patriarch of the house of Hohenstaufen, and Christendom might have beheld him subject to the conqueror, as had happened at Constantinople. On account of the situation of Sicily, the complete separation of those provinces from the Holy See, or the preservation of the right of suzerainty over them, would depend as much on the energy of the new Pope, as upon the sort of relations he would establish with the empire. The Crusades had to be encouraged, to be prepared by a more solid union of the Western peoples, and by a firmer and more sustained direction of those who assumed the Cross. In every kingdom, many ecclesiastical interests were to be regulated, to be redressed, to be set aright." The cardinals thought of all these things, and the very first day of the Conclave their unanimous choice was the cardinal Lothaire, though he was only thirty-seven years of age. At first Lothaire resisted, but the dean of the cardinal-deacons, Gratian, approached and saluted him as Pope Innocent III. (2).

(1) *History of Pope Innocent III.*, B. i. This work, written while Hurter was a Protestant minister, cannot be too highly praised, especially as an accurate and appreciative picture of the time.

(2) At that time, the name of the new Pontiff was given to him, not chosen by himself. *Roman Ordo.*

We shall now give a short sketch of Innocent's relations with Rome; with the empire and Sicily; with Philip Augustus of France, in reference to his divorce from Ingelburga; and with king John of England, in the case of the rights of the see of Canterbury. First, then, we draw the reader's attention to the actions of Innocent in the States of the Church. The new Pontiff found the greater portion of the patrimony of St. Peter in the hands of the foreigner; only in the Campagna was his temporal authority recognized, and even there the late emperor had seized many fiefs. The soldiers of Henry made excursions up to the very gates of Rome. This emperor had not restored the territories of Matilda; the seneschal Markwald ruled at Ravenna, in the March, and in Romagna; one Conrad of Lutzenhard called himself duke of Spoleto and ruled that duchy and Assisi; most of the Exarchate was divided among German barons, and some districts were independent; the Sabine provinces were held by Benedict Carissimi. The Romans had re-established the senate under Lucius III., and, seduced by Arnold of Brescia, had offered the emperor the sovereignty of the city; the people yearned for independence; the nobles favored the emperor, and the prefect of the city received his investiture from that monarch. The day after his coronation, Innocent summoned the prefect and made him swear "to neither sell nor pledge, nor give in fief, any domains confided to him; to exact, and care for, all the taxes due to the Roman Church; to faithfully guard all fortresses, and to build no new ones without the Pope's permission; to be ever ready to give an account of his stewardship, and to lay down his dignity when ordered." Then the Pontiff gave him, instead of the sword which the emperor used to send him, a mantle, as a sign of investiture. Having thus abolished the last trace of imperial suzerainty in Rome, Innocent ordered that the senator, who had replaced, in 1197, the senatorial body, should hereafter exercise his functions only in the name of the Pope; he was to be changed every year. Many of the barons now came from the surrounding country to take the oath of vassalage, and the Pontiff sent all the cardinals then

in Rome to the principal provinces, to receive the oath from the legitimate feudatories and the free communes, and to expel the foreign adventurers. This last task was gladly undertaken by the people, overjoyed at the assurance of Innocent that they would not again be separated from the Holy See. The Pope now turned his attention to the German usurper of Ravenna and the Marches. Markwald procrastinated, promised, and retracted; finally, when many of the cities had sworn fidelity to Innocent, he issued from Ravenna, and, in the very presence of the cardinal-legates sent to him, burned the towns, ransacked the churches, and murdered right and left. Innocent then excommunicated him; the peoples and barons hastily formed an army and drove the miscreant to the frontier, whence he proceeded to Sicily. The Pope was at first disposed to accept the offer of Conrad of Lutzenhard, who promised to do homage for Spoleto and Assisi, to pay a large tribute, and to furnish at least 1000 men to the Papal army; but perforce he heeded the loud curses of his people against the detested stranger, whose name was synonymous with cruelty and rapine, and Conrad yielded his possessions. Perugia, Todi, and Rieti gained many privileges; in fine, says Hurter, "other cities preserved their ancient privileges and a constitution more free than that given by political institutions born on the barren soil of abstract doctrines. . . . Then, without any pretension on the part of (the central) authority to arrange everything and to extinguish every sentiment of life, the cities could make war, form alliances, regulate commerce, determine their own relations according to their customs and rights, and even their suzerain regarded these customs and rights as inviolable." In June of his first year, Innocent made a triumphal progress through the duchy of Spoleto and the contiguous regions, and allowed all the cities to join the Tuscan League against the Germans. (1). About this time, the Lombard League, re-

(1) Profiting by the example of the Lombard League, most of the Tuscan cities, then governed by the duke Philip, brother of Henry VI., resolved to do what they could to realize the will of the countess Matilda. By the advice of their bishops they confederated, with the object of maintaining their municipal liberties, of amicably arranging any differences among themselves, of defending the Holy See, and of not submitting to any temporal sovereign not recommended by the Pope. The League was composed of elected deputies, who themselves chose a president. Innocent tried hard to make Pisa, a city of

newed for thirty years, received strength by the accession of the powerful marquis of Monferrato, hitherto an imperialist: and in a year from Innocent's accession, Northern and Central Italy, thanks to his activity and the co-operation of the people, were freed from the imperial preponderance. The emperor Otho IV. for a time occupied the greater portion of the Papal States, but when he was forced to recross the Alps the entire patrimony again recognized the sovereignty of the Pontiff.

As we enter upon the narrative of Pope Innocent's relation with the empire, we must observe that at the time of his accession Europe was agitated by the question whether the imperial crown was to be hereafter conferred, as, in theory at least, it had hitherto been conferred, upon the most wise, pious, and worthy prince of Christendom, or whether it should become an heirloom of a single family. For the latter idea contended the Hohenstaufen, who had mounted to the imperial dignity in the person of Barbarossa, and who had so consolidated their power, that, had it not been for the energetic interference of the Popes, they would have secured the prize. For the preservation of the electoral privileges, many of the German princes, under the guidance of bishop Adolph of Cologne, strenuously fought; and when Philip of Suabia endeavored to secure the crown for the young Frederick, the baby child of Henry VI. and Constance of Sicily, they successively pushed the cause of Richard of England and Barthold of Zehringen. The friends of the Hohenstaufen finally persuaded Philip to relinquish the idea of seating his nephew Frederick on the imperial throne, and to present himself for election, and they indeed elected him on March 6th, 1198. But Adolph of Cologne and his party were determined that the empire should not become an appanage of the Hohenstaufen, or of any single family, and they turned their eyes to Otho, the second son of Henry the Lion of Saxony. In the month of May this prince was elected emperor in the cathedral of Cologne. His chief partisans were the bish-

merchant-princes, and greatly favored by the Hohenstaufen, join this confederation, and even charged his legate not to launch the interdict he had prepared, if the Pisans would ally with their countrymen. SISMONDI, *Italian Republics*, ii., 313.

ops of Cologne, Munster, Treves, Paderborn, Minden, Cambrai, Utrecht, and Strasbourg; all the princes of the Low Countries, and the powerful landgrave Hermann of Thuringia, whose son Louis afterwards married "the dear St. Elizabeth" of Hungary. But Philip had in his favor the majority of the princes, and the richest of the German countries; a preponderance of military strength, and an abundance of treasure stolen from Sicily; the possession of nearly all the fortresses of the empire, and all the jewels and insignia of the imperial dignity. In the war which now ensued, one of the first endeavors of Otho was to get possession of the coronation-place, Aix-la-Chapelle, that he might there receive the royal crown of Germany, after which he would be free to apply to the Pope for the imperial diadem. After a three weeks' siege, and several assaults, the city surrendered, and the archbishop of Cologne crowned Otho as king of Germany, that prince crying out: "Philip has the insignia, but I have the rights of the empire." Pope Innocent was filled with consternation on account of this German imbroglio: it greatly jeopardized the Crusade; for a great many nobles had already summoned their vassals from Palestine to plunge into the struggle for the empire. But he was resolved to allow the Germans to elect their own king without interference; he would afterwards attend to the imperial crown. As Philip was crowned in Mayence, the parties seemed to stand on equal terms; but in 1199 the cause of Otho received a severe blow by the death of Richard of England, whose money had greatly contributed to the support of the Othonian army; a great many princes and nobles passed over to Philip, and Otho began to feel that he must look to the Pope for assistance. He had already applied to Innocent for recognition, whereas his rival had taken no such steps. Philip at length wrote to Innocent, and his letter was followed by one from Philip Augustus, naturally anxious for his success, simply because Otho was nephew and ally to the king of England. Innocent then sent legates to Germany, to try to induce one or the other of the claimants to abdicate; their efforts failed, and the war continued with alternate success and de-

feat for each party. Finally, toward the end of the year 1200, the Pontiff named as legate in Germany the cardinal Guido, bishop of Palestrina, a prelate remarkable for firmness and disinterestedness, and instructed him to publish the Papal recognition of Otho as king of Germany. From the Bull given to Guido for use in Germany, we take the following passages, as illustrative of the motives which actuated the Pontiff: "It is the duty of the Holy See to proceed with prudence and discretion in its care of the Roman Empire, for to it pertains the right of examining the election in the first and last instance. In the first, because by it and because of it the empire was transferred from the Greeks to the Germans; by it, as the author of that transaction, and because of it, that it might receive more efficacious protection. In the second instance, because from the Pope the emperor receives the imposition of hands for his elevation; he is anointed, crowned, and invested with the imperial dignity by the Pope. As recently there have been chosen three kings, Frederick of Sicily, Philip, and Otho, in each election three things must be particularly examined: what is allowable, what can be granted, and what is proper. At a first glance, the election of the child prince might seem above all attack, but yet there are objections to it. . . . Apparently there ought to be no objection against the election of Philip. . . . Nevertheless, we ought to oppose him. Our predecessor solemnly excommunicated him, and with reason. He had violently occupied and ravaged the patrimony of St. Peter. . . . Philip is a persecutor, a descendant of persecutors; and if we do not oppose him, we will arm a madman against ourselves." Here the Pontiff details the crimes of the Hohenstaufen against the Holy See, and continues: "Philip commenced by persecuting the Church, and he still persists in that course. He calls himself duke of Tuscany and of the Campagna, and raises pretensions to territories close to the very gates of our capital; he endeavors to steal our kingdom of Sicily. . . . Let us now speak of Otho. He will make a better emperor than Philip; the Lord punishes the crime of parents even to the third and fourth genera-

tion, and Philip marches in the footsteps of his ancestors. Consequently, we publicly declare for Otho, who, himself devoted to the Church, descends from families equally true to her."

On June 8th, 1201, while at Nyon, Otho took an oath to respect the rights of the Holy See and of the Lombard and Tuscan Leagues, promising to repeat the same oath when called to Rome for the crown. Until the year 1208, Innocent exerted all his influence in favor of Otho, but that prince did not display the energy that his cause demanded, and finally the Pontiff concluded that his duty to Christendom called upon him to sacrifice his aversion to the Hohenstaufen for the sake of peace. The recognition of Philip was about to be completed when suddenly that prince was assassinated by Otho of Wittelsbach. King Otho IV. was now recognized by all Germany, and, in order to conciliate the friends of the house of Suabia, he was betrothed to Beatrice, a daughter of Philip. In October, he went to Rome to receive the imperial crown. The ceremony was performed with the usual solemnity; but immediately afterward the Romans and the German soldiers were in battle. Otho lost many of his most distinguished officers and courtiers, and, according to himself (1), 1100 of his horses were killed in the fight, and he lost a great deal of other valuable property. When the Pontiff refused to indemnify him for these losses, he grew furious, and left the city. From this moment, Otho refused to fulfil his engagements with the Pontiff; he refused to yield up the territories of Matilda, and while passing through Spoleto, he gave it a duke in the person of one of his courtiers, named Berthold; in the year 1210, he gave the investiture of the March of Ancona to Azzo d'Este, and occupied Orvieto and Perugia; he tried to take Viterbo, but the inhabitants successfully resisted, while the emperor ravaged the surrounding country. He so guarded the roads that the outside world could not communicate with the Pontiff. Otho soon turned his attention to Southern Italy, and, with the assistance of a Pisan fleet, was able to conquer nearly all the continental domains of

(1) MURATORI, *Antiquities*, IV., 983.

the young Frederick. On her deathbed, Constance, the widow of Henry VI., had confided the guardianship of her infant son to the Holy See, and Pope Innocent had been an active and faithful protector since his accession. Frederick now governed by himself, though but sixteen years of age, and his inexperience and frequent imprudences caused Innocent much anxiety. In 1211, the Pontiff excommunicated Otho, "because he has degenerated from the sentiments of his ancestors; because he has violated his oaths; because he has taken territories of the Holy See; because he makes war on Frederick of Sicily." Innocent then demanded aid from Philip Augustus, and it was cheerfully promised. War again broke out in Germany; the landgrave of Thuringia, the king of Bohemia, and a great many bishops abandoned Otho and chose Frederick of Sicily as king of Germany. When the Pontiff was informed of this act, he might well hesitate as to his course. He knew that, on his father's side, Frederick was a Hohenstaufen; but, on the other hand, he might hope that the young king would prove grateful to the Pontiff, who had preserved his maternal inheritance; and therefore he finally gave his consent. Otho now returned to Germany, laden with Italian spoil, but only to meet a cool reception. Innocent summoned to his assistance the marquis of Este, who obeyed at once, and reduced all the Tuscan territory conquered by Otho. In April, 1212, Frederick arrived in Rome, and among other promises upon which Innocent insisted was one declaring that Sicily should not be united with Germany; that Frederick's possessions in South Italy should all be ceded to the son to whom his wife, Constance of Aragon, had given birth. When Frederick departed for Germany, the Pope furnished him with money for his journey. Otho managed to keep his hold upon the greater part of Germany until the great battle of Bouvines, gained on July 27, 1214, by Philip Augustus, over the united forces of Germany and England, shattered his prospects. From that day, if we except a short campaign against Waldemar of Bremen, Otho remained in his hereditary states until May 18, 1218, the day of his death. Frederick II. soon showed that he

was a Hohenstaufen, manifesting the utmost ingratitude to the Holy See, and finally incurring the usual fate of his family, excommunication. We shall treat of his career in a special chapter.

In the struggle to which we now draw the reader's attention, the question was whether the royal mantle so covered all sin, as to render the wearer exempt from obedience to the laws of God and of His Church. The first wife of Philip Augustus, Isabelle of Hainaut, had died in 1190, when he was twenty-three years of age; and in 1193 he sent an embassy to Canute VI., king of Denmark, to ask for the hand of that monarch's second sister, Ingelburga, then a beautiful girl of seventeen; the offer was accepted, and in a few months the princess landed in France; Philip conducted her to Amiens, and the marriage took place. On the day after the marriage, in the presence of all the ecclesiastical and secular lords of the kingdom, Ingelburga was crowned by Philip's uncle, the archbishop of Rheims; but it was observed, during the ceremony, that the king appeared terribly nervous; he could not look at the queen, and trembled and remained pallid until the close of the service. (1). He had already resolved to repudiate his young wife, as the world soon learned. In November, an assembly of bishops, most of them relatives of Philip, was convoked at Compiègne, to consider the validity of the marriage. A genealogical table, proving the consanguinity of Ingelburga with Isabella of Hainaut, the king's first wife, was brought forward, and the archbishop of Rheims pronounced the marriage null and void. The unfortunate queen was informed of the decision by an interpreter, for she knew no French. Bursting into tears, she cried, "France, wicked! wicked! Rome, Rome!" thus expressing her appeal to the only impartial judge on earth for those who wear a crown. As she refused to return to Denmark, a conventual residence at Beaurepaire was assigned to her. So little care did the king take of her support that, rather than be beholden to the charity of the nuns for her board, she sold, not only her jewels, but her very clothing, to

(1) WILLIAM OF NEWBURG, *iv.*, 24; *Deeds*, c. 48.

defray her expenses. Ingelburga found means to appeal to Pope Celestine III., who declared the pretended divorce to be of no value. Nevertheless, Philip looked around for another wife, and after experiencing many rebuffs from royal ladies, who refused to confide in his honor, he married, in June, 1196, Agnes, daughter of Berthold, duke of Meranie, by Agnes, niece of the marquis Didier of Misnia, a descendant of Charlemagne. The king of Denmark had already complained to Rome, and when he heard of the marriage with Agnes, he called upon the Pontiff to excommunicate the royal concubinary. As soon as Innocent ascended the Papal throne, he wrote to the bishop of Paris to the effect that if Philip would put away Agnes, the Holy See would listen to the arguments which might be adduced against the marriage with Ingelburga, but not until that was done. "Think of the anger of God," he wrote to Philip, "listen not to evil advice, respect my paternal good-will, and do not injure your own reputation or mine." In October of 1199, Innocent wrote to all the French clergy: "From the commencement of our reign, we have vainly sought to convince the king by kindness, and to influence him to a reconciliation with his wife. Why does the king not prefer what is just and honorable? Why does he endanger his soul? Why does he give such scandal from his exalted station? Nevertheless, we do not yet despair of his salvation, nor shall we abandon what we have begun; our legate shall once more warn him, and if our counsel is unheeded, the interdict shall be proclaimed."

The terrors of an interdict on his kingdom did not weigh with Philip against the charms of Agnes, and the precise orders from Rome admitted of no delay. Hence the Papal legate convoked a Council at Dijon on the feast of St. Nicholas. The king sent two deputies to inform the prelates that he appealed from the sentence beforehand, and had already dispatched an embassy to Rome. Innocent had foreseen this, and knowing that nothing but delay could be gained by granting a hearing of such appeal, had given the legate formal powers to ignore it. After seven days of consultation, "the mournful tolling of the bells

announced, at midnight, a dying agony. The bishops and priests betook themselves, by torchlight and in silence, to the cathedral. For the last time the canons prayed to the Father of mercy, chanting: 'Lord God, have pity on us.' A veil covered the image of the Crucified; the relics of the saints were removed to the subterranean tombs; the remaining particles of the Eucharist were consumed. Then the legate, vested with a violet stole, as on the day of the Passion, presented himself to the people, and, in the name of Jesus Christ, pronounced an interdict on all the dominions of the king of France, so long as he maintained his adulterous intercourse with Agnes de Meranie. Moans and sobs echoed through the porticoes of the church; it seemed that the Judgment-Day had arrived; the faithful would now be obliged to appear before God without the consolation of the Church's prayers." (1). The misery of his subjects, the utter absence of anything like amusement on the part of an amusement-loving people, soon had a great effect upon trade, and therefore upon the revenues of the king. In his anger, Philip not only seized the benefices of the clergy, and expelled the bishops, but he attacked the possessions of the nobles, and farmed out the taxes to Jewish collectors. The people murmured, many of the barons flew to arms, the king's household servants fled his presence as that of one accursed by God. Fear that the Pontiff would now launch an excommunication, caused Philip to send an embassy to Rome, signifying that he was ready to appear before any judges the Pope would appoint, and to submit to their sentence. "To what sentence?" replied Innocent, "to the one pronounced or to the one to be given? The king knows the first; let him put away his concubine, restore the queen, re-establish the expelled prelates, and indemnify them; then the interdict shall be removed." When Philip heard of this answer, he cried, "I'll become an infidel! Oh! but Saladin was happy, having no Pope!" The wretched monarch then turned to his uncle, the archbishop of Rheims, and asked him if the Pope had really written that the decree of divorce, pro-

(1) HURTER. B. iv.

nounced by that prelate, was a mere farce. When the archbishop admitted that the Pontiff had said so, Philip said: "Then you were a madman and a sot, to pronounce such a decree." The king now sent another embassy, and tried the effect of a woman's tears upon the Pope. In a letter to Innocent, Agnes spoke pathetically of her youth and inexperience, of her children, and of her great love for Philip: "The splendor of a crown does not attract me, but my heart is devoted to the king." But Innocent was inflexible. "It was a similar firmness," says Hurter, "which preserved the influence of Christianity in the West, which founded the rule of Rome over the world, and raised the Apostolic See, by the sole power of a superior idea, above the thrones of kings. Even to-day, it is ordinarily owing to the vigilance and severity of the Supreme Pontiffs, to their constant care of the unity of the Church, that Christianity has the happiness of not being pushed, like a mere sect, into a corner of the globe; of not being petrified, like the religion of the Hindoos, in vain formalities; and of not having allowed European energy to be paralyzed by oriental voluptuousness."

At length Philip yielded, and the cardinal Octavian, uncle of Innocent, was sent to receive his submission. On the eve of the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, Philip, accompanied by the legates, visited Ingelburga, who had been brought to the royal chateau of St. Leger. As they met, the king cried: "The Pope does me violence!" The queen replied: "He only wishes the triumph of justice." The cardinals then ordered three bishops to conduct Ingelburga, with royal honors, to the public assembly, and here Philip swore to acknowledge her as wife, and as queen of France. Then, to the inexpressible joy of the people, the interdict, which had lasted seven months, was raised. But Philip would not live with Ingelburga as his wife, still persisting that they were too closely related by blood. (1) At the beginning of March of the following year, 1201, an immense multitude assembled at Soissons, for the inquiry into the validity of the king's marriage. The discussion lasted

(1) She was sent to the strong fortress of Etampes as a residence, but the legates told Innocent that she received all due honor. This was true only for a time.

fifteen days, and the cardinal-legate was about to pronounce the decision, when Philip, foreseeing its nature, astonished the assembly by sending word that "he was about to recognize Ingelburga as his wife, and would never again be separated from her." He had already called at the abbey of Notre Dame, the residence of the queen, and having helped her to mount behind him, had ridden away. The Council dissolved, and Philip gained his object, a putting off of the evil day when he would be obliged to dismiss his beloved Agnes. Ingelburga was immediately sent to an old chateau, and things remained as before. But shortly after the above event Agnes de Meranie died, and the disconsolate Philip wrote to Pope Innocent, begging him to legitimate her two children, Philip and Mary, as his succession now depended on only one son, the child of Isabella of Hainaut. In replying to this request, Innocent had several things to consider. The reason alleged by Philip was a good one; the young son of Isabella might die, and the kingdom be disturbed by civil war. Again, a Synod of French bishops had, though illegally, really pronounced a divorce from Ingelburga, and Agnes was probably impelled thereby to yield to Philip. Finally, it was well to show that the Pontifical zeal was not directed against mere persons, and that death covers much. Hence Innocent legitimated the little Philip and Mary, and declared the former capable of holding his place in the line of succession. This considerate action of the Pontiff had no effect upon Philip, in reference to his treatment of his unfortunate wife; kept in strict seclusion, she was allowed to receive no news from home, and to write no letters to any one; she was never allowed to confess, was seldom permitted to hear mass, and no ecclesiastic was admitted to her presence; scarcely enough food was given her to sustain life; she could never consult a physician, and was never allowed a bath or any means of taking proper care of her person. In this extremity she found means, on several occasions during the next six years, to appeal for redress to the Father of the Faithful, but all the efforts of the Pontiff proved impotent to ameliorate her condition. In 1207,

Philip having alleged sorcery as a reason for his aversion to Ingelburga, the Pope wrote: "Although as yet you have not hearkened to our representations, the force of our love is so great that we cannot avoid renewing them. Even though the reason you allege for the non-fulfilment of your conjugal duty were believed by men, who do not penetrate hidden motives, yet we see no excuse for your depriving your wife of royal honors. You ought, if it is possible, give her conjugal love, in order that the holy spirit of chastity may not depart from you; but in case you cannot, you must nevertheless consider the disgrace you heap upon yourself by so unworthily treating the daughter, sister, niece, and wife of a king. To gain a victory over one's self is more glorious than to gain one over a large number of enemies." During all these years of difference with the Pontiff on the subject of his reconciliation with Ingelburga, Philip remained in accord with the Holy See on all other matters. Finally, in 1213, when he was about to depart for the war against England and Flanders, Philip surprised the Pontiff and the world by taking Ingelburga from her prison at Etampes, and establishing conjugal relations with her. Twenty years had elapsed since the marriage and separation. Until the death of Philip, in 1223, the union was not troubled in the least. (1).

We shall now consider the struggle for the freedom and rights of the Church in England, which Pope Innocent III. was compelled to make against the pretensions of king John. Among the Church immunities which every English monarch, at his coronation, swore to respect, was the right of the cathedral chapters to elect their own bishops. The kings, as a rule, respected the form of this claim, but not the spirit; they generally insisted upon the chapter's obtaining the royal license for an election, and then, after the election, upon their own right to approve of the choice. So far the practice of the English kings was about the same as that of the continental sovereigns; but in England a system had obtained which was peculiar to itself. Most

(1) Ingelburga survived Philip fourteen years and her body was interred in a church at Corbeil, founded and endowed by her with benefices for thirteen ecclesiastics, on condition that three masses should be daily offered for the souls of the royal couple. The condition was fulfilled until the Revolution, when the church was turned into a powder-magazine.

of the cathedrals were outgrowths of monasteries, and were yet served by monks, who exercised capitular rights; "a singular and incongruous institution," says Lingard, "since it referred the choice of the bishops to men who, by their utter seclusion from the world, were the least calculated to appreciate the merits of the candidates." The objections to this system were most manifest in the great see of Canterbury. The bishops claimed a concurrent right in the election to the primatial chair, but the monks fought hard for "their privileges." When, in June of 1205, archbishop Hubert died, the Canterbury monks assembled one night, and without any concurrence of the bishops, they chose their sub-prior Reginald as archbishop, and sent him at once to Rome to get the first word with the Pontiff. A deputation was sent by the bishops to protest against this election. Then the king, wishing to elevate John De Gray, bishop of Norwich, to the primacy, induced the bishops to resign their rights, for the nonce, in the premises, and proceeded to the monastery, where he asked the brotherhood to elect his nominee, De Gray. This was done, and a deputation went to Rome to inform the Pontiff. Innocent decided favorably to the claim of the monks, on account of its antiquity; he pronounced both elections, however, invalid; that of Reginald, as made clandestinely, and that of De Gray, as made before the previous one had been declared null. Making the Pope understand that he wanted De Gray, king John asked him to appoint some one to the vacant primacy. Innocent immediately thought of Stephen Langton, a learned Englishman, who had been rector of the university of Paris, and whom he had called to Rome and made a cardinal-priest. The Pontiff recommended Langton to the Canterbury monks then in Rome, and as they were specially empowered to act in the name of their whole fraternity, they proceeded to the election, and chose the cardinal as their archbishop. But though John knew and esteemed Langton, he was determined to make De Gray primate, and the messengers of the Pontiff, announcing the election, were thrown into prison. Pope Innocent then consecrated Langton at Vi-

terbo : whereupon John drove the Canterbury monks out of the kingdom. He also swore that Langton should never set foot in England, and sent the following letter to the Pope : " The archbishop-elect has sojourned among my enemies ; his election attacks and violates the rights of my crown. I cannot understand how the Pope and his admirers have not calculated the great value of the friendship of the king of England to the Apostolic See, seeing that this kingdom gives that See more revenue than it receives from all the countries beyond the Alps. But I know how to defend my rights, and I shall cease, in no case, to sustain the election of the bishop of Norwich. If the Apostolic See will not heed these considerations, it will be enough for me to prohibit all journeys to Rome, and to retain in my country the money I need for operations against my enemies." Such language, to a Pontiff like Innocent III., was mere wind. His answer is worthy of the reader's attention : " We have written to you humbly, amicably, and benevolently, exhorting and beseeching you ; you have answered with menaces, insults, and arrogance. We have addressed you with excessive courtesy, and you have observed no conventionalities. In similar circumstances, no prince has ever received from us such honor ; you have trampled on the honor of the Pope as no prince has ever done. The great distinction acquired at Paris by the archbishop-elect ought to conciliate your favor, to excite your joy on the promotion of this prelate to so great a dignity. You should have reflected that Langton is an Englishman, that his parents were faithful subjects, that he has a benefice in York. But the envoys let us see that you are opposed to him because your approval was not requested, and they asked us to accord this honor to you, by an order to the Canterbury monks to ask your consent. We granted their prayer, and although it is not customary to ask the royal assent to any choice made by the Apostolic See, we sent you two monks, and followed them with our own courier, charged with the same mission. After these efforts, it was not necessary to again ask the assent of the king ; but, regarding the ancient institutions of the Church, we

took care that the flock should not be long without a shepherd. We hope, then, that you will not be turned from the right path by evil advisers, but that you will follow our well-meant counsel. You will thus consult your own honor and glory. Your own father and brother swore to the Apostolic legates that they renounced that fatal 'custom' of which St. Thomas was the victim."

This and other remonstrances producing no good effect, Pope Innocent resolved, in 1208, to lay the kingdom under an interdict, and so severe did he deem it necessary to be, that he made no exception, as was usually made, for the Templars, Hospitalers, and some other congregations. The bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester, to whom the execution of the interdict had been intrusted, presented themselves before the king, and with tears begged him to yield. John replied: "If you proclaim the interdict, by the teeth of God, I shall pack off all the bishops and priests to the Pope, and take their property. Then all the Romans now in my dominions shall return to their country with their eyes plucked out and their noses cut off, so that the whole world may recognize them. As for you, if you care for your skins, you will take yourselves off at once." The bishops delayed the interdict for two weeks; then, giving up all hope of an accommodation, on the 24th March they proclaimed it. John now ordered all the bishops to leave England; the only prelate who dared to remain was his favorite, the bishop of Winchester; De Gray had been already sent as lord-deputy to Ireland. The sentence of excommunication was pronounced in 1209, but without any deposition of John from his throne. Fearing that this latter sentence would soon be issued, he vainly tried to strengthen himself by an alliance with Mohammed al Nassir, the Saracen whose conquests in Spain were threatening the extirpation of Christianity in that country. Finally, in 1212, Pope Innocent absolved the vassals of John from their fealty, and exhorted all Christian princes to unite in dethroning him; he specially applied to Philip of France, only too willing to gratify his own ambition. War had already begun between France and England when,

in the spring of 1213, the sub-deacon Pandulph, a Papal messenger who had accompanied Langton from Rome to France, landed in England. By this time John had become convinced of the danger of his position; he therefore sent for Pandulph, and opened negotiations. After much hesitation, he finally agreed, on May 13th. to admit Langton to the see of Canterbury; to restore all confiscated Church property; to liberate all persons imprisoned for defending the rights of the Church; to never again outlaw an ecclesiastic; to make full indemnity for all injuries inflicted on account of the interdict. The next day was spent by the king, his council, and the Pontifical envoy, in secret consultations, and on the 15th, the following charter, subscribed by John, one archbishop, one bishop, nine earls, and three barons, was given to Pandulph: "In order to obtain the mercy of God for the offences we have committed against the Church, and not having anything to offer more precious than our own person and kingdom, and in order that we may be humbled before Him who was humiliated for us even unto death; by an inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and not compelled by violence or by fear, but of our good and free will, we yield up, with the consent of our barons, to God, to His holy apostles Peter and Paul, to our holy mother the Roman Church, to our lord Pope Innocent and his Catholic successors, in expiation of our sins and those of our family, living and dead, our kingdoms of England and Ireland, with all their rights and accessories, in order to receive them again as a vassal of God and of the Roman Church, in witness of which we take the oath of vassalage before Pandulph, as absolutely as though we were in the presence of the Pope, to place ourselves at the disposal of the Pope and of his successors; and our succeeding heirs will always be obliged to take the same oath; and in sign of vassalage, we and our successors will annually pay to the Apostolic See, besides the Peter's Pence, 700 marks for England, and 300 marks for Ireland, raised from the revenues of the kingdom; all under pain of forfeit of the kingdom by that successor who shall dare to violate this permanent disposition." Accompanied by his whole court John then

proceeded to the church, where he laid down his crown and other royal insignia, and took the oath of vassalage. It is impossible to believe that John was actuated in this matter by any other motive than that of disarming the Pontiff, and of obtaining his powerful protection against Philip of France and his own discontented subjects. When Innocent received the news of John's extraordinary submission, he wrote to him: "The Holy Ghost has inspired you to subject your kingdom to the Roman Church, that you may possess it with more solidity and honor, as a sacerdotal kingdom and a royal priesthood." He then appointed Nicholas, cardinal-bishop of Frascati, as legate to England, with extended powers, instructing him to make peace between John and Philip. To the latter he wrote: "If you have hitherto responded to our Apostolic prayers and invitations, you will continue to give the same proofs of devotion to the Holy See." On July 20th, John proceeded to Winchester, where he met Langton, the bishops of London, Ely, Hereford, Lincoln, and Bath, and the prior and monks of Canterbury. Having repeated his oath of fealty to the Pope, and having sworn that he would abolish all illegal customs, and to receive the laws of good king Edward, he was publicly relieved of the excommunication at the doors of the cathedral. The interdict, however, was not raised until June 27th, 1214, when John had done what he could to indemnify the victims of his obstinacy and cruelty. (1).

When Innocent was raised to the Supreme Pontificate, the throne of Constantinople was occupied by Alexis III., the patriarchal chair by George Xiphilinus. Alexis immediately sent an embassy to Rome, declaring that he would be much pleased if the Holy See would send a legate to his capital. Innocent, like all his predecessors since the time of Cerularius, was daily hoping for an extinction of the Greek schism; he therefore welcomed this overture, and sent legates with a letter to Alexis, from which we take the following passages: "The Lord Himself laid the foundation of His Church when he said: 'upon this rock I

(1) We do not allude to the relations of Pope Innocent with king John and the barons in the Magna Charta affair, as that belongs to profane history, but refer the reader to Lingard's graphic and impartial narrative. As for the Pontiff's conduct in the matter of the Albigenses, that will be described in the chapter treating of their heresy.

will build My Church.' If the emperor desires his government to rest solidly upon this foundation, he must love God above all things, and honor His spouse, the Holy Roman Church, of which He is at once the founder and the foundation-stone. All Christian people murmur against the emperor, not only because he does not assist the armies fighting the enemy of the Christian name, but because the Greek populations have separated from the communion of the Holy See and have formed a church of their own, as though another Church could exist alongside of that Church which is one. . . . The emperor should strive to reunite the Greek church with the Roman Church, to bring back the daughter to the mother, that the sheep of the Lord may be guarded by one shepherd." Alexis having expressed a desire for a General Council, to consider the dogmatic differences between Rome and Constantinople, Innocent replied that "he rejoiced at the emperor's disposition toward reunion; his will was to call a Council for the consideration of urgent ecclesiastical affairs, and if the member wishes to rejoin the head, the daughter to come to the mother, and if the patriarch of Constantinople will show proper respect and submission to the Roman Church, he will be joyfully received as one of the principal dignitaries of the Church. The Pontiff begs the emperor to see that the patriarch and the chief prelates attend the Council." The patriarch John of Jerusalem having written to Innocent, denying that the Roman Church was the Mother Church, saying that the church of Jerusalem should receive that title, the Pontiff replied: "The church of Jerusalem may be the mother of the faith, for from her came the signs of the faith; but the Church of Rome is the mother of the faithful, because she was placed over them by pre-eminence of dignity. She is the mother, not as regards time, but in respect of dignity; Andrew was called to the apostolate before Peter, but Peter was promoted over him. The Synagogue may equally be called the mother of the Church, because she existed before the Church, and the Church came out from her; but still the Church is the universal mother, who ever conceives, bears, and nourishes." From

these initiatory steps, however, there was derived no beneficial result; the Greek schismatics remained obstinate. Finally, when, in self-protection, the Crusaders were compelled to take Constantinople (1204) and to found a new empire, the prospects of union grew brighter, and had the Latin emperors not been so persistent in naming Western ecclesiastics for all the chief dignities, and thus exciting the prejudices of the Greeks against the union as a foreign scheme, the long wished-for object might have been accomplished.

If Pope Innocent was doomed to disappointment in the matter of the Greek schism, he was consoled by the reunion of the Armenian church, and that of Bulgaria, with Rome. At that time, Armenia was an independent state, closed at the north by Mt. Taurus, bounded on the south by the sea, on the east by the Euphrates, and on the west by the Calycadnus. (1). A tradition exists that St. Bartholomew first preached the faith to these people, but St. Gregory the Illuminator, in the time of Constantine, seems to have been the successful founder of the faith in those parts. In 535, the Monophysite doctrines made great inroads among the Armenians, and they separated from the patriarchate of Constantinople long before the schism of Photius, founding a national church, a part of which has always remained in the Roman communion. The union of the entire Armenian church with Rome was perfected in 1199, by king Leo, called the Great, and was cordially supported by the Catholicos or primate, and all the clergy. Since then, the union has been broken and renewed, again and again (2). The same is to be said of the reunion of the Bulgarians, which, as the event proved, was promoted by their king, Kolo-

(1) Since the conquest of Armenia by the Persians, the Armenians have nearly all been wanderers. They are now the Yankees, the Irish, and the Jews of Asia; they are found everywhere, and have all the persevering energy of the first, the buoyancy and undaunted bravery of the second, and the business tact of the third. When Richelieu was scheming to develop the commerce of France, he tried to influence the Armenians to settle there in great numbers; the chancellor Seguier established for them a printing-house at Marseilles. Their great monastery at Venice, now many centuries old, is one of the most celebrated in Europe for its library and the number of learned men it has produced. Neither the schismatic Armenians, nor the united (those in communion with Rome), use the vernacular in the liturgy; like all Easterns, they use their ancient (and dead) language, not the modern (and changeable) one. The Armenian schismatic monks follow the rule of St. Basil; but, in the time of Pope John XXII., (1316-1334), most of the united monks adopted the rule of St. Dominic.

(2) The united or Catholic Armenians have two patriarchs, one at Naksivan, in Armenia, and one at Kaminiek, in Poland. The schismatics also have two patriarchs, one at Echmiadzin, near Erivan, and the other at Cis, in Cilicia.

Johannes, merely out of hatred for the Greeks, and to obtain the protection of the Western princes against the Byzantine emperor.

Pope Innocent III. died at Perugia, on July 16th, 1216, in the fifty-sixth year of his age, having sat in the Chair of St. Peter eighteen years, six months, and seven days. According to the superficial Hume, this Pontiff was despotic, and he encroached, not only on the domain of earthly princes, but upon the rights of the clergy; his object in exciting the "frenzy of the Crusades" was the acquisition of greater revenues; his interdicts were instruments of vengeance for the court of Rome; he was guilty of barbarism in exterminating the Albigenses, "the most innocent and pacific of men." (1). If we believe Gibbon, Innocent could boast of the two most signal triumphs ever gained over good sense and humanity: *the establishment of the dogma of Transubstantiation*, and that of the first foundations of the *Inquisition*. (2). Hallam, who expects to understand the Middle Ages without having any appreciation of, or, apparently, any intimate acquaintance with, the Catholic institutions of the time, declares that in all the annals of the Papacy there can be found no such instances of usurpation as in the Pontificate of Innocent III. (3). The author of the *Defense of the Declaration of the French Clergy in 1682*, supposed by many to be Bossuet, reproves our Pontiff for the depositions of Otho and John Lackland; making him responsible for the cruel wars which followed the first, and the misconceptions and hatred caused, in time, in the English mind, by the second. (4). After this, one is not surprised on finding that Fleury, who was a confidant of Bossuet, and had taken part in the famous conferences of the time, allows no occasion to pass without attacking Pope Innocent III. In his *History*, which is often a mere rehash of the calumnies of Matthew of Paris, Matthew Villani, Petrarch, and Theodoric of Niem, Fleury has furnished, in the present matter, welcome material to nearly all the Prot-

(1) *History of England*, vol. ii.

(2) *Fall of the Roman Empire*, vol. ii.

(3) *View of the State of Europe during the Middle Ages*, vol. ii.

(4) Chap. 20 and 21.

estant, and to a few Catholic, historians of later days. He accuses Innocent of preferring his own interests and those of his See to those of the universal Church (1); he says that this Pontiff's interference in German affairs was consequent upon the *false* maxims of Gregory VII. (2); he reproves Innocent for so interpreting the constitution of the empire as to deny the right of the emperor to confirm the election of a Pope (3); he finds fault with Innocent's pretension to be an arbitrator between kings. (4). However, in spite of his reproach of Innocent for having, as he thinks, encroached upon the just rights of princes, Fleury is constrained to admit that the Pontiff's conduct was in accordance with the usages of the time. At the Fourth Council of the Lateran there were present 412 bishops, 71 metropolitans or primates, more than 800 abbots, and ambassadors from all the sovereigns; certainly, in such a gathering of the learning, virtue, and responsibility, of Europe, nothing would be decided contrary to the sentiments of the time. In this Council it was decreed that, if any temporal ruler, after being admonished, neglected to clear his domains of heretics, he should be excommunicated; that if he did not obey within a year, the Pope should be notified, in order that he might absolve that ruler's vassals from their oaths of allegiance, and thus open his lands to the conquests of Catholics. Speaking of this decree, Fleury says: "Here the Church seems to encroach upon the secular power; but it must be remembered that at this Council assisted the ambassadors of many sovereigns, who consented to these decrees in the name of their masters." (5). Why then, asks Saint-Cheron of Fleury, "do you find fault with Innocent for using a power the exercise of which, in so solemn a circumstance, after the decisive events of Germany, England, and France, did not call forth the slightest reclamation on the part of the representatives of the sovereigns of Christendom?" Fleury is positively malignant when he comes to speak of the death of Pope Innocent. He says that, after he had excommunicated Louis, the son of Philip Augustus,

(1) *Discourse on the state of the Church in the 11th and 12th centuries.*

(2) Vol. V., B. lxxv., c. 32.

(4) *Ibid.*, c. 58.

(3) *Ibid.*, c. 37.

(5) *Ibid.*, B. lxxvii., 147.

the Pontiff fell into a fever, which lasted some time, "he continuing to eat a great deal, as was his habit (1) In many things, he was excessively rigorous, and for this reason his death caused more joy than sorrow to those who were subject to him. *Matthew of Paris says that John, king of England, knew this Pope for the most ambitious and proudest of all men, and that he was insatiable as regards money, and was capable of every crime to procure it.*"

After this complaisant citation of John Lackland as a witness to the character of Innocent, we are not astonished at Fleury's insinuation that the Pontiff had a narrow escape from hell. He recites a pretended vision of St. Lugaarde, who, after the Pope's death, saw him surrounded by flames, and asked him how he was so tormented, receiving for answer: "For three things, which would have caused my condemnation to eternal fire, had I not repented at the close of my life." (2). Sismondi, one of the most patient of investigators, and therefore one of the most reliable of historians when not overpowered by party spirit, is extremely hostile to Innocent III. : he goes so far as to accuse the Pontiff of having accepted the guardianship of Frederick of Sicily with the design of despoiling him. (3). Capefigue, who reproaches all the Pontiffs with a tendency to "enclose everything within the limits of Catholic dogma," that is, with the habit of regarding things from a Catholic point of view, nearly always speaks of Innocent as actuated by a spirit of ambition and violence. (4). Nevertheless, he thus speaks of this Pontificate: "This Pope is the only Pontiff, contemporary with Philip-Augustus, who shows a vast and

(1) This insinuation of gluttony is not corroborated by the old chroniclers. According to them, Pope Innocent was very simple as to his table. Golden or silver vessels were never seen, unless on ceremonial occasions, such as royal visits, etc.; the service was not rendered by nobles, but by ecclesiastics. There were never more than three courses, and during the meal, a cleric read aloud some pious or learned book. The author of the *Lives* disposes of the charge of money-loving. According to him, Innocent always defrayed the expenses of his journeys; never availing himself of the custom which allowed him to charge the churches, abbays, etc., where he might be. He always resigned all gifts received, and one tenth of all his revenues, to the poor. During a famine at Rome, he fed, at his own expense, 8000 persons a day, besides those to whom he sent succor at their homes. Poor children were allowed, every day, to clear away the leavings of his table. Every Saturday of his reign, after having washed and kissed the feet of twelve pilgrims, he gave them each twelve pieces of silver. But the greatest of all his works of charity was the rebuilding, enlarging, and endowing of by far the most extensive and best furnished and equipped hospital that the world has ever seen to this day; that of Santo Spirito, at Rome, which gives attention, not only to Romans, but to all patients that come to it, and is, besides, an immense foundling and orphan asylum.

(2) B. lxxvii., c. 62.

(3) *Italian Republics*, vol. ii.

(4) *History of Philip-Augustus*, passim.

active capacity which embraces the Catholic universe. There is not a question concerning crowned heads, barons, or castellans; not a private or public quarrel between kings; not a difference between barons and monasteries, that escapes his vigilance. His vast correspondence is yet one of the great monuments of the Middle Ages. His legates and cardinals visit every province, prescribing laws, proclaiming interdicts, pronouncing anathemas, and every one bows the head before the Apostolic lightnings. He would raise armies by a Bull and by Indulgences; he directed the policy of states, interfering in the government of France, England, and the empire, and *merely by the ascendancy of opinion*. Wherever I come across a great ability, I like to recognize it; and, let us say it, Innocent III. ruled his century far more than did Philip-Augustus and the contemporary princes." (1). Michelet acknowledges the influence of Innocent upon his age, he admits the popular enthusiasm in the war on the Albigenses, he shows us the Pontiff trying to lessen the horrors of that struggle and protecting the count of Toulouse and his son; but he makes Innocent responsible for the "immense execration" heaped by many upon the Holy See, and represents him dying with an uneasy conscience. (2). Very different from this estimate is that formed by Du Theil, Lingard, Muller, and Hurter. In the year 1791, M. de la Porte du Theil published a *Collection of Charters, Acts, and Diplomas relating to the History of France*, and in it he gave to the world many hitherto unedited letters of Pope Innocent III. Incited by his studies, he then published, in the ninth year of the "one and indivisible French Republic," the result of his investigations into the reign of Innocent. From this work (3), Saint Chéron, in his *Introduction to Hurter's great book*, makes some lengthy extracts, of which we will give a synopsis: "The name of Innocent III. will always awaken the remembrance of one of the most remarkable personages of history; of one whose virtues and faults will with diffi-

(1) *History of Philip Augustus*, vol. ii.

(2) *History of France*, vol. ii.

(3) It was inserted in the *Notices and Extracts from the MSS. of the National and other Libraries*, published by the National Institute of France, vol. vi., and bore the title: *Biographical Memoir on Robert de Courçon, with Extracts and an Analysis of Ten Letters of Pope Innocent III.*

culty be exactly defined by an impartial philosophy. . . . Who can refuse praise to Innocent's Christian firmness, when he sees him occupied, for fifteen years, sustaining against a powerful king who is blinded by passion the cause of an unfortunate princess, innocently become the object of unjust disgust and of cruel persecution? Thanks to the inflexible Innocent, justice finally triumphed. When this unfortunate queen was again embraced by her spouse and replaced upon her throne, the king owed to the act of justice and of humanity the remarkable return of his subjects' affection, and therefore those incredible and generous efforts which, the next year, in the battle of Bouvines, secured him the victory. . . . If it is hard to totally excuse Innocent's conduct in the affairs of England, and if we avow that the temporal interests of the Holy See were the visible objects of his policy in regard to king John, we cannot deny that in England, on a thousand occasions, he sustained justice, and caused it to triumph, against the most detestable of princes. . . . It was not easy to arrange the difference which agitated Germany. To speak impartially, there was no real injustice, on the part of Innocent, in preferring the cause of Otho to that of Philip of Suabia. Immediately after the death of the latter, Otho lost the good will of his protector; but this was on account of his own ingratitude, and his unfaithfulness to his own engagements. . . . The temporal power of the Holy See in Italy increased during his reign, but if he soon saw the Roman people, for a long time indocile, become submissive; and if the provinces, stolen by the late emperors, soon returned to his obedience. almost without a compelling blow. is it not just to appreciate that ability which restored its ancient brilliancy to the Pontifical throne, and without a bloody revolution?" Lingard speaks as follows of Innocent's deposition of John Lackland: "At first, indeed, the Popes contented themselves with spiritual censures; but in an age when all notions of justice were remodelled after the feudal jurisprudence, it was soon admitted that princes by their disobedience became traitors to God; that as traitors they ought to forfeit their kingdoms, the fees which they

held of God ; and that to pronounce such sentence belonged to the Pontiff, the vicegerent of Christ upon earth. By these means the servant of the servants of God became the sovereign of the sovereigns, and assumed the right of judging them in his court, and of transferring their crowns as he thought just." (1). Speaking of John's becoming a vassal of the Pontiff, the same author says: "Every epithet of reproach has been expended by writers and readers against the pusillanimity of a prince who could lay his dominions at the feet of a foreign priest, and receive them from him again as his feudatory. It was certainly a disgraceful act (2); but there are some considerations which, if they do not remove, will at least extenuate his offence. Though the principles of morality are unchangeable, our ideas of honor and infamy perpetually vary with the ever-varying state of society. To judge impartially of our ancestors, we are not to measure their actions by the standard of our present manners and notions ; we should transport ourselves back to the age in which they lived, and take into the account their political institutions, their principles of legislation and government. Now, in the thirteenth century, there was nothing so very degrading in the state of vassalage. It was the condition of most of the princes of Christendom. The king of Scotland was the vassal of the king of England ; and the king of England the vassal of the king of France. . . . Henry (father of king John), powerful as he was, had become the feudatory of Pope Alexander III. ; and the lion-hearted Richard had resigned his crown to the emperor of Germany, and consented to hold it of him by the payment of a yearly rent. John, in his distress, followed these examples, and the result seems to have recommended his conduct to the imitation of the Scottish patriots, who, to defeat the claim of his grandson, Edward I., acknowledged the Pope for their superior lord, and maintained that Scotland had always been a fief of the Church of Rome. . . . To the king it offered this benefit: that the very power which had so

(1) *History of England*, edit. 1853, vol. ii., c. 3, p. 321, note.

(2) And almost immediately Lingard proceeds to show that it was not a disgrace. In his anxiety to placate his Protestant countrymen, this author often tends to a minimization of the truth, and sometimes verges on the inaccurate.

nearly driven him from the throne was now bound by duty and interest to preserve him and his posterity on it, against all his foes, both foreign and domestic. To the barons it offered a protector, to whom, as superior lord, they might appeal from the despotic government of his vassal. *From that moment they began to demand the grant of their liberties.*" (1). The celebrated Swiss historian, John Müller, says of Pope Innocent: "To great firmness of character he joined sweetness and amenity. Simple and economical in all his habits, he was benevolent even unto prodigality. He fulfilled, toward the young Frederick, his duties of guardian like a magnanimous prince and a loyal cavalier. (2). If the reader wishes to become familiar with the Pontificate of Innocent III., and hence with the spirit of a time so different from our own, he can do no better than to carefully read Hurter's admirable work. What the Protestant Ranke partly did in the way of lifting clouds of prejudice from our view of several Pontiffs; what the Protestant Voigt nearly entirely did for St. Gregory VII., that the Swiss Protestant minister fully did for Innocent III.

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE ALBIGENSES.

The writers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries gave the name of Albigenses to the inhabitants of Lower Languedoc, and hence the heretics who appeared in that part of France in the twelfth century, and who especially flourished in the city of Albi, came to be known as Albigenses. Many of these sectarians were originally Catharist Waldenses; hence we find, among other names of the Albigenses, that of Cathari applied to them. The basis of their doctrine was Manicheism, but variously modified by the different vagaries of the many heretical leaders, such as Peter of Bruis, Arnold of Brescia, etc.; hence we meet with

(1) We italicise the last sentence, as well worth the reader's particular consideration. *Ibid.*, p. 331.

(2) *Universal History*, vol. ii., c. 9.

the names Petrobruisions, Arnoldists, Henricians, etc., as well as such designations as Patarini, Passagers, Publicans, derived from their morals and customs. (1). The Albigenses were a confused agglomeration of heretics, most of them too ignorant to be able to give an account of what they really believed, only agreeing in rejecting the Sacraments and external services of the Church, and in a violent hatred of the hierarchy. Hence we often find that the writers who treat of their errors, are not always concordant in their descriptions, though they sufficiently agree, while narrating the principal Albigensian doctrines, to enable us to understand the general system. Among the contemporary authors who combated these errors, the principal are Peter of Vaux-Cernay, a Parisian Cistercian, who, with his uncle, the abbot Guido, labored many years in this cause, and was present at the final Crusade (2); Vincent of Beauvais (3); William of Puyslaurens, chaplain to the younger Raymond of Toulouse. (4).

The errors of the Albigenses are summed up, as follows, by Peter of Vaux-Cernay. (5). There are two Creators: the good God, author of the invisible, and the evil God, author of the visible world. The latter was the author of the Old Testament, and was a liar, for he told our first parents, say the Albigenses, that they would die if they ate of the forbidden tree; the former was the author of the New Testament, and this part of Scripture alone the Albigenses respected, together with such passages of the Old Testament as were inserted into it. The evil God was a homicide, for he destroyed Sodom, Pharaoh's hosts, and the Egyptians; and he was the author of the deluge. The good God cures souls, the evil one bodies. (6). All the patriarchs, Prophets, etc., are damned; the Baptist was one of the greater demons. The Christ who was born in the visible Bethlehem, and crucified at Jerusalem, was a wicked man; Mary Magdalen was his concubine; the good Christ, who

(1) They were called *Pifres* and *Patrins*, because they were, as a rule, unrefined; *Publicains*, because they were supposed to hold their women in common; *Passagers*, because they were energetic proselytizers; *Cathari*, *Bons-Hommes*, because they affected to be pure, above all other men.

(2) *History of the Albigenses*, dedicated to Innocent III.

(3) *Historical Mirror*, B. xxix.

(4) *Chronicle*.

(5) *Loc. cit.*, c. 11.

(6) Roger of Hoveden, year 1176.

was born and crucified in an invisible world, was never in this world, unless spiritually in the body of Paul. The good God had two wives, Colla and Colliba, and from them many children. (1). The Roman Church is a den of thieves, and the whore of the Apocalypse. They denied all the Sacraments. Matrimony was whoredom, and no one who begat children could be saved. Our souls are the apostate spirits of heaven and after many transmigrations will return to their first bodies, which, after their rebellion, remained glorified in space; for this present body, there is no resurrection. There were two orders of Albigenses; the perfect led, apparently, an austere life, lived continently, and professed a horror for lies and oaths; the believers lived like other men, and were often of irregular morals, believing that they could be saved by the faith and the imposition of hands of the perfect. (2). The above account of the Albigensian doctrines is confirmed by the *Profession of Faith* signed by Bernard Primus, Durand of Osca, and other numerous converts, who were convinced of their errors at the Conference of Pamiers, in 1210, by Guido of Vaux-Cernay. (3).

Of the few princes who favored the Albigenses, the most powerful was Raymond VI., count of Toulouse. Under the reign of his father, who was nearly always at war, heresy had prospered in the large and wealthy principality, although Raymond V. was himself a devout Catholic. The young Raymond, owing to his father's almost constant absence from home, had passed most of his time with heretics, and had imbibed their errors; when his father died, in 1194, he extended his open protection to them, and even gave a hundred marks to every chevalier who would

(1) Some said that there was only one Creator, who had two sons, Christ and the devil.

(2) The morals of the Albigenses may be judged by the following passage from Luke of Tuy, a Spanish convert: "*Nulla est nociva delectatio, quam non pertranseat coram luxuria; abutitur filius matre, frater fratre, pater filia.*" Cæsius of Heisterback says that at the siege of Béziers the heretics flung the Bible from the ramparts, "*mingentes super eam.*" Another went to the high altar of the cathedral of Toulouse, and *ventrem purgavit, and palla altaris immunditias deterisit. Quidam, scorto super altare collocato, Veneri indulserunt.*"—One of the most insulting epithets in the English language, indicative of a vice to which these heretics were addicted, is derived from one of their names—*Bulgari*, from which came the French *Bougres* and *Bougherie*.

(3) This conference was held with the Albigensian leaders by the holy Spanish bishop, Diego of Osma, who, with St. Dominick, had been preaching the faith in all the heretical districts. Raymond Roger, the heretical count of Foix, presided, and master Arnold of Campranhan, a priest favorable to the Albigenses, was made arbiter. The result was the submission of Arnold, and the conversion of many of the inhabitants of Pamiers.

embrace their doctrine. (1). His violence against certain monks caused his excommunication by Pope Celestine III., but Innocent III. absolved him. Raymond's most active ally, and the most cruel enemy of the Church in France, was Raymond Roger, count of Foix. The other protectors of heresy were Raymond Roger de Béziers, lord of Carcassonne; Gaston, viscount of Béarn; Bernard, count of Comminges; and Gerold, count of Armagnac. The cause of heresy was greatly helped by the negligence of the archbishop of Narbonne, Berengarius, who constantly resided in his rich abbey of Mount Aragon, and for ten years had not visited his diocese, disregarding the complaints of the Papal legate and the threats of the Pontiff. He was guilty of the worst kinds of simony; his priests frequently lived in concubinage, were addicted to dice and hunting, and became lawyers, jugglers, and physicians. (2). After many attempts to recall archbishop Berengarius to a sense of duty, Pope Innocent III. deposed him. (3). In speaking of the progress of heresy in the South of France, Hurter ascribes it partly, "among the great, to their free and luxurious life, which passed along in joy and in love, in tournaments and in play. The troubadours, who found welcome at every Provençal court, who wandered from castle to castle, who scattered their railleries on holy and profane things in promiscuous assemblies of men and women, not sparing bishops and priests, monks and nuns, excited and sustained at first an indifference, and finally, an aversion for the ministers of the Church. In the cities, the middle classes welcomed doctrines which flattered their ideas, their tastes, and that desire of enjoyment permitted them by their wealth." In 1203, the legates of Pope Innocent III. succeeded in obtaining the expulsion of the Albigenses from Toulouse, and in receiving from the principal citizens an oath of fidelity to the Church, but the resistance of the surrounding cities nullified this measure,

(1) He caused jugglers to deride and mimic the priest, during the Mass, thus publishing his want of all veneration. He despised the ties of marriage, and abandoned a woman so soon as she ceased to please. (See William of Puy Laurens, c. 5; *Christian Gaul*, xiii., 329). So violent did the Albigenses become, during the first years of his rule, that, whenever a bishop wished to visit a parish, he begged the lord of the place to accompany him.

(2) *Epistles of Innocent III.*, x., 68; iii., 24; vii., 75; vi., 242.

(3) Sismondi declares that the scandalous life of some prelates favored the growth of heresy, and yet he blames the missionaries for "arrogance" in trying to reform them.

and in the year 1204 the legate Arnold wrote to the Pontiff: "I do not dare to hope for success, for we have no help from the bishops; I wish therefore to be relieved of my mission." The other legates hearkened to the encouraging exhortations of Innocent, and marched through the country, exhorting, disputing, and reprimanding, but they, too, met with so little success and so much danger, that they were about to demand a recall, when the Spanish bishop, Diego de Osma, and Dominick de Guzman met them at Montpellier, and revived their courage. These penetrating minds had realized that nothing but simplicity would affect a people whose favorite excuse was the ostentation of the orthodox clergy. Taking off their shoes and dismissing their attendants, Diego, Dominick, and the legate Arnold (1), entered upon their apostolic mission, obtaining much success, and gaining the affection even of those they did not convert. At Montreal, they were joined by the Cistercians Guido and Peter of Vaux-Cernay, with thirty members of their order. The missionaries now divided into small bands, and resumed their work, living entirely upon alms, and making all their journeys on foot. In a short time, most of the Cistercians became discouraged, Diego de Osma was recalled to Spain, but Dominick de Guzman, the future founder of the Friar Preachers, persisted in his mission, obtained new co-laborers, and continued as before. (2). What would have been the result, had not the murder of the legate, Peter de Castelnau, precipitated severe measures against the Albigenses and their protectors, we cannot tell. A long and cruel war ensued, but as we are not bound to defend its excesses, or to write a panegyric upon Simon de Montfort, and to excuse his

(1) The other legate, Peter de Castelnau, being specially obnoxious to the Albigenses, was advised by Diego to withdraw. He did so, and in 1207 he reconciled the people of Montpellier with the king of Aragon, and re-established peace between the nobles of the two sides of the Rhone. Failing in his endeavor to make the count of Toulouse take severe measures against the heretics, he excommunicated him. Raymond then submitted, again prevaricated, and was again excommunicated. The next morning, Jan. 15, 1208, having celebrated mass, Peter was attacked by two unknown men, one of whom killed him by a thrust of his lance. The martyr's body was buried in the abbey of St. Giles, and in 1562 the "Reformers" burned his remains.

(2) During this mission, St. Dominick gained the esteem of many of the poorer nobles, and they confided to him the care of their daughters. For these he founded an establishment near the church of Prouille, assigning them a common rule, at first that of St. Augustine. Very soon this convent could boast of having been the cradle of the great Dominican Order.

ambition, we refer the reader to profane history for its details. (1).

But there is one alleged incident of this war which we cannot overlook. Velly, d'Anquetil, Sismondi, Michelet, Henri Martin, and nearly every encyclopedist, record a presumed act of barbarity, on the part of a Papal legate, which has no good historical foundation. Even Guizot, in full session of the French Academy (Jan. 24, 1861), in his *Reply to F. Lacordaire's Inaugural Discourse*, did not hesitate to tell the illustrious Dominican: "Six hundred years ago, Monsieur, if my comrades of to-day met you, they would have angrily assailed you as a hateful persecutor; and your brethren, zealously exciting the conquerors of heretics, would have cried: 'Strike, strike; God will distinguish his own!'" The event here designated is supposed to have happened at the storming of Béziers, in 1209. Now the contemporary narratives of this action are five; one by Arnald, abbot of Citeaux, and Milo, a Papal secretary—both legates of the Holy See to the Crusaders; a second by Peter of Vaux-Cernay; a third by an unknown chronicler, styled the anonymous Provençal; a fourth by William of Puy Laurens; and a fifth by Cæsarius, a monk of Heisterbach, in the diocese of Cologne. The last author alone says anything of the alleged incident, and in these words: "The Crusaders arrived before a large city, called Béziers, which was said to have contained more than a hundred thousand inhabitants, and they besieged it. Before the eyes of the Crusaders, the heretics urinated on a volume of the holy Gospels, and threw it from the ramparts into the Christian ranks, accompanying it with a shower of arrows, and saying: 'Wretches, behold your law!' But Christ, Author of the Gospels, did not pass unpunished this outrage against himself. For some of the soldiers, burning with zeal for the faith, and like lions, similar to those warriors of whom we read in *Macchabees*, II., c. xi., 11, intrepidly scaled the walls, and forcing the gates, took the city, putting to flight the terrified heretics. But having

(1) CANTU, *Univ. Hist.*—PAP. MASSON, *Annals*.—BLANC, *French Revolution*, vol. i., p. 16; vol. v., p. 369; vol. vi., pp. 160, 254; edit. 1847.—WITCHE, *The Albigensians in the Face of History*, 1878.—See also NICOLAS, *Relations of Socialism with Protestantism and all other heresies*, 1852.

learned from the heretics that many Catholics were in their ranks, the soldiers addressed the abbot, saying: 'What are we to do? We cannot distinguish the good from the wicked.' Then, *it is said*, the abbot and others, fearing lest their danger might cause the heretics to feign that they were Catholics, and that, after having saved their lives, they would return to their errors, cried: 'Strike, the Lord will know His own!' And therefore innumerable persons were put to death in this city." So speaks, indeed, Cæsarius of Heisterbach, a monk who was six hundred miles from the scene of action, and who can only report, "it is said." But the legates Arnald and Milo, Peter of Vaux-Cernay, the anonymous Provençal, and William of Puy Laurens, all either participants in the action or witnesses of it, make not the slightest allusion to the sanguinary order. Nor is the authority of Cæsarius so great, or are the restraining motives of the others so evident, that the negative evidence of these latter must yield to the positive testimony of the former. The four narratives which are silent as to the alleged command were written by persons who show that they were, by no means, men of moderation, that they were advocates of the utmost severity against the Albigenes, and that they would have been not at all unwilling to record an instance of what, though we now call it cruelty, would have been, at that time, regarded as a matter of course by both parties in the strife. (1). But it is easy to show that the dialogue between the legate Arnald and the soldiers, narrated by Cæsarius, did not take place. According to the four witnesses above mentioned, and all the old French chroniclers, the following were the circumstances of the taking of Béziers.

(1) Arnald coolly says: "The city of Béziers was taken, and our troops put to the sword nearly 20,000 persons, sparing neither rank, nor sex, nor age."—Modern authors have increased this number to 100,000, and cite Cæsarius as authority. Now this monk merely says that Béziers "*was said*" to have contained 100,000 inhabitants before the siege, and he does not say that all were destroyed, but that "innumerable persons were put to death." But it is very unlikely that Béziers was so densely populated. In his *History of the City and Bishops of Béziers* (1854), Sabatier says: "If it is true, as I believe, that Béziers has never varied in extent, the estimate of 15,000 or 12,000 will be the most probable one. And all the inhabitants were not killed; many certainly departed before the siege, and many may have escaped before the assault. The city was not entirely destroyed, for in Aug., 1210, Simon de Montfort gave to the abbey of Cîteaux a house situated in Béziers. In our own day, we observe several mansions the architectural style of which indicates a date anterior to the thirteenth century." How, we ask, could 100,000 have dwelt in a space destined for 15,000 or less? In the *Bulletin of the Archaeological Society of Béziers*, series II., vol. 2, may be consulted a topographical study, tending to prove that the victims of the celebrated massacre numbered less than 8000.

Some of the besieged made a sortie, and wounded one of the Crusaders who had advanced to the bridge. Then the Ribalds, as a certain kind of soldiers were called, rushed to repel the sortie, without even taking time to put on their armor. So impetuous were they, that they entered the town behind their foes. "They made the assault," says Peter of Vaux-Cernay, "without the knowledge of the gentlemen of the army, and instantly took the city." "The inhabitants of Béziers," says William de Puy Laurens, "could not resist the first attack of the common soldiers." The legate Arnald says that, while he was debating with the leaders as to how they might save the Catholics supposed to be in the city, "the *Ribaldi* and other inferior persons, without awaiting orders, invaded it." The anonymous Provençal attributes the beginning of the carnage to the *truands*, and says that the leaders had nothing to do with it. It is evident, then, that the impressive dialogue did not cause the slaughter. (1).

Protestant authors have always found plenty of material in the Crusade proclaimed by Innocent III. against the Albigenses for the charge of intolerance and cruelty against the Catholic Church, and were the present a question as to whether heretics ought to be converted or punished by fire and sword, we would ask to be excused from arguing it. But besides being heretics, the Albigenses were enemies of public order; the very existence of society was threatened by them. They taught that marriage was a crime. What government, even in the nineteenth century, would like to see that doctrine embraced and practically carried out by its subjects? They taught that all the pastors of the Catholic Church were devouring wolves, and that they should be exterminated; nor was their talk mere mouthing and idle declamation—wherever they could, they reduced it to action. They taught that all the ceremonies of the Church, all her external signs of worship, the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, all things, in fine, which presented her as a visible

(1) The narratives of Cæsarius are regarded as grotesquely improbable by Possevin, Vossius, Dupin, Dufresney, and Fleury. In our own day, Hurter, Alzog, and an eminent critic, Daunou, hold the same opinion. The last author, in the *Literary History of France*, vol. xvii., gives a biography of Arnald of Cîteaux, and declares that he cannot receive the account by Cæsarius, concerning the part played by the legate at Béziers. It is to be noted that Daunou is very hostile to the Middle Ages.

mediator between God and man, were intolerable abuses, crying evils and impostures, which were to be destroyed and banished from the face of the earth. Were the faithful to quietly bow their heads, and allow the extirpation of all they held most dear? Were the Albigenses to be exempted from tolerating the belief of Christendom, and Christians to be made to tolerate their own destruction? Robbery, outrage, and murder, under the cloak of religion, were devastating society. What but the strong hand of power could remedy the evil? When a riot breaks out among us, do we shut up our police and military, and send a few preachers to talk to the mob? Again, we must remember that the Church did not recommend force until every other means had been exhausted, and then, in the Third Council of the Lateran, war was declared on "the Belgians, Aragonese, Navarrese, Basques, Cotterels (knifers), and Triaverdins, who respected neither churches nor monasteries; sparing not orphans, women, or old age; but pillaging and desolating everywhere." (1). A regular Crusade was finally preached by Innocent III., and the alacrity with which it was taken up is a strong argument for its necessity and its justice, unless we are willing to suppose that the chivalry of France were all either fools or villainous ruffians. But the civil wickedness and self-outlawry of the Albigenses is proved by the public confession of the count of Toulouse, made to the legate, in 1209, and by the testimony of contemporary historians who were ocular witnesses of the horrors they narrate. And what must have been the rank and file, in the matter of fanatical cruelty, when the royal count of Toulouse caused his own brother to be strangled, because he had returned to the faith? (2).

The excesses and crimes committed by the Crusaders of Simon de Montfort are not to be excused, but it is certain that Pope Innocent was far from favoring or excusing them; he would have punished them, could his voice have been

(1) Canon 27.

(2) Baldwin, brother of Raymond, had been reconciled with the Church, and fought afterwards under the banners of Montfort. Being betrayed into the hands of Raymond by the lord de l'Olme, he was given to the count of Foix to be dealt with. That nobleman, aided by some chevaliers, hung the unfortunate to a tree with his own hands.—PETER OF VAUX-CERNAY, c. 75.

heard. Such is the verdict of the impartial Du Theil, of whose erudite work we had occasion to speak in the last chapter. "Of all the ministers of the church, Pontiffs, bishops, abbots and monks, who, through mistaken piety, or imprudent zeal, or hypocritical ambition, nourished the germ, hastened the development of this bloody quarrel, directed its course, or prolonged its consequences, it is certain Pope Innocent III. had the least reason for self-reproach. . . . During the course of his Pontificate, he appears to have been always on his guard against any suggestions of worldly interest to mingle injustice with the work of the faith, especially after the ambition of Simon de Montfort had become the cause wherefore the war was so cruelly prolonged. . . . Not only the letters of the Pontiff, but history, and the original Acts, show that Innocent did not consent to a legitimatization of Montfort's conquests until the very last moment, and then he was deceived. For a long time he repelled the insinuations of the nuncio Thediusius, a minister who was artful, miserly, cruel, I almost say ferocious and barbarous. Whenever Raymond could make his own voice heard, or cause his justification to reach the ears of the Pontiff, his complaints were heeded, and Innocent begged the chiefs, both lay and ecclesiastical, of the Crusade, to reconcile their fiery zeal for religion with the regards due to humanity. Vain exhortations! He could not moderate so strong an impulse. Innocent III. . . . believing, perhaps, little in the sincerity of the offers and protestations of Raymond, who had really never thoroughly abandoned the party of the innovators; or, perhaps, fearing that heresy would take firmer root, did not dare to exert an authority which, under the circumstances, might be compromised. Hence he was forced to sanction the spoliation of the unfortunate Raymond; but it must be admitted that it was in spite of himself."

Mosheim tells us that the heretics of the thirteenth century all agreed that Catholicism was a mass of superstitions, the rule of the Popes was a mere usurpation and a tyranny. Nor, he asserts, did they rest satisfied with the expression of these opinions; they refuted superstition and imposture

by arguments taken from Scripture, and they declaimed against the vices and power of the clergy with a zeal very pleasing to princes and magistrates, who were sick of the pretensions of Churchmen. (1). That the weavers, laborers, etc., of Languedoc and Provence, and their cut-throat friends of Navarre and Aragon, were not very subtle doctors of theology, or very accurate expositors of Scripture, the reader will perceive by a glance at their doctrines. Like the more modern Huguenots, their theological arguments were empty declamations, foul insults, indecent railleries, and reasonings by the strong hand; their use of a "free and open Bible" caused them to more than rival, in absurdity, iniquity, and blasphemous impurity, their spiritual ancestors, the Manicheans of St. Augustine's acquaintance. As for Mosheim's remark about the disgust felt by the civil powers at the usurpations of Churchmen, it is refuted by the prompt zeal with which these powers repressed the Albigenses, at the command of those Churchmen. Basnage and some other Protestants are desirous of establishing a spiritual descent from the Albigenses, but they forget that these gentry, without bidding farewell to their own theories, could not have signed any Lutheran, Calvinist, or Anglican profession of faith. And is there one Protestant sect ready to concur in the absurdities and blasphemies of the Albigenses?

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE TWELFTH GENERAL COUNCIL: FOURTH OF THE LATERAN.

In May of the year 1213, the sixteenth of his Pontificate, Pope Innocent III. convoked an Ecumenical Council to meet at Rome in November, 1215, to concert measures for the recovery of the Holy Land and for the reformation of Church discipline, and to condemn the heresies of the Albigenses. The Council met under the presidency of the Pontiff in the Lateran basilica, Nov. 18, 1215. There were present 491 bishops, of whom 77 were primates and metro-

(1) *Cent. XIII.*, p. ii., c. 5, § 2.

politans, and two patriarchs, those of Constantinople and Jerusalem (1), many procurators for absent prelates, and more than 800 abbots and priors. Also in attendance were the "orators" of Frederick, king of Sicily, and emperor-elect; of the emperor of Constantinople, and of the kings of France, England, Aragon, Hungary, Jerusalem, and Cyprus. (2). Pope Innocent opened the Council with a sermon on the words of Christ, "With desire I have desired to eat this pasch with you, before I suffer." (3) (Luke, xxii., 15). The following are the principal passages: "As Christ is my life, and death my gain, I do not refuse to drink from the chalice of suffering which is offered me for the defense of the Catholic faith, for the deliverance of the Holy Land, and for the liberty of the Church, although I have desired to continue in the flesh until the accomplishment of the work begun. . . . I wish to celebrate with you a triple pasch: a corporal, a spiritual, and an eternal one. A corporal one, a passage from one place to another, to deliver oppressed Jerusalem; a spiritual one, a passage from one condition of things to another, for the improvement of the universal Church; an eternal one, a passage from this life to another, to eternal glory. . . . My brothers, what ought we now to do? I defer entirely to your will; I open my heart entirely to you; I submit to your advice; I am ready, if you deem it good, to give myself all the trouble, to go to kings, princes, and peoples, even to journey to the Holy Land, and, if I can, to excite all with a loud voice to fight the battle of the Lord, to avenge the insults offered to Jesus Christ, who, because of our sins, has been expelled from His country and from the home He bought with His Blood, and in which he accomplished the means of salvation for our redemption. We priests of the Lord ought to attach a particular importance to the succoring of the Holy Land with our goods and our blood. . . . The

(1) The patriarch of Antioch sent a substitute, he being seriously ill; the Saracens prevented the patriarch of Alexandria from attending, but he sent one of his deacons.

(2) As an illustration of the ideas of the time, we notice that the prince-bishop of Liège appeared at the first session in the mantle and scarlet hat of a count; in the second, dressed in the green costume of a duke; in the third, vested as a bishop. Counting the bishops, abbots, representatives of princes, theologians, notaries, etc., the attendants at this Council numbered 2283.

(3) Eight months after, Pope Innocent died.

time has come when, as the apostle said, judgment should commence in the House of the Lord, for every corruption of the people comes principally from the clergy. When the priest, the anointed one, sins, he causes the people to sin. . . . Faith is perishing, religion is disfigured, liberty is threatened, justice is trodden under foot. Heretics are lifting their heads; also schismatics. Perjurers are venting their fury; the children of Hagar are triumphant."

One of the first acts of the Council was to condemn the errors of the Albigenses. Against their prime error, derived from the Manicheans, that there are two supreme Principles, the Council declares there is but one God, one Principle, one Creator of all things visible and invisible; the demons were created good, they became evil of their own accord; man sinned, yielding to the suggestion of the devil. Against the Albigensian error on the Eucharist, the Council teaches that "the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are truly contained in the Sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine; the bread being transubstantiated, by the divine power, into the Body, and the wine into the Blood." Against their error on Baptism, it is declared that the Sacrament avails for both infants and adults. Against the error on the use of matrimony, it is taught that virgins and the continent are not the only ones to merit eternal happiness, but that the married also, who lead a just life, please God. The Council then condemned the errors of the abbot Joachim of Flora and of Amalricus. (1).

But the principal object of the Council was to concert measures for a general Crusade. Hence Innocent ordered that, on the 1st June following, all Crusaders who wished to go by sea should be at Brindisi or Messina, ready to embark; those who preferred the land route should march, accompanied by a Papal legate, on the same day. Orders were

(1) Joachim introduced a quaternity in the Trinity, holding that the divine essence was a something distinct from the three Persons. He was not, however, a heretic, for some time before his death he expressly submitted all his opinions to the judgment of the Church, and he died fifteen years before the Twelfth Council was held. The Council plainly recognizes the good dispositions of Joachim in its decree against his doctrine.—Amalricus, a clerk of Chartres, taught that no one could be saved who did not believe himself to be a member of Christ. His disciples added that the law of Christ, with its Sacraments, etc., had ceased, and that with themselves commenced the reign of the Holy Ghost; God was good, but they said nothing of His justice: all kinds of crime were consistent with charity.

given to all the bishops and priests who would accompany the troops to persevere in prayer and in preaching, to insist upon penance for all sin, to practise and inculcate modesty in dress, frugality, and abstemiousness. "In order that nothing may be neglected," said the Pontiff, "in this work of Jesus Christ, we command all the patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, abbots, and pastors of souls, to preach seriously the word of the Cross to those who are confided to their care, and to conjure, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the one and only true and eternal God, all the kings, dukes, princes, marquises, counts, barons, and other nobles, the citizens of all cities, towns, and villages, that those who themselves cannot depart will equip a proper number of warriors, and furnish them with necessaries for three years; and all this for the remission of their sins. All who will donate ships, or construct them, for this object, will share in the pardon. If there is any one so ungrateful to the Lord our God, as to refuse all contribution, announce to him, in the apostolic name, that one day he will render an account before the tribunal of the severe Judge . . . In all the churches, the faithful will pray the Lord of armies to grant prosperity to the Crusaders, and success to their great task." And that it might not be said that the Pope himself did nothing, Innocent pledged himself to restrict his expenses to the smallest amount, to give at once 30,000 livres, and a ship for the Roman contingent. All clergymen were obliged, for three years, to give to the cause a twentieth of their revenues; the cardinals to contribute one tenth. Proper provision was made for the families and properties of all Crusaders, and all interest on money loaned to them was forbidden.

The affairs of the empire also occupied the attention of the Council. Misfortune had made Otho more docile, and he had already tried to be reconciled with the Church. The Milanese sent a deputy to the Council to plead his cause, while the marquis of Monferrato spoke for Frederick. The marquis declared that no regard should be extended to Otho, who had violated his oath of fidelity to the Roman See, and had not given up the states stolen from it; at that

very moment, he was upholding an excommunicated bishop, and was keeping another prelate in prison; he had styled Frederick, "the priests' king," had destroyed a convent, and converted another into a fortress. The factions broke into mutual insults; therefore Innocent rose from the throne, and left the basilica. Then the Council confirmed the election of Frederick as king of Germany.

The mind of the Council was also directed to the late events in England. Deputies were present to plead the cause of John's revolted barons, but they were told that, being excommunicated, they could not be heard. (1). Louis, son of Philip I., to whom the barons had offered the English crown, and who was preparing to seize it, was excommunicated. The fathers also considered the case of Raymond of Toulouse. Accompanied by the counts of Foix and Comminges, count Raymond and his son appeared before the Pontiff, and threw themselves on their knees. Innocent kindly bade them arise, and then they formulated their complaints against Simon de Montfort, who, despite their submission to the Papal legates, had despoiled them of their dominions. These complaints, re-echoed by Foix and Comminges, showed Innocent that his legates in Provence had deceived him. A few prelates spoke warmly in favor of the counts, but Foulques of Toulouse denounced them, especially the count of Foix, with greater warmth. After many recriminations, the disputants were checked by the Pope, who said that, as the four counts had promised lasting obedience to the Church, it would be unjust to deprive them of their principalities. The French prelates did not welcome this remark, but a chanter of the cathedral of Lyons

(1) Some time before the meeting of the Twelfth Council, Pope Innocent had condemned the action of the English barons in revolting against a vassal of the Holy See. They ought, he said, not to have made themselves judges in the matter at issue. England had become a fief of the Holy See, and, even though the king had the will, he could not give away the rights of his crown without the consent of the suzerain. Innocent therefore concluded that he ought to annul the concessions made by John, as having been obtained in contempt of the Holy See, and to the impediment of the great design of the time, the Crusade. Writing to the barons, the Pope stated his reasons, and exhorted them to lay their claims before the Council about to meet at Rome, promising that he would look to the abolition of all grievances, and that the clergy and people would be confirmed in their ancient liberties. But the barons persisted, and they were strengthened by the active sympathy of archbishop Langton. The Pontiff ordered this prelate to excommunicate the refractory nobles, and on his refusal to do so, he was suspended. Langton attended the Twelfth Council, but he could not obtain from the Pontiff the restoration of his episcopal faculties, and only escaped deposition by promising not to return to England until the troubles were settled. MATTHEW of Paris; ALBERICUS; Anonymous Continuator of ROGER of Hoveden.

arose and said : " Yes, Holy Father, count Raymond has unhesitatingly given up his fortresses to your legate ; he has been one of the first to take the Cross ; since the siege of Carcassonne, he has fought for the Church against his own nephew, the count of Béziers. If you do not give him his domains, it will be a shame for you and the Church. As for you, bishop of Toulouse, you love neither your prince nor your people. You have kindled a fire in Toulouse which no one can extinguish. By your fault, ten thousand men have been killed ; shall more perish ? You do not consider the Apostolic See. Is it right, Holy Father, that so many persons should be sacrificed to one man's hatred ? " The Pontiff then protested that he himself had never commanded the spoliation of Raymond. The bishop of Agde arose and defended Simon, who, he said, had spent himself, day and night, for so long a time, in the service of the Church. Innocent then declared that " he was forced to admit that he had received several complaints against Simon and the legates. But, even though the count of Toulouse were culpable, the son ought not therefore to be punished. Many of the French bishops then threatened that, if Montfort's conquests were taken from him, they would combine to restore them. But the friend of St. Dominick, the holy bishop of Osma, whom we have seen a bare-footed missionary among the Albigenses, took the part of the young Raymond. Innocent then said : " Rest easy regarding the young count ; if Montfort keeps his principality, I will give him another, providing he remains faithful to God and the Church." (1).

The Canons of the Twelfth Council are seventy in number. It has been asserted by some authors, following the footsteps of the apostate De Dominis of Spalato, and of

(1) After the dissolution of the Council, young Raymond remained forty days in Rome. When he went to bid farewell to Innocent, the Pontiff seated him beside himself, and taking him by the hand, said : " My dear son, if you follow my counsels, you will not err. Love God above all else, and serve him faithfully. Never extend your hand to another's domains, but defend your own against all comers. That you may not be without principalities, I give you the Venaissin, Beaucaire, and Provence ; with these, you can live conformably to your rank. If we have another Council, your complaints against Montfort will be heeded." The count replied, " Holy Father, be not angry if I retake my states from the count of Montfort and others who hold them." The Pope answered : " Whatever you do, may God give you grace to commence it well, and to finish it even better." Innocent then blessed him, and handed him the diplomas which guaranteed him the above provinces.—*Chronicles*.

John Barclay (1), that these Canons were not the work of the Council, but were issued by Pope Innocent III., without the assent of the Fathers. Thus Mosheim says: "In this Council, without asking the opinion of any one, Innocent promulgated seventy laws, by which he increased the Pontifical power and the dignity of the priesthood, and introduced several new dogmas, or, as they are commonly called, articles of faith." (2). Barclay even tries to show, from certain expressions in the Conciliary decrees, that these seventy Canons were introduced after the dissolution of the assembly. The following arguments are used by Alexandre (3) in refutation of this assertion. All writers of any name, who have treated of these decrees, have spoken of them as the work of an Ecumenical Council; this is especially true of the decrees on Transubstantiation, on the errors of Joachim, and on the Paschal Communion (at all of which Mosheim aims, as "new articles of faith"). In the Gregorian Collection of Decretals, these Canons are inserted as "by Innocent III., in General Council." Clement V., in diploma abrogating the decretal *Clericis Laicos* of Boniface VIII., ordered that all the decrees of the Lateran Council concerning customs-duties, tributes, etc., should be held inviolate; this action regards the Canon 46 of our Council. (4). In the *Defense of the Liberty of the French Church*, presented to king Louis XI. by the Parisian Parliament, article 33 speaks of the Canons 23 and 24 as edited "by the Council of Lateran, convoked at Rome by Innocent III." Even the Centuriators of Magdeburg, who would let no occasion pass without attacking an argument for Transubstantiation and Sacramental Confession, cast no doubt upon the Conciliary authorship of these Canons (5). But Barclay objects certain expressions of the Council, such as that in chap. 15: "It is known that it was forbidden in the Lateran Council to, etc.," which cannot, he says,

(1) John Barclay was the son of William, a Scotch jurist, and professor of law at Angers. Among other works, William wrote one on *The Power of the Pope*, which John afterwards edited, in opposition to the fifth book of Bellarmine's treatise on *The Roman Pontiff*. John Barclay died in Rome, in 1621.

(2) *Cent. XIII.*, p. ii., c. 3, § 2.

(3) *Cent. XIII.*, diss. 1. art. 2.

(4) This decree of Clement V. is in *Clementines*, B. 3, tit. *Immunity of Churches*, cap. *Quoniam*.

(5) *Cent. XIII.*, c. 9.

have been said by the Council itself. Again, says Barclay, these Canons are not found in the old Collections, they were unknown until John Cochlée gave them to the world, in 1537. (1). But Barclay seems to have forgotten that the Fourth Lateran Council confirmed and re-issued many decrees of the Third Lateran, held under Alexander III. Thus, the 11th, concerning schoolmasters in every cathedral church, refers to the 18th of the Third Lateran; the 33d, on manner of Visitations, refers to the 4th of the same Council; the 29th, on Restitutions, refers to the previous Council's 13th; the 61st, concerning Regulars, refers to its 9th Canon. Therefore the words cited by Barclay refer to the Third Lateran, and not to the Fourth. As for Barclay's remark about Cochlée, it does not follow, because this critic had the Canons in question inserted in the Collection, that they were not edited by the Fourth Lateran, for they were found in the ancient MS. Codex, and in the Gregorian and Clementine Decretals.

We shall now give the principal Canons of the Fourth Lateran Council, making such comments as may appear necessary. The *First* and *Second* refer to the errors of Joachim and Amalricus. (2). The *Third* decrees excommunication and temporal penalties against heretics; also establishes penalties against such lords as do not purge their territories of heresy, excommunicating these lords, and decreeing that, after a year's obstinacy, the Pontiff shall free their vassals from the oath of allegiance. Those who condemn the temporal punishment of heretics in all circumstances would do well to read the opinions of St. Augustine on the matter. (3). The *Fifth* renews the ancient privileges of the patriarchal sees, and decrees that "After the Roman Church, which, as mother and mistress of all the faithful of Christ, has, by the Lord's disposition, the principality of ordinary power over all others, the church of Constantinople shall have the first place, that of Alexandria the second, that of

(1) See the Epistle of Cochlée in the edition of the *Councils* by the Franciscan, Peter Crabbe; Cologne, 1538.

(2) They are inserted in *Decretals*, B. I., cap. *Firmiter*, and cap. *Damnamus*, tit. *De Summa Trinitate* and *Fide Catholica*.

(3) *Against the Epistle of Armenian*, B. i., c. 7; *Against Gaudentius*, B. i., c. 25; *Epistle 93 (48) to Vincent*; *Epistle 186 (70) to Count Boniface*. The Third Canon is inserted in the Gregorian Collection, B. v., tit. *Hereticis*, cap. *Excommunicamus*.

Antioch the third, that of Jerusalem the fourth." After the patriarchs have sworn obedience to the Pope, and have received the pallium from him, they may confer it upon their metropolitans. They may also have a cross borne before them, unless the Pontiff or his legates are present. They may receive appeals from their own provinces, "saving appeals to the Apostolic See." (1). The *Eighth* prescribes the course of proceeding in an "Inquisition." There must be accusation, denunciation, and inquiry. Before a person can be denounced as a heretic, he must have been fraternally admonished; before an inquiry, there must be notoriety in his crime. The inquiry must be made in presence of the accused, unless he is contumacious; the charge and names of the witnesses must be communicated to him, and his exceptions noted. (2). The *Ninth* orders that, when more than one rite (such as Latin and Greek, Greek and Slavonic, Greek and Armenian, Armenian and Coptic) are co-existent in a diocese, as occurs to this day, there shall be only one diocesan, but he may appoint another bishop to act as his vicar in administering the affairs of his particular rite. (3). The *Eleventh* orders the observation of the Third Lateran Canon regarding schoolmasters in every cathedral church, and adds that the same rule be extended to all churches where the revenue can afford it. (4). The *Thirteenth* prohibits the institution of new Religious Orders, and decrees that no monk shall belong to more than one monastery, or no abbot govern more than one. (5). The *Twentieth* orders that the Eucharist and Chrism be kept under lock and key; if he whose duty this is, neglects it, he shall be suspended for three months. (6). The *Twenty-first* reads as follows: "All the faithful of both sexes, when they have reached the age of discretion, shall, at least once a year, confess their sins privately (*solus*) to their own priest, and shall perform the enjoined penance as well as they can (*pro viribus*); reverent-

(1) *Decretals*, tit. *Privilegiis*.

(2) *Ibid.*, B. v., cap. *Qualiter*, tit. *Accusationibus*.

(3) *Ibid.*, cap. *Quoniam*, tit. *Officio Judicis Ordinarii*.

(4) *Ibid.*, cap. *Quia Nonnullis*, tit. *Magistris*. It also decrees that in every metropolitan church there be instituted a Theologian, whose duty it will be to instruct the clergy in what pertains to the care of souls. He must receive a canon's revenue, but will not necessarily be a canon.

(5) *Ibid.*, cap. *Ne nimia*, tit. *Rel. Domibus*.

(6) *Ibid.*, cap. *Statuimus*.

ly receiving, at least at the Paschal time, the Sacrament of the Eucharist, unless perchance, by advice of their own priest, it be deemed proper, for a reasonable cause, that they should abstain for a time from its reception; otherwise, they shall be debarred from entrance to a church, while living, and shall not receive Christian burial, when dead." If a priest should violate the sacramental seal, he is to be deposed, and for life confined in a monastery of the strictest observance. (1). In reference to the above decrees, as well as to the decree on the Eucharist, given against the Albigenses, Mosheim says (2): "Although as yet there was more than one opinion about the manner of Christ's presence in the Holy Supper, and the manner of belief had been defined by no clear and evident law, Innocent pronounced as alone true that opinion which is now held by the Roman Church, and introduced the hitherto unknown word *Transubstantiation*. He then prescribed the belief that it was ordained by divine law that every one should confess and enumerate his sins to a priest, which doctrine had hitherto been, not the public belief of the Church, but only an opinion of certain doctors. Down to this time, although confession of sins was deemed necessary, each one had been free to confess them either to God alone, and in his own mind, or to a priest, with the tongue. Both of these dogmas, being now received as divine, according to the command of Innocent, gave rise to many institutions unknown to the sacred books and to the first Christian age, and which were more apt to encourage, than to obviate, superstition." It is the province of the dogmatic theologian to prove that both the Eucharistic doctrine and that of Sacramental auricular Confession are of divine institution, but if the reader will refer to our chapters on "Canonical Penance," and on the "Eucharistic Faith in the Tenth Century," he will see how false is Mosheim's assertion that auricular confession and the doctrine of Transubstantiation were introduced by Pope Innocent III.

(1) *Ibid.*, cap. *Omnis utriusque sexus*, tit. *Pœnitentiis*. The eccentric Launoy, in a book explanatory of *The Tradition of the Church on the Canon "Omnis Utriusque Sexus,"* contended that by the words "to their own priest," the faithful were obliged to confess, for the Paschal Communion, to their parish-priest. For a refutation of this opinion, see Alexandre's *Diss.* iv., *Cent.* xiii.

(2) *Loc. cit.*

The *Forty-first* Canon declares that no prescription is valid, in either ecclesiastical or civil matters, in which good faith is wanting. (1). The *Forty-seventh* prohibits the launching of an excommunication without previous admonition. (2). The *Fiftieth* restricts the prohibited decrees of matrimony to the first of affinity and the fourth of consanguinity, (3), but by the *Fifty-second* Canon, hear-say testimony cannot be received as evidence of the existence of these impediments. The *Fifty-first* prohibits clandestine marriage, and declares its fruit illegitimate. The pastor who does not forbid any nuptials within the prohibited degrees is suspended from his office for three years. The *Sixty-second* forbids the veneration of any relics of saints, unless they have been approved by the Roman Pontiff.(4). The *Sixty-third* prohibits a bishop from receiving any money for a consecration, ordination, or benediction. (5).

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE CAUSE OF FREDERICK II. AND THE THIRTEENTH GENERAL COUNCIL.

Pope Innocent III. having died at Perugia, on July 16th, (or 17th), 1216, the cardinals, on the following day, raised to the Papacy the cardinal Cenci, Camerlingo of the Roman Church, and priest of the title of SS. John and Paul. Nothing was nearer the heart of Honorius III. than the conquest of the Holy Land, and he was deeply pained when the delay of Frederick II. to join the Crusaders, as he had promised Innocent to do, entailed the destruction of the Christian fleet and the capture of Damietta (1219) by the Saracens. Nevertheless, the Pontiff crowned Frederick as emperor, in 1220, and received his oath to depart with an army for Palestine. (6). Honorius, true to the traditions of

(1) *Decretals*, cap. *Quoniam omne*, tit. *Præscriptionibus*.

(2) *Ibid.*, cap. *Saero*, tit. *Sententia Excommunicationis*.

(3) *Ibid.*, cap. *Non debet*, tit. *De Consanguinitate*.

(4) *Ibid.*, cap. *Cum ex eo*, tit. *De Reliquiis*.

(5) *Ibid.*, cap. *Sicut*, tit. *Simonía*.

(6) After his coronation, Frederick made many wise laws for the liberty of the Church, etc., which are found in Goldastus' *Imperial Constitutions*, but they were not long enforced. He also promised to restore the legacy of the countess Matilda to the Holy See.

the Papacy not to allow Italy to be entirely absorbed by the empire, and for which principle his predecessor had so strenuously combated, exacted from Frederick, before his coronation, an oath to cede the two Sicilies to his son Henry, born of his union with Constance of Aragon; he also required an acknowledgment that the new king would be solely and entirely a vassal to the Holy See. Frederick promised all that was required; but he soon showed that he was more intent upon crushing the Italian Guelphs, who would not submit to his supreme will, than he was upon the conquest of Palestine. The Guelphs were now dominant in Northern Italy; allied against the emperor were Milan, Brescia, Padua, Mantua, Vercelli, Alessandria, Vicenza, Treviso, Bologna, and the powerful marquis of Monferato. Opposed to this league were the count of Savoy, and the Ghibelline cities of Pavia, Cremona, Genoa, Modena, Reggio, and Asti. The war might have gone on indefinitely, but as Frederick made it a pretext for delaying his departure for the Crusade, Pope Honorius bent his energies to terminate it. A peace advantageous to both parties was concluded, but still Frederick delayed to embark for the Crusade. In the year 1227, Pope Honorius III. died, and was succeeded by the cardinal Ugolino dei Segni, bishop of Ostia, as Gregory IX. The new Pontiff found Frederick immersed in voluptuousness, but he continually tried to excite him to military and religious zeal. Now the emperor alleged in excuse his weak health, and then he could not undertake the necessary extensive preparations. He was also occupied, he said, with his honeymoon festivities, he having just been married to Iolande, daughter of John of Brienne, titular king of Jerusalem. But at length he yielded, not so much, probably, because of the Pontiff's threat of excommunication, as because of a hope that he might obtain for himself a new kingdom by means of his wife's precarious rights. At Brindisi there awaited his arrival a large number of Crusaders from France, Italy, England, Germany, Denmark, and Sweden; but before he was ready to start, a plague broke out in the army, and the Landgrave of Thuringia and the greater part of the Crusa-

ders perished. Frederick's delay in the midst of the summer's heat was regarded as the cause of the calamity, and the Christian fleet had scarcely set sail, when the Pope launched an excommunication against him. Gregory IX. himself tells us the reasons for the sentence. First, Frederick had violated his oath to lead a certain number of troops to Palestine, and to contribute a sum of money to the Crusade; second, he had deposed the archbishop of Tarento; third, he had despoiled the Knights Templars; fourth, he had broken his treaty with Raynald of Aversa; fifth, he had robbed of his domains the Crusader, count Roger, who was under the protection of the Holy See, and had kept the son of the count in prison, in spite of the Pontifical protests. (1). Every place where the emperor would reside, was interdicted. The Pontiff gave the kingdom of Sicily to Frederick's father-in-law, John of Brienne, and that prince, having heard a rumor that Frederick had died, promptly accepted. In the meantime, Frederick had arrived in Syria, where he heard of the Pontifical action. He immediately made peace with the Sultan of Damascus, and returned to Italy; his army was too powerful for John of Brienne, and in a short time he recovered his Sicilian dominions. Gregory now issued another decree, freeing all of Frederick's subjects from their obligation of fidelity, whereupon the monarch made overtures of peace. Before the Papal legates he swore to obey the Pontifical mandates, and he was restored to communion. He now began to nourish vast projects: his son Henry managed affairs in Germany, and he was free to give all his attention to Italy. Master of Sicily and of all the southern part of the peninsula: influential in, though only titular sovereign of Tuscany; sustained by the Ghibelline cities, he would be sovereign of Italy, if he could crush the Guelph League of Lombardy. With this object he commenced, in 1236, a war upon the League, at the head of an army of Germans and Saracens (2), aided by troops from the Ghibelline cities, and even by Venice and Genoa, eager to take what appeared to be the

(1) *Epistle to the Bishops of Apulia*, B. i., no. 180.

(2) His Saracens came from Nocera, a settlement he had given them in the Puglia. This place was afterwards called *Nocera de' Pagani*.

safer side. In the year 1239 Pope Gregory again excommunicated Frederick and freed his subjects from their allegiance, "for so long a time as he persisted in his excommunicated condition." The Pontiff also offered the empire to Robert, brother of St. Louis of France, but the French barons objected to his accepting it. To revenge himself, Frederick commenced a violent persecution of the clergy on both sides of the Alps; despoiling the seculars, expelling religious from their monasteries, and imposing heavy tributes on all the churches. He also excited rebellion in Rome. In 1241, Gregory IX. died, and was succeeded by the cardinal Godfrey Castiglione, as Celestine IX; but in seventeen days he also died, and the cardinal Sinibaldo Fieschi, of the title of St. Laurence in Lucina, mounted the throne as Innocent IV. Frederick immediately sent an embassy to the new Pontiff, signifying his desire for reconciliation. The Pontiff sent legates to the emperor, offering to convoke a Council, as Frederick had often desired it, and saying that "if the Church has in any way, outside of her duty, injured the emperor, she is ready to make reparation . . . and to revoke her sentence, and to receive from him, with as much kindness and gentleness as the honor of God and of the Church will permit, satisfaction for the injuries she and her own have received. (1). On the feast of Holy Thursday, 1244, Frederick sent three ambassadors to Innocent, to draw up final conditions of peace. According to Matthew of Paris, the following conditions were accepted. 1st, Frederick would restore all territories taken from the Holy See and its allies. 2d, He would write to all Christian princes, saying that he had not spurned the authority of the Church or the sentence of Gregory IX., but as the latter had not been formally announced to him, he had been advised by his prelates and princes to ignore it; however, he recognized the full spiritual power of the Pontiff over all princes, clerics, and laymen. 3d, He would do penance, by fasting, alms-giving, etc., for his crimes, and, until his absolution, would respect the decree of excommunication, 4th, He would free all

(1) *Epistle 84, B. i.*

imprisoned bishops, and would obey the mandates of the Pope, saving the rights of the empire. 5th, He would revoke all edicts against the allies of the Holy See, would restore all prisoners, and would recall all exiles. However, Frederick soon repented of his acceptance of these conditions, and openly refused to observe them. Pope Innocent, deeming himself insecure in Rome, where the gold of the emperor excited frequent seditions, secretly withdrew from the city, and embarking in a Genoese squadron, proceeded to France. Here he immediately signified his intention of holding a General Council, to consider the state of the Holy Land and of the empire. The customary letters were despatched, the Council being ordered to meet on the Monday following, feast of St. John the Baptist, 1245, in the city of Lyons.

The Thirteenth General Council (First of Lyons) met in the monastery of St. Just, under the presidency of Pope Innocent IV. Besides the cardinals, there were present the patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Aquileia, and 140 bishops. In attendance were also the emperor Baldwin of Constantinople, the count of Toulouse, Thaddeus de Suessa (procurator of Frederick) and the orators of the king of France, St. Louis, of king Henry III. of England, and other Christian princes. In an eloquent sermon on the text: "O all ye that pass by the way, attend, and see if there be any sorrow like to my sorrow!" (*Lam. i., 12.*), Innocent laid open the objects of the Council, comparing the five troubles of the Church with the five wounds of our Lord. The Fathers were to consider, I. the aggressions of the Mohammedans in Christian lands. II. The Greek Schism. III. The prevailing heresies. IV. The rumored capture of Jerusalem by the Saracens. V. The crimes of Frederick II. When the business of the Council commenced, the imperial procurator, Thaddeus de Suessa, an eloquent lawyer, arose and vehemently perorated his master's cause. If Frederick were absolved, he said, he would at once compel the schismatics of the East to obey the Pontiff; he would attack the Saracens, Tartars, etc., with an army equipped at his own expense; he would restore to the

Roman Church all its lost territories, and would indemnify it for all the expense to which he had put it. The Pontiff remembered the value of Frederick's promises and answered that there was but one way for that prince to be reconciled to the Church, namely, to fulfil his already sworn agreements. Thaddeus then offered the kings of France and England as security for his master, but in vain. In the next session, the Pontiff recapitulated the crimes of Frederick. Besides those of heresy and sacrilege, he had given territories in a Christian land to Mohammedan colonists (1); he had made treaties of friendship with the sultan of Babylon and other Mohammedan princes; he had held impure relations with Saracen women; he had been guilty of perjury; he had imprisoned bishops. Among other excuses which Thaddeus made for Frederick, he said that Saracens had been introduced into the Sicilies to punish rebellion; the emperor had held no carnal intercourse with Saracen women, but had simply enjoyed their play, dances, etc.; at any rate, Frederick ought not to be condemned of heresy, before he made his profession of faith, and the orator demanded a delay of proceeding, that he might communicate with his master. A delay of two weeks was then granted, but when the Council again met, Frederick refused to appear, and Thaddeus, in his name, appealed from the present "to a *more general* Council." In answer to this appeal, Innocent replied, "it is your lord's fault that more bishops are not here; hence it is not right to defer sentence, for no one should profit by his own fraud." In the next Session, having recited the crimes of Frederick, the Pontiff issued the following sentence: We forever absolve from their oath all who are bound by an oath of allegiance to him; prohibiting, by our Apostolic authority, all from obeying him or regarding him as emperor; and decreeing that all incur excommunication, by the very fact, who shall hereafter extend to him, as emperor or as king, any counsel, aid, or favor. Let those to whom the election of an emperor belongs, proceed freely to elect one. As to the kingdom of Sicily, we will take care to

(1) The Saracens of the Puglia.

provide for it as, with the counsel of our brethren, may seem proper."

In commenting upon this sentence of deposition, Alexandre admits that Pope Innocent "justly deprived Frederick of the kingdom of Sicily, because he held it as a fief of the Roman Church, and especially because he abused his power to the detriment of that Church, and did not pay the accustomed tribute. But the case of the empire was different, for the empire was not subject to the Roman Church," and such is the opinion expressed by all imperialist and Gallican writers. In our chapter on the "Deposing Power of the Roman Pontiff," we have seen that the public law of the time subjected the emperor as well as other sovereigns to the judgment of the Pontiff, in all pertaining to his tenure of power, when religion suffered; but here we would remark that, if Pope Innocent IV. exceeded his duty and his rights in the matter of Frederick II., it is strange that his action received the approbation of a General Council. If, as Alexandre and other writers hold, the deposing power of the Pope is opposed by both Scripture and Tradition, how comes it that the assembled wisdom and sanctity of Europe, in the presence, too, of the representatives of the principal sovereigns, did not check the usurpation? But, reply the courtier-theologians, the sentence of deposition was issued, not by the Council, but by Innocent; not "the Sacred Council approving," but "the Sacred Council being present." This answer does not relieve the Council of the burden of responsibility which imperialists would place upon it; by its acquiescence, the Council shouldered that burden. We pass by the remark of Roncaglia (1) that "a change was made in the above title by a fault of the transcribers, as often happened," for even though that phrase should remain, there is abundant proof that the Council approved of the deposition of Frederick II. The Franciscan Nicholas de Curbio, confessor to Innocent IV., and an eye-witness of what he narrates, says (2): "This sentence was approved by all the prelates present in the same Council, as is made evident to present and future times by

(1) Note, § IV., to Alexandre's *Diss.* 2, in *Cent.* XI.

(2) *Life of Innocent IV.*, c. 14.

their signatures and seals appended." Matthew of Paris says: "Therefore, the lord Pope and the attending bishops, with lighted candles, fulminated terribly against the said emperor Frederick, who is now no longer to be called emperor. . . . When master Thaddeus heard of these things, he drew deep sighs, and said: 'I well know there is no help for it,' and weeping and groaning, he added: 'Truly, this is a day of wrath,' as he had before said when, in full Council, the bishops lowered and extinguished the lighted candles, deposing the excommunicated emperor Frederick."

(1). And the approbation of the Council is plainly indicated by these words of the sentence of deposition: "Having first carefully deliberated with our brethren, and with the Sacred Council, upon the aforesaid and many other detestable crimes, we show and denounce the said prince as deprived by the Lord of all honor and dignity, and by our sentence we do deprive him."

After the deposition of Frederick, the Council issued several Constitutions looking to the aid of the Latin empire of Constantinople, and to the success of the Crusades. It also received ambassadors from King Henry III. of England, complaining of extortions on the part of Martin, the Papal legate, and of other abuses. The Pontiff took the papers, and reserved his decision. After the dissolution of the Council, Pope Innocent influenced some of the imperial electors to proceed to an election, and Henry, landgrave of Thuringia, was chosen emperor. With the funds of the Church the Pope enabled Henry to equip his followers, and they all took the Cross as against a heretic. All the territories which obeyed Frederick were laid under an interdict, and legates were sent into Germany to compel, by Apostolic censures, the recognition of Henry. The opposing armies met, finally, near Frankfort, and the forces of Frederick, commanded by his son Conrad, were routed. But Henry died soon after, in 1247. William, count of Holland, was now elected, and the following year he cap-

(1) Matthew of Paris was an intense and blinded courtier, whose zeal for the court made him often show the utmost virulence towards the Pontiffs. Had the Thirteenth Council not approved of Frederick's deposition, he would have made a point of its opposition. To the above testimonies may also be added those of William de Nangis, Henry Knyghton, and the Monk of Padua, in their *Chronicles*.

tered Aix-la-Chapelle, and was there crowned by Innocent IV. In the meantime, Frederick was making preparations for an inroad into France, for the purpose of capturing Innocent, when disastrous news from Italy caused him to proceed at once to that country. For years the struggle between the imperialists and the Guelphs had been progressing with alternate fortune. Of all the Ghibelline cities, Parma had been for some time the most influential, but it happened that, in a moment of frenzy, the imperialists expelled all the Guelphs from the city. The exiles kept up communications with certain partisans within the walls, and one day they suddenly appeared in force. The imperial vicar, Testa of Arezzo, marched out to give them battle, but was defeated and killed. The conquerors occupied the city; in their turn, they expelled all the Ghibellines, and taking the citadel by storm, put the German garrison to the sword. The furious Frederick soon arrived, swearing that he would treat Parma as the Red-beard had treated Milan. In the immense army with which he surrounded the city were a large number of his favorite Saracens. This circumstance added to the determination of the Parmegiani, who believed that he had become a Mohammedan. The siege endured for two years, with constant assaults and sorties. Confident that famine, if not military success, would eventually enable him to sweep Parma from the face of the earth, Frederick had already commenced the erection of a new city, to be called Vittoria, which was to take its place, and shelter his partisans; the vast citadel was already finished, and famine was commencing its work in Parma, when one morning at daybreak the garrison made a sortie, assaulted and destroyed the citadel, and put the imperial army to flight. With difficulty Frederick reached Cremona, having left all his provisions of war and his military chest on the field. The Guelphs now everywhere arising, Frederick betook himself with the wreck of his army into the Puglia. He soon sent legates to Pope Innocent, begging for absolution, and promising to obey the Holy See in everything; especially, to depart at once for Palestine, with all the forces he could

raise, in company with St. Louis, then preparing to march. But experience caused the Pontiff to wait, and in 1250 death laid his hand on Frederick, at Firenzola, in the Puglia. According to Ptolemy of Lucca, Martin the Pole, Villani, St. Antonine, and Cuspinian, he was assassinated by his illegitimate son, Manfred, while on a bed of sickness. That he died impenitent, is asserted by his contemporaries, the Monk of Padua, Martin the Pole, and Recordano Malaspina, as also by the later authors, St. Antonine and Villani. However, William of Puy Laurens, Albert Stadensis, and Matthew of Paris, contemporaries, say he repented, and was absolved by the archbishop of Palermo.

CHAPTER XXX.

THE FOURTEENTH GENERAL COUNCIL : SECOND OF LYONS.

After the death of Pope Clement IV., in 1268, the Holy See remained vacant, owing to the private ambitions and political discords of the cardinals, until the fall of 1271, when Tabaldo Visconti of Piacenza was elected as Gregory X. Tabaldo had been known as a man of extraordinary prudence and probity, although not very learned. He was not a member of the Sacred College, nor was he even a bishop. When elected to the Papal throne, he was arch-deacon of Liége, and was with the Crusaders in Syria. He arrived in Rome in April, 1272, and was immediately consecrated and crowned. Pope Gregory X. found the empire vacant. After the death of William of Holland, the archbishops of Cologne and Mentz and the Palatine had chosen, in 1256, Richard, brother of Henry III. of England, as emperor; while the remaining electors, the archbishop of Treves, the duke of Saxony, the margrave of Brandenburg, and the king of Bohemia, had elected Alphonse, king of Castile. Richard had been crowned at Aix-la-Chapelle, on December 28th, in the presence of most of the princes of the empire (1), but his power was never more than nom-

(1) RYMER, I., 622. *Annals Burt.*, 376. *Ancient Laws*, 26.

inal, and he spent most of his time in England, where he died in March, 1272. Alphonse had vainly besought the Popes Alexander IV., Urban IV., and Clement IV., for recognition, and immediately after his own elevation to the Papacy, Gregory X. compelled him, by a threat of excommunication, to abdicate his claims. The Pontiff then convoked the electoral body, and by his influence, Rudolph, count of Hapsburg, was chosen as king of the Romans, Oct., 1273. However, Gregory did not confirm the election of Rudolph until he had sworn to respect all the rights of the Roman Church, and that the kingdom of Sicily should never be subject to the empire. (1). On the death of Frederick II., his natural son and probably his murderer, Manfred, had usurped the Sicilian dominions, but in 1265 Pope Clement IV. offered the crown to Charles of Anjou, brother of St. Louis of France, and this prince came to Rome, and was solemnly crowned king of Naples and Sicily, in 1266. After the final defeat and death of Manfred, Charles intrigued so successfully to extend his authority, or at least his influence, that Genoa and many other cities of Northern Italy, tired of civil discord, acknowledged his suzerainty. It was the ambition of this prince, plainly directed towards the mastership of all Italy, that furnished Pope Gregory X. with a powerful motive in reviving the dormant imperial dignity in the person of Rudolph.

From his accession to the Papal throne, Pope Gregory X. assigned himself three great tasks, each of which was well worthy of the attention of a Supreme Pontiff: the establishment of concord among all Christian people, and particularly among the Italians; the liberation of the Holy Land, again fallen into the hands of the infidels; and above all, the extinction of the Greek Schism, which had been somewhat weakened by the ephemeral Latin empire of Constantinople, but which had recovered its olden force, after the recapture of the city, in 1261, by Alexius Stratego-

(1) Rudolph afterwards solemnly renounced all claims to suzerainty over Bologna, and the whole Romagna, as well as all right to Florence and Lucca. See Blondus, Platina, Sabellicus, Trithemius, and Cuspinian. The founder of the House of Hapsburg was a prince of moderate possessions, but was warlike, just, and above all, pious; and although some of his line preferred to imitate the Hohenstaufen rather than their glorious progenitor, they have furnished the empire with its most respectable princes. Stero and Eberhard, contemporaries of Rudolph, give us many proofs of his piety and wisdom. See also the *Chronicle of the Dominicans of Colmar*, and the *Affairs of Mentz*, of Serarius, B. 5.

polus, Cæsar under the emperor Michael Paleologus. The union of the churches had been the object of strenuous exertions on the part of Popes Urban IV. and Clement IV., nor was the new emperor personally averse to it. He was rather favorable to it, for he regarded it as the best means of securing the Byzantine throne to himself and his posterity. The heirs of Baldwin II. had the sympathy of the Western princes, but if Michael could bring about an extinction of the Schism, these heirs would be deprived of a powerful weapon. Whether or not Michael was impelled rather by this motive than by a true zeal for unity and a conscientious respect for the rights of the Supreme Pontificate, it was the duty of the Pontiff to avail himself of all legitimate means to extinguish the Schism; and when Michael sent to Rome a Franciscan friar as legate, to negotiate a union, and when he besought St. Louis of France to act as an "arbiter" in the cause (1), Pope Gregory X. sent legates to Constantinople, in 1272, notifying the emperor that a General Council would be held in two years' time, and inviting him to be personally present, or to send his orators to represent him. Four Franciscans friars carried to Michael a *Profession of Faith*, to which the emperor, patriarch, bishops, and priests would be obliged to subscribe. The legates also bore letters of invitation to the Council, directed to the patriarch Joseph and the Greek bishops. The Fourteenth General Council met at Lyons, in the church of St. John, on May 7, 1274. Pope Gregory X. presided in person. (2). There were present the patriarchs of Constantinople and Antioch, 500 bishops, 70 abbots, and about 1000 inferior prelates. In attendance also were the orators of the kings of France, England, Germany, and Sicily; and the legates of the emperor Mi-

(1) St. Louis replied that he could not usurp a right of judging in a cause of faith, but that he would use all his influence with the Apostolic See to bring the affair to a happy issue. So testifies the Pontiff in a letter to Michael, dated 9 Kal. Nov., 1274.

(2) Pope Sixtus IV., in the Bull of Canonization of St. Buonaventura, and Pope Sixtus V., in the Bull numbering that saint among the Doctors of the Church, say that he presided at the Council. But this is to be understood as referring to the private discussions of the Fathers, over which the holy cardinal, on account of his learning, was chosen by the Pontiff to preside. In the presence of the Pontiff, no one else could hold the first place in the public and official Sessions. During the fifth Session, St. Buonaventura died. This holy doctor was preceded to the grave, a short time before, by St. Thomas of Aquin, while on his way to the Council.

chael Paleologus. (1). The Council lasted three months, during which were held six Sessions. Between the first and second, the Pontiff decreed that one tenth of all ecclesiastical revenues should be given, for six years, to the cause of the Crusades. After the third Session, the Greek orators entered the Council and were most graciously received. High Mass was sung by the Pontiff, the Creed was sung in Latin and in Greek, the Greeks repeating thrice the words: "Who proceeds from the Father and the Son." In the fourth Session was read the Greek emperor's letter to Pope Gregory X., addressed "To the Most Holy and Most Blessed First and Supreme Pontiff, the Venerable Pope of the Apostolic See, the Common Father of all Christians, the Venerable Father of our Empire, etc." In this letter, the emperor professes the Catholic faith according to the *Confession* sent to him by the Pope, and when he comes to the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, he says: "The Holy Roman Church obtains the supreme and full primacy and principality over the Universal Catholic Church. . . . Voluntarily returning to the obedience of that Church, we confess, acknowledge, accept, and willingly receive the primacy of the same Holy Roman Church." Then were read letters of the same tenor from the Greek bishops; after which, George, great Logothete of the emperor Michael, in the name of his sovereign, abjured the Schism, professed the faith of the Roman Church, acknowledged the primacy of of the Pope, and solemnly swore never to break the unity of the Church. The same oath was taken by the legates of the Greek bishops.

After the dissolution of the Synod, the Pontiff appointed the abbot of Montecassino to accompany the Greek legates to Constantinople, and to deliver congratulatory letters to Michael, his son Andronicus, and the Greek bishops. The emperor seems to have lent all his energies to perfect the union begun at Lyons (2), but he experienced intense opposition. Nevertheless, in a general Synod held at

(1) Blondus, and after him, Trithemius, Platina, and others, assert that Paleologus himself was at the Council, but this is proved false by the presence and action of his legates; and by the fact that, after the Council, the Pontiff informed him, as one ignorant, of what had been done.

(2) PACHYMERES, B. v. NICEPHORUS GREGORAS, B. v. Author of the *Life of the Patriarch Athanasius*, quoted by Leo Allatius.

Constantinople, the patriarch (John Veccus, successor of Joseph, who had been deposed as an obstinate schismatic) and most of the Greek bishops signed a *Profession of Faith* sent from Rome. (1). During the Pontificate of Nicholas III. (1277-1280), Michael sent the prothonotary Ogerius to Rome to deprecate the Pontiff's indignation because the work of union was not further advanced, saying that his throne was at stake, and that patience and prudence alone could entail success. Among the Greeks no one was more zealous for union than the patriarch, John Veccus. During his eight years of patriarchate he wrote several defenses of the Catholic dogma on the Procession of the Holy Ghost, and in his last will and testament, drawn up in prison, he said: "On account of the true teaching of the Fathers concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son, I have suffered exile and imprisonment, and with my own hand I subscribe to this doctrine in this, my testament." (2). Another zealous defender of unity was George Metochita, a companion and deacon of Veccus, who was imprisoned and exiled by Andronicus, when, after the death of his father Michael, that prince openly returned to the Schism. (3). In his testament, Veccus praises the labors of Constantine Meliteniotas, who "was as a son to him" in his sufferings. (4). That the emperor Michael was sincere in his endeavors to extinguish the Schism, is evident to any one who reads the *History* of Pachymeres, a contemporary author, who was, as Possevin remarks, by no means well disposed to Rome. (5). Michael deposed the schismatic patriarch Joseph, and for the sake of unity sustained a war with his own niece, the wife of Constantine, king of Bulgaria, who was incited to it by her mother Eulogia, the emperor's sister, and a bitter schismatic. Many of his own relatives and friends were imprisoned and otherwise punished for their obstinate adherence

(1) The Synodal Letters, sent to Pope John XXI., are given by Leo Allatius, and are to be read in the Collections of the Councils.

(2) Allatius gives several of his writings in *Orthodox Greece*.

(3) ALLATIUS. *Perpetual Consent*, etc., B. ii., c. 15, no. 9.

(4) GREGORAS, B. VI., and PACHYMERES, B. XII., speak of this author as having written on *The Ecclesiastical Union of the Latins and Greeks*, and a treatise on *The Procession of the Holy Ghost*.

(5) Pachymeres assisted the schismatic Job Iasitas in writing a book against the Latins, and himself issued a treatise "To those who say that the Spirit is said to be of the Son, because He is Consubstantial."

to the Schism, and in some cases he was guilty of cruelties which called forth the reproofs of Rome. (1). Nevertheless, Pope Martin IV., who succeeded Nicholas III. in 1281, received Michael's legates in an ungracious manner, being persuaded that the show of severity against certain schismatics was only intended as a blind to the Westerns. In the same year, 1281, this Pontiff excommunicated Michael as a "favorer of schismatics" (2), and the emperor responded by ordering that the Pontiff should no longer be prayed for at mass, proceeding, however, to no further extremities. Michael Paleologus died in 1283, and the manner in which his remains were treated by his son and heir, Andronicus, shows that the Greek schismatics regarded him as a sincere friend of unity. The schismatic Nicephorus Gregoras says that Andronicus "would not honor his father with even a plebeian funeral; and he ordered that a few should remove the body by night, and cover it with much earth. . . . and this because, while living, he had departed from the right doctrine of the Church; which fact the son detested from his heart, although he greatly loved his father." And Andronicus himself confirms this in Pachymeres, B. 12. Metochita, whose testimony ought to be invaluable in such a matter, after praising the piety of Michael, says that he was indefatigable in pursuing "the object of his life, the restoration of the true faith; he made use of all that would conduce to that end, and in deed, thought, and advice, always had it in view, at every time and in every movement." Andronicus, his grandson of the same name, and John Cantacuzene, strengthened the Schism with all their power, although each made overtures of union whenever they anticipated trouble with the Western powers; indeed, from this time down to the capture of Constantinople by Mohammed II., a wish for reconciliation with Rome was always a trick of state-craft with the Byzantines.

The disciplinary Canons of the Fourteenth Council were thirty in number, the first Constitution treating of the

(1) PACHYMERES, B. vi., c. 30.

(2) Jordan, and Ptolemy of Lucca, writers quoted by Odoric Raynald, say that Martin IV., a Frenchman who had been elected by the influence of Charles of Anjou, was impelled to this act by that prince, because Michael had made alliance with the king of Aragon against him.

Holy Trinity and the Catholic Faith. The *Second* Canon renewed the statutes of Alexander III. regarding the election of a Roman Pontiff, and made some additional provisions which experience had shown to be necessary. Accordingly to this Canon, the cardinals who are in the place where a Pope dies shall only wait ten days for the arrival of their absent brethren, before they enter upon an election. They then proceed to the Pontifical palace, each with only one attendant ; or, if necessity demands it in particular cases, with two. In the palace they will all be shut up in one room, under lock and key (hence the term *Conclave*) ; the only exception to this community of habitation will be the retiring room. No one shall enter or leave the Conclave, until after the election ; and no communication be held with the outside world, under pain of excommunication (by the very fact) for all parties concerned, unless the entire College deems the intercourse, in each particular case, necessary to the election. If a Pontiff is not chosen within three days, during the next five days only one dish will be furnished for each cardinal's dinner and supper ; if the election is not perfected on the eighth day, only bread, wine, and water will be served, until a conclusion is reached. During the Conclave, the members can derive no revenue from the Apostolic Chamber, or from any fund of the Roman Church ; the accruing revenues will accumulate, and be at the disposal of the new Pontiff. The cardinals will attend to the election alone, and will notice other matters only when the whole body deems them to be of sufficient urgency to justify attention. If sickness causes the departure of an elector, the election will go on, no attention being paid to him or his vote ; if he returns in time his right revives. Such are the chief provisions of this Canon. It did not please many of the cardinals, and they tried hard, but in vain, to prevent its adoption. (1). The *Third* Canon regards appeals from the result of ecclesiastical elections in general, and is inserted in *Sexto*, tit. *Election*, cap. *Ut circa*. The *Fourth* decrees that no one shall enter

(1) Boniface VIII. inserted it in *Sextum*, tit. *Election*, cap. *Ubi*. The *Glossa* observes that "it derives its force rather from the renewal by Celestine V., and its approbation by Boniface VIII., than from its original constitution by Gregory X., for it was revoked by Adrian V. and John XXI., and once was not read among the Gregorian Canons.

upon the administration of an office until his election is confirmed, under the pretext of "procuration" or any other title; he who violates this decree loses all right to his office; *Sexto*, tit. *Election*, cap. *Avaritice*. The *Fifth* provides against long vacancies, establishing limits thereto; *Sexto*, tit. *Election*, cap. *Quam fit*. The *Sixth*, *Seventh*, and *Eighth* regard the purity of elections. The *Ninth* restricts appeals, and regulates their abuse: *Sexto*, tit. *Election*, cap. *Quamvis*. The *Tenth* decrees that an examination be held as to any alleged defect, physical or mental, on the part of an elect; and if he be found free, the opponent is to be punished: *Ibid.*, cap. *Si forte*. The *Eleventh* excommunicates those who in any way molest ecclesiastics because of the way they have voted in an election: *Ibid.*, cap. *Sciant*. The *Twelfth* decrees excommunication, by the very fact, against all who "try to usurp the regalia (1), or custody, of churches, monasteries, or other pious places, under the pretext of advocacy or defense; or who presume to seize the goods of churches, monasteries, or of their vacant territories; no matter what be the dignity of the offenders, even if they be clerics or monks." The clergy who do not oppose these usurpations are deprived, during the time of their neglect, of their own revenues. (2). This Canon quite naturally displeased the princes and courtier-bishops of the day, nor was it easily enforced. William Durand, the "Speculator," who was present at the Council, says, in his Commentary on its Canons: "This Constitution was promulgated at the instance of the prelates of France and England; but thus far we see very little of its utility." It is inserted in *Sexto*, cap. *Generali*, tit. *Election*. The *Thirteenth*

(1) The "regalia," says Ruzæus, was the royal right of enjoying the revenues of a vacant ecclesiastical office, and of conferring its benefices when they did not involve the care of souls; which right certain sovereigns exercised until the new incumbent took the oath of fidelity, and received from the sovereign the investiture of the temporalities. In a very lengthy dissertation, Alexander defends this right, as such, especially of the French kings, and not as a privilege conceded by the Church. See *Diss.* 8, *Cent.* 13. His argument rests principally upon the royal office of defending the Church; but, as Roncaglia well observes, it is not a guardian's right to steal what is entrusted to his care. See *Animadversion* III. to Alexander's *Diss.* 8.

(2) One of the reasons why the sovereigns of the Middle Ages, especially those of France, England, and Germany, claimed the regalia during a vacancy, was the principle then in vogue whereby a fief reverted to the suzerain on the death or treason of the enfeoffed. But while this title might have been legitimate, in regard to certain of the feudal revenues, it could not obtain, unless by usurpation, in the case of revenues purely ecclesiastical, such as tithes and offerings. Again, this "*jus relevii*," whereby a vacancy caused a reversion of the fief to the superior, did not always and everywhere obtain. Finally, could the fiefs of the Church, things given to the Lord, ever become vacant?

is directed against usurers, and the *Fourteenth* against duelling and dangerous tournaments. The *Fifteenth* deals with clerical immunities, and the inviolability of churches and cemeteries. The *Sixteenth* absolutely prohibits hereditary right to ecclesiastical benefices. The *Seventeenth* forbids marriage within certain degrees of relationship. The remaining Canons are of minor moment.

CHAPTER XXXI.

THE INQUISITION.*

Since the Church is the sole depositary and interpreter of revealed divine truth on earth, ought she not use every legitimate means to prevent the propagation of error? This is the most available argument wherewith to defend the Inquisition; and its force can be diminished only by insisting on the illegitimacy of the tribunal, and of its methods, as means to preserve the integrity of the Christian body. In the Middle Age every person who impeded the progress of religion, or who placed an obstacle in his neighbor's path to heaven, was regarded as an enemy to society. The civil law was supposed to protect the faith as much as, if not more than, life or property. The use of force to prevent a heretic from sowing the seeds of religious dissension in a united community, seemed to be no less legitimate than resistance to a foreign invader or a domestic highwayman. Nor did this idea first manifest itself in the so-called Dark Ages: from the day when Constantine gave liberty to the Church, we hear the Fathers insisting that repression of error is a proper defence against persecution and seduction. This repression was not always exercised in the same manner: it varied according to the exigencies of the public weal. We find instances of "contentious" and coercive jurisdiction enforced by the ecclesiastical authorities in the very first days of Christianity. The lying Ananias and Saphira fall dead at the imperious voice of St. Peter; an

* This chapter appeared as an article in the *Ave Maria*, vol. xxxii., No. 7.

incestuous man is consigned to the vexations of the demon ; St. Polycarp styles Marcion, who seeks his friendship, the first-born of Satan (1) ; and St. Ignatius commends the zeal of those Corinthians who so detested heresy that they would not allow its professors to pass through their territories (2). In the Code of Justinian we read many decrees of the early Christian emperors in defence of the integrity of the faith ; Constantine issued two, Valentinian I. one, Gratian two, Theodosius I. fifteen, Valentinian II. three. Constantine pursued the Donatists with fines and confiscations (3), and burned the books of the Arians. Theodosius banished heretics (4), and Honorius ordered the scourging and imprisonment of Jovinian and his followers, after their condemnation by Pope Siricius (5). St. Augustine speaks of having received from the deacon Quod Vult Deus a copy of the proceedings of an inquisition held at Carthage against certain Manicheans (6) ; and he himself proceeded against the subdeacon Victorinus, a Manichean, and after a formal trial degraded him and procured his banishment from Hippo (7). St. Epiphanius gives an account of the process instituted by the patriarch of Alexandria against Arius, which is interesting because of the close resemblance of its forms to those used by the modern Inquisition (8). The same saint tells us that he endeavored to discover Gnostics, and that hence " fifty were exiled, leaving the city free from their thorns " (9). In fact, there occur, during the first centuries of Christianity, so many instances of inquisitorial action against heretics, that the Franciscan De Castro, writing at the time of the Reformation, could well say that the system " was not introduced only three hundred years ago, as Luther asserts : it originated a thousand years ago, and we may infer that it came down from apostolic times " (10).

The Inquisition never attempted to force a profession of Christianity on infidels or Jews ; in order **that** heresy

(1) IRENÆUS, b. iii. c. 3.

(3) OPTATUS of Milevi, b. iii.

(5) *Idem*, y. 390. no. 47.

(7) *Epist.* 236 alias 74.

(9) *Ibi.*, 26. no. 17.

(2) *Epist. to Ephes.*

(4) BARONIO, y. 383, no. 34.

(6) *Heresies*, to Quod Vult Deus, c. 46.

(8) *Heresies*, 69.

(10) *Just Punishment of Heretics*, Paris, 1565.

should be punishable, it was necessary that a sufficiently instructed *Christian* should persevere in error, and manifest in action his opposition to the authority of the Church. St. Thomas of Aquin, asking whether infidels can be compelled to accept the faith, replies that "they are in no way to be forced to believe, for belief is from the will" (1); and he contends that the worship of heretics is to be tolerated, just as God tolerates certain evils, in order that man may not lose his liberty. Suárez gives as the common teaching of theologians the doctrine that "infidels *who are not apostates* ought not to be compelled to embrace the faith, even though they have acquired a sufficient knowledge of it." The Council of Trent declares that "the Church judges no one who has not entered her fold by Baptism" (2).

In the early ages of the Church the penalty of death was seldom inflicted upon heretics. The emperor Maximus was the first Christian prince to adopt this questionable method of preserving religious unity. In 385 he put to death Priscillian, bishop of Avila, two priests, two deacons, the poet Latronianus, and Eucrosia, a matron; and it is to be noted that the bishops who took part in this condemnation were reproved by their colleagues. Again, when the tribune Marcellinus was about to condemn certain Donatists who had shed Catholic blood, St. Augustine interceded for them; and when Honorius published a bloody law against Donatists and Jews, the same saint wrote to the proconsul that if any death sentences were executed, no ecclesiastic would ever again denounce heretics (3). However, this holy Doctor afterwards approved of the imperial rigor (4), and in his *Retractations* he wrote: "I composed two books against the Donatists, in which I said that I did not like to see secular force used to compel schismatics to communion; for I had not yet discovered how impunity adds to the audacity of evil, and how quickness of punishment helps to ameliorate" (5). And elsewhere: "See what they do and what they suffer. They kill souls, and suffer in their bodies; they produce eternal death, and complain of a temporal

(1) *Summa Theol.*, q. 10, art. 8.

(2) Sess. 4, c. 2.

(3) *Epist.* 100.(4) *Epist.* 93.

(5) B. II. c. 5.

one. . . . If thou hast suffered affliction from the Catholic Church, oh, faction of Donatus! thou hast suffered like Hagar from Sarah. Return to thy mistress!" (1).

The first modern law decreeing death as penalty for heresy was promulgated by the emperor Frederick II., who, strange to say, was himself strongly suspected of infidelity, and is lauded by our contemporary liberals as a model for anti-clericals. In 1220, at the time of his coronation, this monarch declared that he "would use the sword received by him from God against the enemies of the faith;" and he ordered that all heretics in Lombardy should be burned, or deprived of their tongues. In 1231, publishing his *Constitutions for the Kingdom of Sicily*, the same Frederick placed heresy "among other public crimes," and ranked it as more grievous than high-treason.

It has been asserted that Pope Innocent III. founded the Inquisition; that he received the idea from St. Dominic, and that this holy man was the first inquisitor. Innocent III. certainly appointed Rainer and Guy as inquisitors of the faith during the Albigensian troubles; but the Inquisition does not appear as a recognized tribunal before the pontificate of Gregory IX., and in the year 1229. As for St. Dominic, he died in 1221, and the Preaching Friars were not entrusted with the Inquisition until 1233. Again, Theodoric of Apolda tells us that the saint opposed the Albigensians with "words, example, and miracles;" and, finally, those heretics needed no Inquisition; for they were not occult, but declaimed their errors in public. The origin of the Inquisition is found in the synod held at Toulouse in 1229, under the presidency of the cardinal Romano di Sant' Angelo, who had accompanied the reconciled count Raymond VII. to his restored capital, in order to see that he fulfilled his promises. The cardinal ordained that the bishops should appoint, in each parish, a priest and two or three laymen of good standing, who would swear to "inquire for" heretics, and to make them known to the magistrates; the harborers of heretics were to be punished, and the houses in which they were voluntarily received were to be

(1) *Tract on John*, no. 15.

destroyed. The institution of this tribunal was certainly an improvement on the previous system ; for henceforth an inquiry was conducted by ecclesiastics, more learned and less harsh than the civil authorities. The inquisitors admonished twice before they proceeded to arrests. Whoever abjured was pardoned ; frequently moral punishment only was inflicted, whereas the secular tribunals would inevitably have imposed corporal chastisement. At the instance of St. Raymond of Pennafort, Pope Gregory IX. deprived the bishops of the right of inquisition, and conferred it on the friars, whose power was felt not only by every layman, but by all the clergy. When the inquisitor arrived in a town, he convoked the magistrates and caused them to swear to execute the decrees against heresy ; in case of refusal, suspension from office was the lot of the recalcitrant ; and if the people interfered, an interdict was launched against the place. The denunciations could not be anonymous, and the accused was accorded a period within which to present himself at the tribunal ; if he did not, he was cited. In the preparatory examination, the witnesses were heard before a notary and two ecclesiastics ; if the accused appeared guilty, he was arrested, his residence was searched, and his property sequestrated.

In the *Maestruzza*—a summary on the Sacraments and Commandments, written in 1338 for the use of the inquisitors, by the Dominican Bartholomew da San Concordio—we read : “ According to the civil law, soothsayers and witches should be burned ; but according to the Church, they should be deprived of communion, if their crime be notorious ; if it is secret, they should receive a penance of forty days (c. 42). The inquisitors cannot interfere with soothsayers and sorcerers, unless heresy is plainly to be feared. Those who relapse into heresy after having abjured it, should be delivered to the secular power (c. 91).” The crime, therefore, was a civil one. The Church mitigated its punishment ; for she absolved the penitent, and even tried to regain the relapsed. The inquisitor had to declare that the accused was really a heretic, and therefore separated from the Church ; from that moment he was a criminal be-

fore the state ; and the state did not execute the sentences of the Inquisition, but applied the penalties established by the law.

In 1255 Pope Alexander III. established the Inquisition in France, with the consent, or rather at the request, of St. Louis ; and the office of grand-inquisitor was conferred on the Dominican provincial and on the guardian of the Franciscans of Paris. According to the Bull of their institution, these inquisitors were independent of the bishops ; but so displeasing was the new jurisdiction to both the ecclesiastical and civil authorities, that the friars soon found themselves adorned with a useless title (1). In Venice the Inquisition was introduced in 1289 ; but it should not be confounded with the Venetian Inquisition of State, a purely political institution, founded in 1454. The Inquisition of Venice was, from its very commencement, dependent upon the civil authorities ; and in the sixteenth century it was prevented from undertaking any process whatever without the assistance of three senators. In English history this tribunal does not figure, although the English bishops, like all the other ordinaries of Christendom, frequently exercised inquisitorial power. In Germany it never obtained a foothold, and consequently heresy was left in that country, to the rigors of the imperial laws.

The "Supreme Roman Inquisition," or tribunal of the "Holy Office," was created on July 21, 1542, by a Bull, "*Licet ab initio*," of Pope Paul III., and at the suggestion of Cardinal Caraffa, afterward Pope Paul IV. At Rome it was composed of Dominicans ; but in some countries, of Franciscans. Paul IV. decreed that the Inquisition should thereafter depend, not from each bishop, but from this Congregation, which was authorized to judge definitively in all matters of heresy on both sides of the Alps. Sixtus V. reorganized the Holy Office, constituting twelve cardinals as

(1) Bergier, art. *Inquisition*.—Bergier complacently congratulates his countrymen upon their freedom from the obnoxious tribunal, but he omits to state that the civil authorities of France furnished the world with spectacular "acts of faith" in quite modern times. Thus, on Feb. 17, 1525, in the Place Maubert at Paris, the licentiate, Master William Joubert, after having made a public recantation in the Church of St. Genevieve, was given to the flames because of his former Lutheranism. Vanini suffered at Toulouse on Feb. 19, 1618.

its members, under the presidency of the Pontiff. It received faculties to inquire for heretics, or those suspected of heresy, and their abettors; to prosecute magicians, astrologers, etc.; also to prosecute all abusers of the Sacraments, all writers or possessors of prohibited books, all who abstained from confession or who ate forbidden food, polygamists, and many other offenders. That the methods of the Holy Office were only the customary ones of the time, and by no means secret, is evident from its Code. We have the *Directory for Inquisitors*, by the Dominican Eymeric (Rome, 1587); the *Duty of the Holy Inquisition, and its Mode of Proceeding in Causes of Faith* (Cremona, 1641), by Carena Cesare; and the *Compendium of the Art of Exorcism*, by Mengius. The *Directory* was translated in 1762, by Morellet, with intent to injure the Church; but the celebrated Malesherbes said to him: "You think that you have collected extraordinary facts, unheard-of proceedings. Know, then, that this jurisprudence of Eymeric and of the Inquisition is very nearly our own" (1). From these documents we learn that the Holy Office allowed to each of the accused a "procurator," who had full liberty to communicate with his client, and to conduct his defense; but we must admit that sometimes the inquisitors did "not allow the notaries to give copies of the *Acts* of the Holy Office, unless to the accused; and then without the names of the witnesses, and without any particulars which might indicate the names to the accused" (2). However, this now reprehensible secrecy was common to all the tribunals of those days; and the Protestant Jeremy Bentham admits that, in many cases, such secrecy may be absolutely necessary to public security (3). The Inquisition was extended also to the Jews, not to persecute them, but to prevent them from propagating their errors, and from committing the alleged crimes against which the credulous then raged, just as to-day the credu-

(1) Morellet says in his *Memoirs*, vol. i, 59: "I was confounded at this assertion, but afterward I found that he was right."

(2) *Short Account of the Manner of Prosecuting the Causes of the Holy Office, by the Rev. Vicars of the Inquisition of Modena*, cited by Cantù, in his *Heretics of Italy*, disc. 32, note 63.

(3) *Works*, vol. ii. p. 191; and *passim*.

lous fume on recalling the "atrocities" of the Holy Office (1).

There is a great diversity of opinion, even among Catholic authors, as to the severity or mildness of the *Roman Inquisition*. Bergier says that "no instance is known of an execution (for heresy) at Rome." The late Archbishop Spalding, in an admirable refutation of Prescott's allegations against the *Spanish Inquisition*, says that "though three hundred years have elapsed since the establishment of this court (the Holy Office), it would be difficult to point to an instance in which it ever pronounced sentence of capital punishment." De Maistre tells us that "it is impossible to ascertain precisely at what epoch the inquisitorial tribunal first pronounced a capital condemnation. It is fully sufficient for our purpose, however, to be convinced of an incontestable fact: that it never could have acquired this right until it became exclusively a royal or political institution; and that every judgment which affects life in any degree was, is, and must ever be, most conscientiously discountenanced by the Church. . . . The Inquisition never condemns to death." But Cantù gives many instances of capital punishment awarded by the Roman Inquisition. Tiepolo, Venetian ambassador at Rome, describes an "Act of Faith" (*auto da fe, atto di fede*) performed in that city on September 27, 1567, when the famous Mgr. Carnesecchi, and a certain friar of Belluno, having persisted in heresy, were decapitated, and their bodies burned. Averardo Serristori, Florentine ambassador, writes that the sentence of Carnesecchi was pronounced by the cardinals of Trani and of Pisa, Paceco and Gambura (2). Cantù cites another dispatch of Tiepolo, describing an Act of May 28, 1569, when, in presence of twenty-two cardinals, four impenitents were

(1) The good Sadoletto, called the Italian Fénelon, in a letter to Cardinal Farnese, laments that the Jews were treated too kindly at Rome, and protected by Paul III.

(2) *Embassy of Averardo Serristori, ambassador of Cosimo I. to Charles V., and at the Court of Rome, 1537-1568*; Florence, 1853.—Carnesecchi had been excommunicated as contumacious by Paul IV.; under Pius IV. he defended himself so well that he was absolved and acknowledged as a good Catholic. But he soon became notorious as a teacher of the Reformed doctrines, and Pius V. obtained his extradition from the grand-duke Cosimo I., whose subject he was. His process is very interesting, as furnishing many particulars concerning Cardinal Pole, Victoria Colonna, and others of the same school.

given to the flames. In a dispatch of February 24, 1585, the Venetian resident at Rome speaks of a "publication" of seventeen *inquisiti* by the Holy Office in presence of many cardinals; three of the accused were condemned to the stake. In fine, although many letters of the time narrate alleged atrocities of the Holy Office which are merely founded on the exaggerations of the mob (1), there seems to be no doubt that the Roman tribunal condemned many heretics to death. It is certain, however, that mildness was the general characteristic of the Holy Office. Cousin, in his *Mémoire on Vanini*, shows that the friends of this wretched hypocrite (2) tried to have his case transferred to the Roman Inquisition, feeling that thus he would escape capital punishment. And history furnishes many instances of criminals feigning guilt of heresy, sorcery, or similar crimes, in order to pass under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition. The case of Campanella is celebrated. His clerical comrades in the Calabrian conspiracy against the Spanish crown escaped death by pleading guilty of heresy, and being therefore consigned to the Inquisition; while he himself, after twenty-seven years of confinement, was saved by the demand of Pope Urban VIII. that he should be tried for sorcery (3).

The word "Inquisition," as met in history, has three very different significations. It may mean either a religious, a political, or a mixed tribunal. All bishops, as inquirers into the purity of faith in their respective dioceses, exercise a religious inquisition. The political inquisition can meet with no opposition, unless from those who decry every species of government, even such as obtains among savages; for all governments employ some sort of police. But when there is a question of the mixed inquisition, such as Rome

(1) De Thou writes that during the reign of Sixtus V. Mureto told him: "Whenever I awake I dread lest I shall hear that such a one is no more." The assertion is false; for Mureto died in 1585, shortly after the election of Sixtus V., and De Thou was then residing in France.

(2) Leibnitz deemed him insane.

(3) The great mathematician was acquitted; he was enrolled in the Papal household, and an annual pension assigned him. But the Spanish residents having mobbed him several times, he repaired to France, where he was received with open arms by Cardinal Richelieu, and made a counsellor of state. He became president of the newly-founded Royal Academy of France.

sanctioned from the beginning of the Thirteenth Century, our ears are deafened with clamor. When the Inquisition is condemned by a Catholic, contending that the Gospel of love should have prevented violent proceedings, the idea may not be utterly unreasonable; but we must remember that intolerance seems to be inseparable from profound belief. In the Middle Age faith was the very life of society, the necessary and only tie which constituted it; it is not strange, therefore, that the guardians of society proceeded to the last extremity against the violators of the faith. Such is the explanation which we tender to the Catholic who condemns the Inquisition. But when a Protestant attacks this tribunal, he betrays either ignorance and misplaced complacency in his religious predecessors, or a desire to prescribe one code of morality for his own, and another for the Catholic Church. Luther, according to his enthusiastic apologist, Seckendorf, would have imprisoned, banished, and despoiled all the Jews, and would even have deprived them of the Bible. Calvin banished the Carmelite apostate, Bolsec, because this unfortunate proved that the heresiarch's doctrine made God the author of sin; and it was not Calvin's fault that the daring man was not capitally punished as a Pelagian. The death of Servetus at the stake; the condemnation of Gentile to death, which he avoided for a time by recantation; the banishment of Ochino; the persecution of Biandrata; and Calvin's own book on the errors of Servetus, in which, according to the title-page, "it is taught that heretics are to be coerced by the sword,"—all these facts should cause the Protestant polemic to be less bitter in his diatribes against the Inquisition (1). The "Gentle" Melancthon hoped that some brave man would merit glory by assassinating Henry VIII., and he himself approved the

(1) The reforming princes of Germany and Sweden were foes to toleration; they had arrogated to themselves all the power in religious matters, and would have but one religion in their dominions. Their motto was *Ejus religio ejus regio*. Calvin, most stubborn of foes to a separation of Church and state, invoked against dissenters the penalty of death, because, as he asserted, no one can refuse to acknowledge the authority of princes over the Church without injury to the government established by God. Those Protestants who would claim Savonarola as one of the precursors of the Lutheran revolt, should know that the friar was no friend to toleration. Disputing against astrologists, he exclaimed: "Oh, ye foolish and insensate astrologists! the only way to argue with you is the use of fire." (*Tract against Astrologers*, c. 3.)

execution of Servetus: "The magistracy of the republic of Geneva gave, by putting Servetus out of the way, a pious and memorable example to all posterity" (1). Beza wrote a book in defence of the thesis that "liberty of conscience is a doctrine of the devil;" and article 36 of the "Helvetic Confession" reads: "Let the magistrates draw the sword against all blasphemers, and coerce the heretics" (2). But we do not wish, in this matter, to reprove Protestants or to excuse Catholics; we rather say with Cantù: "We seek and explain the truth; and reflecting that persecution was peculiar to that time, as toleration is said to be peculiar to ours, and that the fury of the persecutors attests their sincerity, we lament the facts, and recur to that principle which is infallible. The Council of Trent speaks not of Inquisition or of stakes, though it pronounces anathema on the unbeliever; but whenever humanity carries out a great design, it becomes prodigal of blood."

We now approach the subject of the Spanish Inquisition, a tribunal which is often, and wrongly, confounded with the Roman, and about which, reprehensible though it was, there are probably as many popular misconceptions as upon any matter of history. The misstatements of all modern enemies of the Church concerning this tribunal are traceable either to Mm̃e. d'Aunoy's Hispanophobic book, or to Philip Limborch, or to John Anthony Llorente. The falsehoods of Mm̃e. d'Aunoy and of Limborch were admirably refuted by De Vayrac (3), and his work is one of the most valuable ever written on the subject. Hefele's book on *Cardinal Ximenes, etc.*, can not be too warmly recommended to the student. Cantù is by no means sparing of the Spanish tribunal; but the thoroughly Catholic tone of his philosophical reflections, and his evident impartiality, render an attentive study of his views on this subject more satisfactory, at least to our mind, than that of any other author.

After 780 years of combat, the Spaniards had saved their Catholicism and nationality—with them the two were

(1) *On Servetus*, 1555.—*Corpus Reform.*, viii. 523; ix. 133

(2) At this day, says Cantù, they show at Dresden the axe which the Lutherans used against dissenters, and on it is inscribed: „Hüt dich, Calvinist!“

(3) *Present State of Spain*, Amsterdam, 1719.

thoroughly identified—from the Moors. At first the free exercise of their religion was allowed to the conquered; but after they had repeatedly revolted, and had made many attempts to procure another Mohammedan invasion from Africa, the Spanish sovereigns ordered, in 1501, that all the Moors should leave Castile and Granada, saving those who would embrace Christianity. Most of the Moors received baptism, but many secretly apostatized, while others adulterated their Christian rites with Mohammedan practices. At this time the Spanish government, which for more than a century had resisted the popular demands for the banishment of the Jews, resolved to acquiesce, alleging as a reason a league of all the foes of Christianity against the freedom of Spain. All good Spaniards yearned for a means of cementing the religious and political unity of the nation; and that means seemed to be offered by the Inquisition, which had been introduced into Spain in 1480 in the following manner: The island of Sicily having been added to the Spanish dominions in 1479, the Sicilian inquisitor, De Barbaris, asked Ferdinand and Isabella for a confirmation of the right, granted by Frederick II. to the Inquisition, to appropriate a third of all the property confiscated from heretics. While urging his demand, De Barbaris advised the sovereigns to introduce the Inquisition into Spain, as a measure against the Moorish and Jewish apostates, who, even at this time, long before the decree of banishment, were numerous, and about whom every infamy was narrated. Isabella opposed the project until she was persuaded that it would further the salvation of souls; Ferdinand saw in it a means to replenish his treasury, and immediately consented. When Pope Sixtus IV. heard of Ferdinand's action, he was so displeased that he placed the Spanish ambassador under arrest; in retaliation, Ferdinand arrested the Papal envoy, and recalled all his subjects from the Roman States.

The Pontiff afterward yielded, and allowed the Inquisition to be introduced into Castile and Aragon (1480); later on, however, touched by the complaints that reached him concerning the rigor of the tribunal, he declared that the Bull of institution was surreptitious. He admonished the in-

quisitors, ordering them to proceed only in accord with the bishops, and not to extend their inquiries into the other provinces ; he also instituted a Papal judge to hear all appeals from the Spanish tribunal, and he quashed many of its indictments. Ferdinand and Isabella, as well as their successor, Charles V., constantly endeavored to elude these provisions of the Holy See ; but even Llorente admits that the Papal appellate judges often restored property and civil rights to those whom the Inquisition had condemned ; and that they often compelled the inquisitors to absolve the accused privately, in order to save them from legal punishment and public ignominy.

The Dominican friar Thomas de Torquemada (1), of Valladolid, was chosen to preside over the Supreme or Royal Council of the Inquisition of Castile and Aragon, the members of which had a deliberative voice in all matters of civil law, and a consultative one in affairs of canon law. Seville, Cordova, Jaen, and Toledo had dependent tribunals ; and the inquisitors, with two royal assessors, published a code of procedure (2). From this time the cloak of religion

(1) Not to be confounded with his uncle, the great theologian, John, cardinal Torquemada, who died in 1468.

(2) The first three articles treated of the composition of the tribunal in cities ; the publication of censures against heretics and apostates, who did not voluntarily denounce themselves ; and prescribed a further term of grace by which confiscation might be avoided. IV. Voluntary confessions, made within the term of grace, were to be written in answer to **questions** of the inquisitors. V. Absolution could not be given in secret, unless the **crime was secret**. VI. A reconciled person was deprived of every office of honor, and could not use gold, silver, pearls, silk, or fine wool. VII. Pecuniary penances were given to those who voluntarily confessed. VIII. A voluntary penitent, presenting himself after the term of grace, could not be exempted from the confiscation incurred on the day of his apostasy or heresy. IX. Only a light penance was given to voluntary penitents who were not yet twenty years of age. X. The time of a penitent's first fall was to be particularized, that it might be ascertained what proportion of his goods should be confiscated. XI. If a heretic, confined by the Inquisition, should demand absolution, being touched by sincere repentance, it was to be granted ; but his penance should be imprisonment for life. XII. The inquisitors were allowed to use torture in the case of a reconciled person whose confession they deemed imperfect, and whose penitence they deemed it necessary to stimulate. XIII. Torture was also permitted in the case of one who had boasted of having concealed crimes in his confession. XIV. A convicted person, persisting in a denial of guilt, was to be condemned as impenitent. XV. If a person under torture confessed, and afterward confirmed his avowal, he was to be condemned as one convicted ; if he retracted, he was to be again interrogated. XVI. It was prohibited to furnish the accused an entire copy of the testimony against him. XVII. The witnesses were to be questioned by the inquisitors themselves. XVIII. One or two inquisitors were to be present at every examination. XIX. An accused who did not obey a formal citation was to be condemned as a convicted heretic. XX. If his conduct, while living, showed that any person, now dead, was a heretic, he was to be condemned as such ; his body, if in consecrated ground, was to be disinterred, and his property

covered many acts of tyranny in Spain. The Roman Pontiffs frequently interfered; indeed, as far back as the pontificate of Nicholas V. (1447-55) all distinction between new and old Christians had been condemned. Sixtus IV., Innocent VIII., and Leo X. received appeals from the decisions of the inquisitors, and reminded them of the prodigal son. Julius II. and Leo X. dispensed many from the obligation of wearing the *sambenito*, or penitential sack, which the tribunal imposed on all the reconciled; and these Pontiffs, in several cases, ordered the signs of reprobation to be removed from the tombs of the condemned. Leo X., in spite of Charles V., excommunicated the inquisitor of Toledo in 1519. Paul III. encouraged the Neapolitans to resist Charles V. when he wished to introduce the tribunal among them; and when the learned Vives was condemned as suspected of Lutheranism, the same Pontiff declared him innocent. Mureto, the great Latinist whom the Spanish Inquisition would have sent to the stake, was called to Rome and made a professor in the University.

Diego Deza, successor to Torquemada, persuaded the Spanish sovereigns to establish the tribunal also in Granada, but Isabella insisted that it should be confined to Cordova; afterward, following the advice of Ximenes, the sovereigns bought and emancipated all Moorish slaves who would become Christians, and thus were obtained fifty thousand "new Christians." Under Charles V. the Inquisition increased in activity, but under Philip II. it attained its greatest development. When dying, Charles V. had earnestly impressed upon the mind of his heir the necessity of preserving the tribunal, and so well did Philip fulfil his father's desire, that the power of the Inquisition became so great as to overshadow, in some respects, that of Rome. This antagonism is illustrated by the celebrated process of Carranza. Carranza was a Dominican, and had greatly distinguished himself in the Council of Trent. His merit caused him to

confiscated. XXI. The inquisitors were ordered to exercise their powers over the vassals of the lords, and to censure the latter if they resisted. XXII. A portion of all confiscated property was to be given, as alms, to the heirs of the condemned. The remaining six articles regarded the conduct of the inquisitors among themselves and toward their subordinates.

be promoted to the See of Toledo in 1557; but his genius drew upon him the jealousy of many, and he was accused of heresy. For this reason Charles V. received him rather coldly when he approached the monarch's death-bed to administer the last Sacraments. The accusers of Carranza insisted that after the death of the emperor, the archbishop lifted a crucifix and exclaimed: "Behold Him who has saved us all! Everything is forgiven through His merits; there is no longer any sin." For such expressions, as though he excluded the co-operation of man in the work of justification, he was arrested on August 22, 1559, and confined in the inquisitorial prison of Valladolid. The Holy Office had already placed on the Index his *Comments on the Christian Catechism*, although the book was dedicated to Philip II., and had been approved by a commission of the Council of Trent. Pius IV., rigorous though he was, disapproved of the conduct of the Inquisition, and called the case to Rome. Philip, however, declared that the first prelate of Spain should be tried only in Spain, and the Pontiff compromised by sending a legate and two other judges to conduct the examination. But the inquisitors contrived to prolong the investigation until St. Pius V. ascended the papal throne. This Pontiff repeatedly complained to Philip that he was not kept informed of the progress of the cause; and finally, by threatening the monarch with excommunication, succeeded in having Carranza sent to Rome. This was in May, 1567, after nearly eight years' imprisonment under the Spanish inquisitors (1).

Since the work of Llorente is generally adduced as an au-

(1) When Carranza arrived in Rome, the Holy Office assigned honorable lodgings to him in Castel San Angelo. Four cardinals, four bishops, and twelve theological doctors were deputed for his trial. The Pope plainly manifested his indignation at the conduct of the Inquisition; he declared that far from prohibiting the *Comments* of the Archbishop, he was much inclined to approve of the work by a *motu proprio*. But it appears certain that Carranza had at least rendered himself liable to suspicion. In 1539, he had assisted as "qualificator" of the Inquisition, at a general chapter of the Dominican Order at Rome, and had become very intimate with Flaminius and other suspects, and even with the noted heretic, Carnesecchi. The process at Rome lasted three years; three more were spent in the law's delays, and only in 1576 was definitive sentence pronounced by Pope Gregory XIII. On his knees before the Pope, Carranza made an abjuration of all heretical doctrines, and withdrew fourteen "evil-sounding" propositions taken from his writings. He was suspended from episcopal functions, and ordered to reside in a house of his Order at Orvieto for five years, after having visited the seven basilicas of Rome. However, he died a few days afterward, and the Pope gave him a splendid funeral.

thority in all matters concerning the Spanish Inquisition, it is well to give some account of this famous writer. Born of a noble family of Aragon in 1756, he entered the priesthood in 1779, became vicar-general of the diocese of Calaborra in 1782, and was appointed secretary-general of the Inquisition at Madrid in 1789. From his early manhood he was a Freemason, and, of course, a "Liberal," which term was then—as even now it sometimes is—synonymous with anti-Catholic. When Napoleon commenced his experiment of planting his own dynasty on the throne of Spain, Llorente became an enthusiastic *Afrancesado*, as all patriotic Spaniards styled the adherents of the Josephine administration. It has always been a favorite trick with usurpers to ransack the archives of dispossessed princes, and to publish to the world whatever might turn, or might be twisted, to the discredit of the latter. In accordance with this idea, the intruding Joseph Bonaparte, in 1809, commissioned Llorente, the ex-secretary (he had been dismissed for sundry irregularities) to show up the secrets of the Inquisition, that the Spaniards might learn to love the tyranny-crushing rule of a foreigner. When the venal *Afrancesado's* work appeared, it was found to be an insult to Rome, to Spain, and to the Spanish Church. Hefele proffers the following judgment on Llorente: "A prominent feature in his writings is their great bitterness toward the Church, and this sentiment impels him to many inexact and even false assertions. The shallowness and inaccuracy of Llorente, as a historian, are no less evident than his hatred of the Church. In his *Portraits* he informs us that Paul of Samosata embraced the heresy of Sabellius; an assertion, the absurdity of which brings a smile to the face of the veriest tyro in ecclesiastical history. He also tells us that St. Justin (d. 167) wrote his works before the time of St. Ignatius of Antioch (d. 107 or 116); that Apollonius of Tyana was a heretic, etc. No less full of errors is his *History of the Inquisition*. However, this work is valuable, inasmuch as it furnishes us with numerous extracts of original documents of the Inquisition; and they enable us to form, concerning the Spanish tribunal, a more exact judgment than one could have formed before Llorente wrote."

The Protestant Ranke says that Llorente "gave us a famous book on this subject; and if I may presume to say anything that contravenes the opinion of such a predecessor, let my excuse be that this well-informed author wrote in the interest of the *Afrancesados* of the Josephine administration. In that interest . . . he looks on the Inquisition as a usurpation of the spiritual over the secular authority. Nevertheless, if I am not altogether in error, it appears, even from his own facts, that the Inquisition was a royal court of judicature, although armed with ecclesiastical weapons."

Relying implicitly on the authority of the salaried sycophant of Joseph Bonaparte, many later writers regard the establishment of the Spanish Inquisition as due to the influence of the court of Rome. They assert that the severities of this tribunal were but consequences of Catholic intolerance and of the Roman mania for persecution; they depict the Inquisition in such lurid colors as to lead the reader to believe it the monster, without a rival in cruelty, among all tribunals, ancient or modern, civilized or barbarous,—Christian, Mussulman, or Pagan. Llorente is a great favorite with Prescott; consequently when the latter treats of the Inquisition, many of his facts are miscolored, and not a few perverted. Now, nothing is more certain than that the Spanish tribunal was mainly a political institution. The king appointed the grand-inquisitor; he confirmed the nomination of the assessors, two of whom were already taken from the supreme council of Castile; the tribunal depended from the sovereign, who thus became master of the lives and property of his subjects (1); the king reserved to himself a share of the funds of the Inquisition, and often the inquisitors had not enough for their expenses. The Protestant Schröck, in his *Universal History*, admits that this tribunal

(1) Anthony Perez, pursued for his life by Philip II., and escaping to France, published some *Relations*, in which he tells how the papal nuncio disapproved of this notion of the royal power, and adds: "While I was at Madrid, a certain party, whom I need not name, preaching before the Catholic king, asserted that 'kings have absolute power over the persons and goods of their subjects.' This proposition was condemned by the Inquisition; and the preacher was compelled, in the same place, and with all the juridical formalities, to retract it. He did so in the same pulpit, adding, 'Kings possess over their subjects only that authority which is accorded them by divine and human law, and not any derived from their own absolute will.' The delinquent was made to repeat these words by order of Master Fernan del Castillo, consultor of the Holy Office."

was secular, and wonders that the Pontiff allowed it to become such. But let us hear Ranke on this matter: "In the first place, the inquisitors were royal officers. The kings appointed and dismissed them; among the various councils at their court, the kings had likewise one of the Inquisition; the courts of the Inquisition, like other magistracies, were subject to royal visitation; the same men who sat in the Supreme Court of Castile were often accessories of the Inquisition. To no purpose did Ximenes scruple to admit into the council of the Inquisition a layman nominated by Ferdinand the Catholic. 'Do you not know,' said the king, 'that if the tribunal possesses jurisdiction, it derives it from the king?' . . . In the second place, *all the profit of the confiscations by this court accrued to the king.* . . . It was even believed and asserted from the beginning that the kings had been moved to establish this tribunal more by a hankering after the wealth it confiscated than by motives of piety. . . Segni says that the Inquisition was invented to rob the wealthy of their property, and the powerful of their influence (1). As Charles V. knew no other means of bringing certain punishment on the bishops who had taken part in the insurrection of the Comunidades, (2) he chose to have them judged by the Inquisition. . . . Under Philip it interfered in matters of trade and of the arts, of customs and marine. How much further could it go, when it pronounced it heresy to sell horses or munitions to France? . . . In spirit, and above all in tendency, it was a political institution. The Pope had an interest in thwarting it, and he did so as often as he could" (3).

In 1812 the Spanish Cortes, having assembled to arrange a new constitution for the kingdom, appointed a committee to report on the Inquisition. This document shows that its authors were no friends of the tribunal, but it asserts that

(1) Ranke might have stated that the Florentine historian adds: "It was based on the omnipotence of the king, and it worked everything to the profit of the royal power, to the detriment of the spiritual. In its first idea and in its object, it is a political institution. It is the interest of the Pope to put obstacles in its way, and he does so whenever he can; but it is the interest of the king to maintain it in continual progress."

(2) Alluding to the struggle of the Communes for their *fueros*, or privileges, a struggle in which the clergy sided with the people.

(3) *Loc. cit.*

the Inquisition "was an institution demanded and established by the Spanish monarchs in difficult circumstances;" and that, furthermore, the tribunal "could decree nothing without the consent of the king." Nay, according to this committee, "the Inquisition is a royal authority, the inquisitor is a royal agent, and all his ordinances are null and void unless they have the royal sanction. The king's power suspends and revokes at will every member of the tribunal; and the very moment royal authority would disappear, the tribunal would accompany it." The Calvinist Limborch, who is, after Llorente, the most bitter of all polemics who have written on the Inquisition, narrates a fact which also proves that the Spanish tribunal was a local political institution. When Philip II. sought to establish it in Milan, the people revolted, declaring that "in a Christian city, it would be tyranny to establish a form of inquisition designed for Moors and Jews." The conduct of the Neapolitans, ever adverse to the introduction of the Spanish Inquisition, though they willingly received the Roman, as well as the ordinary Inquisition of their own bishops, also proves that the Spanish tribunal was regarded as a royal one. Many attempts, met by insurrection and bloodshed, had been made by the viceroys of Charles V. and Philip II. to introduce it; and in 1564, when several of the friends of Victoria Colonna and Julia Gonzaga (1) had been cited by the archiepiscopal vicar, and when two others had been beheaded, the citizens demanded of the viceroy, the duke of Alcala, whether he intended to force the obnoxious tribunal upon them. A negative answer reassured them; and a few years afterward the citizens sent deputies, "with orders to thank the illustrious archbishop for his many demonstrations against heretics and Jews, and to request him to inform his Holiness

(1) The princess Victoria Colonna, born 1490, at Marino, a fief of her family, was one of the most distinguished women of her day. Loved, after the manner of Petrarch, by Michelangelo, and intimate with Pole, Morone, Flaminio, and other great spirits of the time, she exercised more influence than any other one person of her circle. Her correspondence, redolent of mysticism, is orthodox: but she did not escape the suspicion of heresy. Julia Gonzaga, Countess of Fondi, another famous princess of the day, had to bear the same accusation; but, as Pompeo Litta says (*Celebrated Italian Families*, no. 33), this was common to all the learned personages who then contended for a reform of ecclesiastical discipline.

that the entire city is well pleased with the chastisement and extirpation of such persons by the hand of our own ordinary, as is quite proper ; this we have always prayed for : that the canons should be observed, and that there should be no interference of a *secular* court."

We must now say a few words in conclusion upon the severity of the Spanish Inquisition. Many of the apologists of this tribunal point to the words "Mercy and Justice" emblazoned on its banner, and insist on the fact that the consignment of a culprit to the secular arm was always accompanied by a strong recommendation to mercy. There is no doubt that mercy was generally shown to the repentant, and that, in their case, the *auto da fé* consisted in the burning of the candles which they held in their hands. But, in the case of the unrepentant, we lay no stress on the recommendation to mercy ; we agree with those who regard this phrase as a mere form. The inquisitors well knew that their condemnation and their abandonment of the accused to the civil power was equivalent to a sentence of death ; that all hope of mercy rested with themselves alone. We prefer to confine ourselves to an inquiry into the truth of the popular estimate of the cruelites of the tribunal.

The reader may rest assured that in this exhibition, with which popular prejudice has long been regaled, there is nothing behind the curtain that might further satisfy the morbid ; everything that could contribute to render the scene more impressive has been artistically presented. Outside of Spain, few authors, Catholic or Protestant, have attempted to explain, still fewer to defend, the Spanish Inquisition. In France, for a long time after the days of Philip II., it was the fashion to ridicule everything pertaining to Spain. In England, commercial rivalry and religious rancor, aided by a consciousness of England's own superior cruelty in religious persecution, caused those writers, on whom moderns have relied for information, to misrepresent everything emanating from his Catholic Majesty. In Germany, until very recent times, the calumnies of the first "reformers" had so firm a hold on the popular and even on the cultivated mind, that no horror narrated of a Catholic

people or of a Catholic ruler appeared incredible. But even Voltaire, of course an implacable foe of the Inquisition, admits that "without doubt this justly detested tribunal has been charged with horrible excesses that it did not always commit; it is foolish to clamor against the Inquisition because of doubtful facts, and still more foolish to search for lies with which to render it hateful" (1). And hearken to the opinion of Bourgoing, Minister of the first French Republic to Spain, and from the very nature of his associations, an opponent of the Inquisition: "I publicly avow, in order to pay homage to truth, that the Inquisition might be cited, in our days, as a model of equity" (2). Even Limborch admits that during a very long period only fifteen men and four women were executed, and most of these for treason, witchcraft, sacrilege, or other crimes different from heresy (3). Llorente cites an *auto da fé* of 1486 at Toledo, when seven hundred and fifty were condemned, but not one to capital punishment; another of nine hundred, also without a death; another where three thousand three hundred were condemned, but only twenty-seven suffered death. And we must remember that, besides heresy, the Inquisition had jurisdiction over sins against nature, solicitation *in tribunale*, blasphemy, robbery of churches, and even over the furnishing of contraband goods to the enemy.

Let us examine the mode of procedure adopted and constantly followed by the Spanish Inquisition. According to Simancas (4), one of the first lawyers of the sixteenth century, no one was arrested until accused by three different witnesses, each of whom swore that he was not acting in collusion with any other, and that he was not actuated by malice (5). So careful was the tribunal to exclude malice, that both witnesses and inquisitors were subject to excommunication if they yielded to it. When the accused appeared, if he could disprove the charges, he was released; if he could not disprove them, but avowed his repentance, he was, even

(1) In the French *Dictionary of Sciences*.

(2) *A Voyage in Spain*, by M. Bourgoing, reviewed in the *Journal of the Empire*, Sept. 17, 1805.

(3) SPALDING, *loc. cit.*

(4) *Catholic Institutions against Heresy*, 1552.

(5) *Ibi.* tit. xlv.

then, released. Even if he relapsed, and being again committed, repented, he was again released (1). Only on the third conviction, and by three different sets of witnesses, each generally consisting of three (sometimes only two were required), the accused was finally consigned to the civil court for judgment. Much fault has been found with the Inquisition for sometimes admitting the evidence of disreputable persons, such as courtesans, etc.; but all tribunals do so to this day; and Simancas says that such testimony was received only "for what it was worth," and that, to condemn the accused, evidence "clearer than light" was required (2).

So far, we think, the reader will find no fault with the proceedings of the Inquisition, unless he is violently affected by the fact of the crime being a religious one, and therefore—as he may have been accustomed to think—one beyond the cognizance of a human tribunal. Let him remember, however, that positive law is conventional; that "to-day different crimes are punished, but this proves only that social interests are not always the same; those of to-day have the advantage of being actual, while those of the olden time have the disadvantage of having passed away" (3). But the reader will probably condemn the practice of torturing the convicted who would not confess their guilt. The more enlightened jurisprudence of our day recognizes the foolishness, as well as the cruelty, of such a practice; but at the time of the Inquisition the custom of applying the "question" (4) at the trial of imputed criminals was universal, and had been recognized from the days of Justinian. Men seem not to have perceived its absurdity and inhumanity until a very modern period; most of the European states continued its use until the end of the last century. But there are two points concerning the use of torture by the Spanish Inquisition which are too frequently ignored. Torture was applied by the civil, not by the ecclesiastical court; and if, as we learn from Art. 18 of the code estab-

(1) Limborch admits these two consecutive pardons.

(2) *Loc. cit.*, tit. li.

(3) CANTU, *Heretics of Italy*, disc. 5.

(4) There were two kinds of "question," the ordinary and extraordinary; the former being a mild use of the instruments employed "to elicit the truth," while the latter involved the utmost extreme of torment.

lished by Torquemada, one or two ecclesiastics were always present at the question, they were there merely to witness the avowals, and not—as popular fancy has pictured them—to gloat over the agonies of their victims. Again, a confession extorted by torture was of no avail to the prosecution, unless it was voluntarily confirmed three days afterward.

Concerning the number of the victims, whether by death or by exile, of the Spanish Inquisition, Balmes says that he defies England or France—the two nations who now claim to be at the head of civilization—to show, and to compare with the Spanish, their statistics on the subject of religious persecution: “We do not fear the parallel.” The Continuator of Fleury gives us a discourse of the celebrated chancellor de l’Hopital, who was strongly suspected of Calvinism, which indicates that, in the sixteenth century, the dreaded tribunal was not painted in colors so sombre as it wears at present. At the Colloquy of Poissy there was a debate on the propriety of establishing the Inquisition in France; and the chancellor avowed that he would vote for it “had not the evil of religious dissension already taken so deep a root in his country, and were it likely that France would secure that benefit of unity of faith which Philip had secured for Spain, at the cost (during his reign) of forty-eight capital executions.” Llorente contends that, during its career of three hundred and thirty years, the Spanish tribunal put more than thirty thousand persons to death; but when we analyze his details, we find that his figures are not to be trusted. Take, for instance, the assertion that during the first year of its existence (1481), the sole tribunal of Seville burned two thousand, all of whom, he says, belonged to the diocese of Seville and Cadiz. In support of this charge he cites Mariana; but a consultation of that historian will reveal that the number of two thousand includes all the persons executed under Torquemada, and throughout his entire jurisdiction—that is, in the whole of Castile and Leon during his fifteen years of inquisitorship. After narrating how Torquemada founded inquisitorial tribunals in Castile, Aragon, Valencia, and Catalonia, Pulgar, a contemporary historian, justifies

the remarks of Mariana: "These tribunals summoned all heretics to present themselves; and fifteen thousand having obeyed, they were reconciled to the Church by penance. As for those who waited for prosecution, the convicted were consigned to the secular authority, and about two thousand of them were burned at different times in various districts."

Llorente himself shows, in another passage, that his figures concerning the victims of the year 1481 are falsified; for there he states that, in that very year, the new tribunal executed two hundred and ninety-eight persons. He perceived the contradiction, and tried to escape by remarking that seventeen hundred and two other victims belonged to other places than Seville—"to the surrounding districts and the diocese of Cadiz." But the forgetful historian had already told us, and rightly, that before 1483 there was but one inquisitorial tribunal in all Andalusia, and that it was at Seville, whither the accused were sent from all parts. So much for Llorente's statistics of the first year of the Spanish Inquisition; and nearly all his other calculations are made with similar disregard for truth. Listen to the following argument: "When the number of tribunals was increased from three to eleven, the number of executions must have increased in the same proportion;" and then he builds up his figures. Must we suppose that eleven tribunals necessarily have eleven times the number of capital sentences hitherto pronounced by one? Again, the bad faith of Llorente is plain when he says that his thirty thousand victims were all heretics,—“unfortunates, who had committed, perhaps, no other crime than that of better interpreting the Bible, and of having a faith more enlightened than that of their judges.” According to his own admission, the Spanish tribunal took cognizance of many crimes besides heresy: of sins against nature; of ecclesiastical and monastic immoralities; of blasphemy, usury, and sacrilegious theft; of all crimes connected with the employees or affairs of the tribunal; of traffic in contraband of war; and of every kind of sorcery and superstition—which last crimes, thanks to the Moors and Jews, caused more trouble in Spain than all the others produced. Finally, Hefele shows that at Nordlingen

—a Protestant town of Germany, having then a population of six thousand—the Protestant authorities burned in four years (1590–94) thirty-five sorcerers. Applying these proportions to Spain, where sorcery was then at least as prevalent, there should have been, in four years, fifty thousand sorcerers executed in that country; that is, twenty thousand more than Llorente assigns as victims of every kind to the Spanish Inquisition during its career of three hundred and thirty years. Let the reader reflect as to the probable proportion of heretics in Llorente's thirty thousand victims.

CHAPTER XXXII.

POPE BONIFACE VIII.

On the death of Pope Nicholas IV. on April 4, 1292, so great were the dissensions among the cardinals, that no election was effected until July 5, 1294, when the tiara was conferred on Peter Morone, the founder of a Benedictine Congregation afterward styled Celestines. The new Pontiff was a man of evident sanctity, but he was utterly ignorant of the world and its passions, and had never had any experience of men. Very soon after the accession of Celestine V., widespread confusion proved that a pontiff should have some idea of the wants and habits of the world. All the time of Celestine was passed in a little cell in the interior of the palace, and the curials abused his authority to sanction acts of simony. Charles II., king of Naples, realizing how much the House of Anjou might gain by manipulating so simple-minded a pontiff, prevailed on Celestine to promise at least a temporary transfer of the papal residence to Naples; and he also obtained a release from his vow not to detain the Pope in his dominions. Thus did this holy, but injudicious pastor, subject the pontifical independence to the whims of a tricky sovereign. Very soon Celestine heard that it was whispered that the weal of Christendom demanded his abdication; and a poem by the celebrated Jacopone da Todi, warning him of the tremendous respon-

sibilities of the tiara, completed his own conviction that he was unsuited to his position. But could a Pope abdicate? He consulted Cardinal Gaetani, one of the most learned men of his court; and that prelate, backed by many other cardinals, having pronounced in the affirmative, a full Consistory listened, on December 13, 1294, to the Act of abdication, and then the venerable ex-pontiff resumed his monastic habit. On the first day of the ensuing Conclave, the unanimous choice of the electors was Benedict Gaetani, who assumed the name of Boniface VIII.

Born at Anagni, Gaetani received his first education from the Franciscans, and, in time, he acquired the reputation of a consummate jurist. Martin IV. raised him to the cardinalate. When he donned the tiara, Boniface VIII. was in his seventy-eighth year; but he had the energy of youth. At that moment, Philip the Fair of France and Edward I. of England were entering upon that struggle which was, in a few years, to end in nearly the ruin of France. The contest between Albert of Austria and Adolphus of Nassau divided Germany. Sicily, yet red with the blood of the famous Vespers (1282), and submissive to the house of Aragon, defied the censures of the Church. Venice, Genoa, and Pisa were at war; Tuscany was a prey to the Whites and Blacks. The Eternal City was exhausted by the factious wars of the Orsini and the Colonna (1). In the East, the Christian

(1) In the Rome of the Middle Age there are ever visible three distinct political elements: 1, the republican, represented by the people, with its "Roman Republic," its prefect of the city, its consuls, patricians, senate, and all the forms of the ancient constitution (See CURTIUS; *Commentaries on the Roman Senate*, Geneva, 1769). 2, the feudal element, represented by the nobility, with their castles, fiefs, and all the customs of feudalism. 3, the ecclesiastical element, represented by the Pope-King. During the time of the first Carolingian emperors, the Popes were dominant in Rome, but in the tenth century the feudal element nearly annihilated their authority, and a turbulent oligarchy governed the city, to the detriment of popular liberty. The Otthos repressed the Roman nobility, and the third of the line even tried to make Rome his capital; the emperor's effigy appeared on the Roman coins along with that of the Pontiff (MURATORI; *Italian Antiquities of the Middle Age*, vol. II, diss. 27), and the emperor reserved the right of exercising criminal justice by means of the prefect, whom he invested with the sword, etc. All this in spite of the fact that at the emperor's coronation he swore thrice (at the Ponticello, at the Porta Collina, and at the steps of St. Peter's) to respect the liberties of the Romans. In the twelfth century the power of the Roman Senate greatly increased; the S. P. Q. R. was resumed in all acts, and with the exception of criminal justice and foreign relations, the Senate was the government until the reign of Innocent III, who restored the Pontifical authority. In the thirteenth century, the Pontiffs who were the most respected abroad frequently trembled in their own capital, but this was owing, not so much to the turbulence of the Romans, as to the antagonism of

colonies, established by the Crusaders, begged the Western powers to save them from destruction. But it is not our purpose to narrate the entire history of this Pontificate; we shall confine ourselves to the events which have rendered famous the name of Boniface VIII., and which have been too often misrepresented.

When Boniface VIII. ascended the Papal throne, Philip IV. had occupied the throne of France for nine years. He had reduced the power of the chief vassals of the crown, and naturally entertained exaggerated ideas of his own importance. His political morality was of slight calibre, and he was the first French monarch who made it an art to be able in evil. The famous disagreement between Pope Boniface and King Philip may be traced to various causes. Shortly after his election, the Pontiff had erected the abbey of the canons-regular at Pamiers into a bishopric, and had given the new diocese to a person much disliked by the king. On Oct. 18, 1296, Boniface published the Bull *Clericis Laicos*, in which he ordered all ecclesiastics to pay, out of the ecclesiastical revenues, no tax, etc., to laics, without the express permission of the Holy See. This Bull was directed more especially against Edward I. of England, who exercised against the clergy an oppression which Philip had not yet attempted; but this monarch chose to be offended by it. In another Bull, *Ineffabilis*, dated Oct. 25, 1296, the Pontiff explains his prohibition, and shows the old affection of the Roman court for France: "If your kingdom—which God forbid!—were in imminent danger, far from prohibiting the French clergy from according subsidies to you, the Holy See would sacrifice its crosses, its chalices, its sacred vessels, rather than expose to danger so noble, so dear a kingdom which has been so long so devoted to the Roman Church." Pope Boniface has been greatly blamed for his Bull *Clericis Laicos*, but it merely gives the sense of Canon 44 of the Fourth Council of Lateran.

In 1298, Philip received, with great honor, several members of the Guelphs and Ghibellines. In Rome these factions were headed, respectively, by the Orsini and Colonna, two families whose origin is traced to the times of the old empire (CRESCENZI; *Crown of the Italian Nobility*, Bologna, 1639. MONALDESCO, in Muratori's *Italian Writers*, vol. XII.).

bers of the Colonna family, who affected to regard Boniface VIII. as an Anti-Pope, he having reduced them to subjection. In the same year the Pontiff displeased the king by ordering a truce with England and Germany. The authors of the *Art of Verifying Dates*, not at all favorable to our Pontiff, say: "Boniface VIII. having been chosen as arbitrator by the kings of France and England, rendered judgment in full Consistory on June 28, 1298, and afterward expedited it in the form of a Bull. This document, given in its entirety by Rymer, does honor to the impartiality of Boniface, although most French writers speak ill of it. But these authors are fully refuted by the text of the Bull, and by the docility with which the two kings obeyed the sentence." The decision of the Pontiff was carried to Paris by the English ambassador to the Holy See. This choice wounded the national pride of Philip. Again, the Pontiff had restored the *status quo ante bellum*, and Philip wished to retain the advantages of his victories in Flanders; consequently, he did not object when the count d'Artois snatched the document from the hands of the bishop and cast it into the fire. As for himself, he protested that he would not observe one of its articles; nevertheless, he afterward submitted.

In 1301 the Pontiff sent as legate to France the bishop of Pamiers, whom Philip detested, Bernard de Saisset, with instructions to urge the monarch to an expedition to the Holy Land; to prohibit the use of clerical subsidies for any other purpose than the redemption of the Holy Sepulchre; and to protest against many violations of ecclesiastical immunities on the part of Philip. Boniface might have chosen a more acceptable agent than de Saisset; but when certain authors assert that this "insolence" and a threat to depose Philip caused the bishop's expulsion from the French court, they draw on their own imagination, and not on any one of the authorities of the time. Philip believed that he had many reasons for detesting de Saisset. The quarrels of that prelate with the count de Foix concerning the independence of his episcopal city; his descent from the counts of Toulouse, and his supposed desire to

revive the kingdom of Languedoc : these sufficed to prompt Philip to seek a pretext for disembarassing himself of the legate. The count de Foix and others swore that Saisset had often declared that Philip came from bastards, and was a phantom ; that the same Saisset had charged the king with adulterating the coinage of the realm. The prelate had even, according to his foes, fomented the war with England, and had incited the counts de Foix and de Comminges to revolt. On Oct. 24, the accused was tried ; the chancellor, Peter Flotte, acting as prosecutor. The legate returned a general denial, but a verdict of guilty was rendered, and he was consigned to the custody of the archbishop of Narbonne. To justify his proceedings, Philip sent Flotte to Rome, and in full Consistory the chancellor defended his master with such audacity that the Pontiff reminded him of the spiritual sword. Flotte retorted : " Very well, your Holiness ; but your sword is one of mere words, while my master's deals death ; " an impudence which Philip would scarcely have authorized. Pope Boniface now sent into France another legate, James des Normands, who was charged to demand the liberty of Saisset, and to bring the king to reason in all other matters. The new legate took with him four Bulls, in the first of which the Pope suspended all the privileges accorded to the king. In the second, commencing *Ausculta fili*, the Pontiff concludes : " We have often tried to lead the king back to his duty, but in vain. Therefore, we now order the archbishops, bishops, abbots, chapters, and doctors in theology, to appear before us in November of next year, that we may provide, with their counsel, for reform in the kingdom, and for the re-establishment of good order." The two other Bulls were invitations to the clergy of France to attend the conference ordered above. The Bull *Ausculta fili* was retained by Flotte, and, as the great Gallican de Marca admits, he forged a Brief which was calculated to further irritate Philip, and to put the Pontiff into a false position. This Brief, although evidently false, is found in all the old histories of this dispute, and is even inserted in the *Glossary* of Canon Law. It says : " Boniface, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to Philip,

king of France: Fear God and keep His commandments. We wish you to know that you are subject to us in both temporals and spirituals; that the granting of benefices and prebends belongs to you in no way; that you are bound to reserve their revenues for those who succeed to them; and that, if you have conferred any benefices, we pronounce such collations and all their consequent acts to be null and void. We regard as heretics all who believe otherwise." The proofs that this Brief is a forgery are as follows: I. Pope Boniface accuses Peter Flotte, by name, of the crime. II. The legate, des Normands, denies that he ever used such language to Philip, either in writing, or by speech. III. The affectation of brevity, the imperious tone, of the document are entirely foreign both to the style of the Roman Curia, and to the courtesy ever manifested in the correspondence of Boniface VIII. IV. The entire Sacred College protested officially against it. However, King Philip chose to call the document authentic, and so far demeaned himself as to parody it in the following letter to the Pontiff: "Philip, by the grace of God, king of the French, to Boniface, styling himself Sovereign Pontiff, little or no greeting: We wish your great Fatuity to know that we are subject to no one in temporals. The giving of vacant benefices and prebends, and the right to receive their revenues, is our royal prerogative. The provisions we have made, and shall make, are valid, both as to the past and as to the future, and we shall uphold their possessors against all persons. We regard as insensate all who believe otherwise." Unfortunately for the memory of this great monarch, while the little Brief is certainly false, there is full evidence that the royal reply is authentic. When James des Normands finally read the true Bull *Ausculta fili*, it was interpreted in the sense of the forged Brief, and on Feb. 11, 1302, in the presence of all the nobility then in the capital, the count d'Artois gave it to the flames, and news of the act was proclaimed by public crier through the public streets. The cause of Bernard de Saisset was now secondary, and, together with the legate des Normands, he was ordered to quit France.

To complete the iniquitous work, a counsellor of the

king, William of Nogaret, prompted by the Colonna refugees, presented to Philip the following accusations against Pope Boniface. I. He was not Pope. II. He was an open heretic. III. He was the worst simoniac the world had ever seen. IV. His other enormities were innumerable. Hence, Philip was entreated to assemble the estates of the kingdom to punish the monster. On April 10, 1302, the estates met in Notre Dame, under the presidency of the king, but Peter Flotte, now keeper of the seal, addressed them in the royal name. He accused Pope Boniface of pretending that France was a fief of the Holy See, and adduced as proof the Brief he had forged. He then asked the prelates, barons, and other lords, whether they held their fiefs from the Pope or from the king; and he insisted on an immediate answer, for he wished to know who were traitors to his Majesty. The temporal lords submitted at once; after some hesitation the spiritual ones followed. As for the Council convoked by Boniface, a royal prohibition prevented most of the prelates from attending it, but to the honor of the French clergy be it remembered that four archbishops, thirty-five bishops, and six abbots, obeyed the Pontifical summons, and their revenues went into the royal exchequer. The Pope and the Sacred College protested against the calumnies of the chancellor, and on November 1, 1302, Boniface opened his Synod, but we know little of its transactions. The Pontiff published his famous Constitution *Unam Sanctam*, in which some writers have found that he claimed to dispose, at his own pleasure, of all the kingdoms of the earth. But Fenelon explained the Pontiff's assertions in the sense of the simple "directive" power. The strongest expressions of the *Unam Sanctam* are taken from Hugh of St. Victor and St. Bernard, and Bossuet explains their meaning in the "directive" sense. Pope Boniface speaks of submission to the Pontiff as to the source or organ of Christian principle; he does not claim obedience in the purely temporal order. In the very Synod in which the *Unam Sanctam* was issued, the Pope said: "It is forty years since we were initiated in the science of law, and we know that there are two powers ordained by God. How

then can any one believe that such foolishness entered into our mind (as to assert that the French king holds his temporalities from the Pope)? We protest, therefore, that we have no intention to usurp, in any way, the jurisdiction of the king; but the king cannot deny, any more than any other Christian, that he is subject to us, by reason of sin."

That he might not neglect any means of bringing Philip to a sense of his duty, the Pontiff sent to him the cardinal Lemoine, much esteemed by the monarch, with the following eleven articles of agreement, the acceptance of which would have guaranteed a durable peace. I. The royal prohibition to the clergy to visit the Eternal City should be revoked. II. The Papal permission for the royal collation of a benefice was to be regarded as necessary. III. The right of the Pope to send legates where he might please, was to be acknowledged. IV. Only the Pontiff can legislate concerning the administration of ecclesiastical property. V. No prince can seize such goods of the clergy, as they do not hold from him in fief. VI. The crime of the king of France, in allowing a Papal Bull to be burnt in his presence, if not proved to be without foundation in truth, was to be punished by the loss of all the privileges accorded to the king by the Apostolic See. VII. During the vacancy of dioceses, etc., the king should put an end to the abuses sanctioned as rights of *regalia*. VIII. The spiritual sword was to be restored to the bishops, all privileges to the contrary notwithstanding. IX. The king should make restitution for his adulteration of the coin of the realm, and for all unjust exactions by his officers. X. An explanation was to be given for the discourteous reception of the legate, des Normands. XI. This article concerned the independence of the church of Lyons. The cardinal Lemoine presented these articles to Philip in March, 1303, and received instantly a categorical answer to each one. As to the first, only the circumstances of the time had induced the monarch to forbid the bishops' visits to the Holy See. As to the second, fourth, fifth, and seventh articles, which concerned benefices, the king would remedy all abuses. Concerning the third, he would never refuse to recognize a Papal legate,

unless he had good reason to suspect him. As for the sixth, the burning of the Bull was owing to the invocation, in a contest between the Chapter and some officers of Laon, of a Bull the nullity of which was proved, and that Bull was burnt with the consent of the bishop of Laon. The eighth he would not notice. He replied to the ninth and tenth that the example of his predecessors had led him to adulterate his coinage, as a means of aiding his treasury, and that some of his subjects' losses had been repaired; in future, he would avoid adulteration. As to the eleventh article, the independence of the church of Lyons would form a subject for future negotiation. No wonder if these replies were regarded by the Pontiff as "vague, equivocal, obscure, and evasive," and if he stamped the answer to the sixth article as an absolute falsehood.

Following the advice of Nogaret, King Philip soon resolved to proceed to the last extremities in his difference with Pope Boniface. On June 13, 1303, the estates met in the Louvre, and in the presence of Philip, William Plasian, lord of Vezénobre, accused the Supreme Pontiff of unbelief in the immortality of the soul, in a future life, and in the Real Presence. He also declared that Boniface favored idolatry; that he consulted a familiar demon; that he practised sodomy; that he was a simoniac; and that he forced priests to reveal the secrets of the confessional. Plasian then protested that in proffering these charges, he was actuated by no malice against the accused; and he swore that he would prove all his allegations in a General Council which he conjured King Philip to promote. Then Philip arose, and having declared his agreement with the conduct of Plasian, he requested the prelates to join him in procuring a General Council; then, as it was certain that Boniface would oppose such a measure, Philip appealed to the future Council against anything that the said Boniface might do or say. The Continuator of Nange and John Villani record that the abbot of Cîteaux alone dared to protest against these enormities. Alexandre, in his article on the manner in which "the king and the French church defended their rights and liberties against the attacks of Boniface VIII.,"

contends that the protest of the Cistercian abbot is uncertain; for he pronounces it contradicted by the Acts of the assembly as cited in the famous *Proofs of the Dispute, etc.* But while it is true that the name of the abbot of Citeaux is read among the signatures, they who compelled the votes were capable of forgery, and hence we may credit the assertion of the Continuator and of Villani, and believe that there was one brave soul that day among the higher clergy of France. When the estates separated, Philip sent Plasian and two others, with ample powers, into all the provinces to obtain the approbation of the above proceedings from all the towns, churches, and communities. Over seven hundred adhesions were put into his hands, but many Italian monks, then residing in the kingdom, refused their signatures, as did also the abbots of Cluny, Citeaux, and Prémontré, and these were all thrust into prison. When the news of these outrages reached Rome, the Pontiff, deeming it wiser to be out of the power of the Ghibellines, then dominant in his capital, proceeded to Anagni. There he protested his innocence of the crimes imputed to him by Philip, and expedited five Bulls, all under date of August 18, 1303. The first excommunicated all who prevented the publication of Papal documents, be the dignity of such parties the highest. The second suspended the archbishop of Nicosia for having favored the disobedience of Philip. The third deprived all the doctors of the University of Paris, who had counselled the king, of the right to confer degrees, until his Majesty obeyed the orders of the Holy See. The fourth took from every French ecclesiastical corporation the right of election, reserving all nominations to the Pontiff. The fifth concerned the royal criminal alone. It commences: *Nuper ad audientiam*, and in it the Pope recapitulates the proceedings at the Louvre on June 13, and repels the accusations, especially of heresy, made against himself. Then he reproaches Philip with his reception of the rebel, Stephen Colonna, and with his violence toward the Papal legates. He points out the absurdity of a General Council without the concurrence of the Pontiff. He does not excommunicate the king, but he warns him to beware lest he may draw this

punishment on himself. This last fact shows that the Constitution *Per processus nostros*, in which the excommunication is pronounced, was written only by way of provision.

The Bull *Nuper ad audientiam* arrived at Paris too late to obviate the final catastrophe. William de Nogaret had already proceeded to Italy. There he met Jacopo (called Sciarra, "dispute," owing to his irritability) Colonna, whom Philip, says Ferretti of Vicenza, a great authority among the foes of Boniface, had begged to help in the work entrusted to his minister. Sciarra was at the head of three hundred horse and some foot-soldiers, and he was soon joined by two hundred cavalry, a remnant of the army that Charles of Valois had commanded in Sicily, and by a number of friends of Ceccano (whom Boniface held in prison), of Maffeo d'Anagni, and of Rinaldo di Suppino, the Ghibelline governor of Ferentino. Meanwhile, Pope Boniface, far from suspecting that the grandson of St. Louis could conspire against the life or liberty of a Roman Pontiff, was engaged on his Bull *Super Petri solio*, which was destined to give the final blow to the haughty monarch. On the morning of September 7, word was brought to the Papal palace that the streets of Anagni were filled with soldiers under the royal standard of France, and very soon the Pontiff heard shouts of "Death to Boniface!" and of "Live the King of France!" Nogaret and Colonna, aided by the treachery of the Ghibelline magistrates of the city, were undisputed masters of Anagni. The palace was soon attacked, and after a short and brave resistance by the Marquis Gaetani and a few retainers, an entrance was forced. At this moment there were with the Pope only two cardinals, the bishops of Ostia and of Sabina, but the grand soul of Boniface would have sustained him in greater desolation. Crying to the attendants: "Open my doors, for I desire to die a martyr for the Church of God," he hastily donned the Pontifical insignia, and when the noble ruffians burst into the apartment, they beheld the venerable successor of Peter seated upon his throne, with his face toward the altar, the tiara on his head, one hand holding a cross, and the other

grasping the symbolic keys (1). For a moment Sciarra and Nogaret were abashed, but soon the former gave vent to a torrent of insults (2), some writers asserting that he even struck the pontiff, while others make no mention of such an outrage. At any rate, Nogaret uttered this insulting remark: "Caitiff that thou art, note the goodness of my master, the king of France, who from a distance protects thee, by my means, from thy enemies" (3). The dignity of Pope Boniface remained unruffled, and he persevered in silence until the Frenchman threatened to put him in chains and to take him to Lyons, there to be deposed by a future Council. "Here is my head," cried the Pontiff; "for the liberty of the Church, I, a Catholic, legitimate Pope, and vicar of Jesus Christ, am willing to be condemned and deposed by Patarini; I desire a martyrdom for the faith of Christ, and for His Church." This allusion to the grandfather of Nogaret, who had been burnt as a Patarine, silenced the ruffian, and he put an end to the scene by ordering the imprisonment of his victim (4). For three days Boniface was kept in close confinement, and subjected to many outrages and privations. His palace was sacked, the relics of saints were dispersed, the archives plundered, and the bishop of Strigonium was put to death (5). Finally, the people of Anagni attacked the bands of Nogaret and Sciarra, beat them out of the city, and freed the Pontiff. The manner in which Boniface resented his injuries does not justify the generally received opinion that he was violent and implacable. He dismissed all his prisoners, excepting the robbers of the treasury, and he pardoned Rinaldo di

(1) JOHN VILLANI, b. VIII., c. 63; ST. ANTONINE, v. III., tit. XX., c. 8; PIPINUS, *Chronicle*, b. IV, c 41; WALSINGHAM, *Hist. of England*; FERRETTI of Vicenza, b. III., p. 1002 — *Chron. Parma*, y. 1303 *Pistolce Histories*, in MURATORI, v. XI.; RUBEO, *Process.*

(2) VILLANI; ST. ANTONINE; FERRETTI, all *loc. cit.*

(3) WALSINGHAM, *loc. cit.*

(4) Violently opposed though he was to Boniface VIII., this terrible scene caused Dante to allow the Catholic to banish the Ghibelline, and to write:

"Entering Alagna, lo the fleur de lis,
And in his vicar, Christ a captive led!
I see Him mocked a second time—again
The vinegar and gall produced I see;
And Christ Himself 'twixt living robbers slain."

—*Purgatory*, cto. XX., Wright's Translation.

(5) RUBEO, *loc. cit.*

Suppino, and the cardinals, Napoleon Orsini and Richard of Siena, implicated in the late outrage (1). He immediately proceeded to Rome, but was soon seized by an ardent fever, and seeing his last hour approach, he received the last Sacraments, and rendered his heroic soul to God on Oct. 11, 1303.

It has been the fortune of Pope Boniface VIII. to have made many enemies, and to have found very few apologists, even among Catholic writers. Most Protestant authors have ranked him among the "wicked" Popes. Very many Catholic authors would have acted, they think, in a very different way if they had occupied the Papal throne in circumstances like those that surrounded this Pontiff. Raynald tells us that "upon this same Boniface, who had caused kings, bishops, the clergy, religious, and the people to quake with fear, there suddenly came, one day, grief, fear, and trembling; in order that, by this example, the higher prelates might learn that they ought not tyrannize over the clergy and the people, but rather to care for their subjects, and to desire their love more than their fear." Cantù, to our great surprise, regards this judgment of Raynald as "Christian impartiality," and accepts the account of our Pontiff's death as given by his enemies: "Crushed, and out of his mind, he expired like a madman" (2). When authors so devoted to the Holy See utter such opinions with regard to Boniface VIII., we need not be surprised that Sismondi, the Magdebourg Centuriators, Mosheim, and the rank and file of Protestant polemics, can see no good in him; that while Popes Gregory VII. and Innocent III. have found a Voigt and a Hurter to proclaim their virtues and to defend their policies, and while a Ranke finds much to admire in many other Pontiffs, Boniface is nearly universally regarded as, at best, an unscrupulous intriguer. But he has found some apologists, and among them the first place is due to the learned Benedictine of Montecassino, Dom Louis Tosti whose *History of Boniface VIII.* would have been still more valuable, if the author had possessed the *Acts* published by Dupuy, and had not been obliged to rely upon simple ex-

(1) WALSINGHAM; RUBEO, *ibi*.(2) *Univ. Hist.*, b. XIII., c. 6.

tracts from them. The concise and judicious Palma has deviated, while treating of this Pontificate, from his usual brevity, and has given a very satisfactory apology. The abbé Christophe, in his *History of the Papacy during the Fourteenth Century* (1853), has done much to clear the character of Boniface, and Cardinal Wiseman published, in 1844, a critical and exhaustive essay in his defense, which cannot be too highly praised.

The first accusation made against Pope Boniface VIII. coincides with his assumption of the tiara. He is charged with having used artifice to procure the abdication of Celestine V. Mosheim says that "several cardinals, and especially Benedict Gaetani, advised Celestine to abdicate the Papacy . . . and they had the pleasure of seeing their advice followed with the utmost docility" (1). Sismondi tells us that "among the cardinals was Benedict Gaetani, who took care to excite their discontent, and to exaggerate in their minds the danger that threatened Christendom. In address and dissimulation this man had no equal; he knew how, at the same time, to flatter the cardinals who regarded him as the defender of their prerogative, and to rule the mind of Celestine, who acted only in accordance with his counsels, and who, perhaps, would not have fallen into so many errors, had not the treacherous adviser schemed to render him both odious and ridiculous . . . Then he induced Celestine to resign a position for which he was not fitted. Some declare that he planned a speaking-trumpet to convey, as it were, an order from heaven, to this intent; but without recurring to this trick, he could influence in many ways the simple-minded man whose conscience he alarmed" (2). Ferretti of Vicenza is the *some* upon whom Sismondi relies to make us accept the tale of the speaking-trumpet, but even this bitter foe of Boniface introduces his story with a *ferunt*—"they say." And it is strange that Sismondi should accept the authority of Ferretti's *ferunt*, when he quietly ignores that partisan's assertion that Gaetani had himself made the nominator of the new Pontiff, and declares that

(1) *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. II.

(2) *History of the Italian Republics of the Middle Age*, vol. IV., ch. 24.

he was the unanimous choice of the cardinals. But did the cardinal Gaetani use any illegitimate means to procure the abdication of Pope St. Celestine V.? Was he justified in using all legitimate means for that end? As to the first question, the most reliable authorities of the fourteenth century ascribe no more influence in the premises to Gaetani than they credit to any other cardinal; in fact, he rather appears to have acted as the mouthpiece of the Sacred College. Ptolemy of Lucca (d. 1328), bishop of Torcelli, who was no friend to Boniface, says that Pope Celestine "was urged to resign by some of the cardinals, as his rule had caused confusion and danger to the Roman Church . . . certain cardinals persistently declared that the evils of his administration would ensure the loss of his soul" (1). Cardinal Stephanesius, who was a warm friend of Celestine, and who composed the prayers and responsories for his office, tells us that "in spite of the opinion of some, and especially of his olden fellow-religious, he appeared willing to abdicate when he found that to do so was in his power; and in December, on the festival of the virgin St. Lucy, he relinquished the honors and the weight of the Pontificate" (2). Stephanesius also says that when the burden of his responsibility seemed to be beyond his capacity, he consulted "a friend"; that this friend (who may have been, as Sismondi insists, Gaetani) tried to dissuade him, while admitting that the renunciation could be effected; that Celestine replied: "I feel the sufficiency of my reasons"; that having consulted with another with the same result, he made up his mind. The celebrated Aegidius Colonna, general of the Augustinians, and finally archbishop of Bourges, who was devoted to St. Celestine, and too much so to Philip the Fair, says: "Many persons yet living can testify that the lord Pope Boniface VIII., then a cardinal, urged the lord Celestine not to abdicate, insisting that the Sacred College could act in the name of his Holiness. This was heard by many" (3). In the archives of the Vatican is preserved a manuscript *Life of St. Celestine V.* which is noticed by Rubeo,

(1) *Eccles. Hist.*, in MURATORI, *Italian Writers*, vol. XI., b. XXIV., c. 22.

(2) Poem entitled *The Abdication of Celestine*, in the *Introduction*.

(3) *Resignation of the Pope*, c. 23.

and which Cardinal Wiseman, in his researches concerning our Pontiff, transcribed. The author must have been an intimate of Celestine, and he confirms all that we have adduced from Ptolemy of Lucca, Stephanesius, and Aegidius Colonna. Having narrated how Celestine passed his time in his little cell, he proceeds: "He began to reflect on his burden, and to think of ridding himself of it, if he could do so without danger to his soul. He opened his mind to the lord cardinal Benedict, a man of great prudence and experience, who rejoiced greatly on hearing him, and told him that he could abdicate without scruple, adducing instances of such action on the part of other Pontiffs. Celestine then became so intent on his design, that no one could dissuade him." Having spoken of a procession, got up by the Angevine faction, which went to the Pope to beg him not to resign, the anonymous biographer continues: "The Pope would yield to no requests, tears, or clamors, although he kept in retirement for eight days, and all thought he had changed his mind. But after eight days, he summoned the aforesaid lord Benedict, and bade him prepare the act of abdication." To the above testimonies against Sismondi's assertion that Gaetani suggested Celestine's resignation, we may add those of Villani, Amalric Augarius—a bitter foe of Boniface VIII. and of Petrarch. Villani says that "Benedict Gaetani of Anagni, having heard that Celestine wished to abdicate, waited upon him, etc." (1). Amalric ascribes the resignation to the fact that "Celestine himself found himself incapable of administration" (2). Petrarch, after blaming Dante for attributing Celestine's action to cowardice, says: "I have heard persons who witnessed it, and they told how he fled with such joy, bearing in his eyes and on his brow such marks of spiritual gladness, when he retired from the Consistory, now restored to himself and free, that he seemed as though he had withdrawn, not merely his shoulders from a mild yoke, but his neck from the fatal axe" (3).

But even though we were to grant that the cardinal Gaetani procured, and even first suggested, the abdication of

(1) *Florentine Histories*, b. VIII., c. 5.

(2) *Lives of the Rom. Pont.*, in MURATORI, *Ital. Writers*, v. III., pt. 2.

(3) *Solitary Life*, b. II., sec. 3. c. 18.

Pope St. Celestine V., is he to be blamed for such action? That this Pontiff was utterly unfit to occupy the Papal chair, is fully shown by the authors of his time. James, the contemporary archbishop of Genoa, tells us that he "conferred dignities, prelacies, offices, and benefices, in defiance of the customs of the Curia. . . . He did many other things contrary to the statutes and example of his predecessors, and although this was all without malice and in all simplicity, yet it caused great evils in the Church. Therefore, when he realized his inexperience and deficiencies, he followed wise advice, etc." (1). Stephanesius says that Celestine forced the Benedictines of Montecassino to adopt the dress of his own "Celestines"; that he allowed the king of Naples to nominate to the Sacred College; and that, out of twelve cardinalitial hats given in one day, seven were for Frenchmen, creatures of the Angevine interest, and not one was for a Roman subject. The *Milanese Annals* say: "He did many things which greatly scandalized the Church, and realizing his insufficiency he. . . . abdicated the Pontificate" (2). Ptolemy of Lucca, while praising the piety of Celestine, tells us that "he was often deceived by his officers with regard to favors granted, of which he could have known nothing. . . . hence the same privileges were found to have been granted to two, or three, or more persons, even on (originally) blank, but sealed parchments" (3). But even Sismondi admits that "very soon Celestine gave the most striking proof that he was absolutely incapable of governing the Church." Would not Gaetani, therefore, have been justified in procuring his resignation?

We now approach the subject of St. Celestine's confinement by order of Pope Boniface. Even Sismondi grants that many, especially if of the Angevine interest feigned to regard this Pontiff's abdication as invalid. He would have been a pliant instrument in the hands of unscrupulous parties, and a schism might very easily have been promoted; that there was imminent danger of such a catastrophe, was afterward proved by the conduct of the Colonna family.

(1) *Jannensian Chron.*, in MURATORI, *loc. cit.*, vol. IX.

(2) *Ibi.* vol. XVI.

(3) *Ubi sup.*

Dante shows us that this distrust must have been widespread when he dares to make St. Peter style Boniface a usurper : and George Stella, an enemy of Boniface, plainly says that this Pontiff confined his predecessor because of a fear of schism (1). But if it be said that St. Celestine was harshly treated, and that his death was occasioned by wounds caused by the ferocity of his jailers, the foes of Pope Boniface draw upon their own perverted imaginations. Ptolemy of Lucca informs us that "Boniface sent couriers after Celestine, and he was put in custody, to avoid danger to the Roman Church ; for some persons doubted whether he could abdicate, and hence there was danger of a schism. Therefore he was kept in confinement, but respectfully, and he died in the Castle of Fumone." John Villani says that Boniface "caused Celestine to be held in courteous imprisonment, so that he might not, while living, be brought forward to contest his (Boniface's) election ; for many Christians regarded Celestine as the true and lawful Pope, since they thought that such a dignity could not be resigned." The cardinal Stephanesius declares that Celestine came to Anagni willingly, and that Boniface received him kindly and tendered every comfort to him, but he preferred to lead a penitential life. Sismondi ignores these testimonies, justifying his own account of Celestine's imprisonment with the assertion that it "is taken from a *Life of Celestine V.* by Peter d'Ailly, his contemporary." As Celestine died in 1296, and the cardinal d'Ailly was not born until 1350, this *Life* cannot properly be called the work of a *contemporary* of Celestine, and is not the result of d'Ailly's own personal knowledge, as are the remarks of the authors whom we have quoted. The death of Celestine is ascribed by nearly all his contemporaries to a fever, and the fact that d'Ailly, whose Gallican zeal allowed him to forego no opportunity of blaming Boniface, says nothing of any wounds on Celestine's person, is sufficient to stamp the story as a falsehood.

The adversaries of Boniface VIII. place much stress on his treatment of the Colonna family, and, as the struggle with this powerful faction was the direct cause of the catas-

(1) *Annals*, MURATORI, *loc. cit.*, vol. XVII.

trophe of our Pontiff's life, it would interest the reader if we were to sketch its origin and progress. But our limits warn us to rather refer the student to the cited paper of Cardinal Wiseman, where he will also find a refutation of the charges of cruelty and perfidy made, in this connection, by Sismondi. But one event of this struggle claims a brief observation. We are told that Boniface took Palestrina by treachery. The Pontiff, says Sismondi, having found it impossible to reduce the place, sent for the celebrated general, Count Guido di Montefeltro, who had become a Franciscan friar, to obtain his advice. "He ordered the count, by his vow of obedience, to find out how the city might be taken, promising him full absolution for anything he might do or counsel against his conscience. Guido obeyed, examined the fortifications, and finding that force could not reduce them, returned to Boniface, and requested more express absolution for any crime he had committed, or might commit, in giving advice in the matter. This absolution having been accorded, he said: 'I see but one way, and that is to promise much and perform little,' and then he returned to the convent." Having pondered on this perfidious advice, Boniface is said to have promised pardon to the Colonna if they would surrender in three days. They did so, but, continues Sismondi, they had been warned that Boniface intended to execute them, and hence they fled to foreign lands. None of these assertions are supported by sound testimony; some of them are contradicted by contemporary evidence. Three authorities are adduced, namely, Dante (1), Ferretti, and Pepino, all virulent enemies of Boniface. We would at once remark, with Christophe, that, if we can suppose the Pontiff to have been capable of following such perfidious advice as is attributed to Guido, we must also believe him to have been able to conceive it. It was not necessary to draw an old soldier from his cloister in order to hit upon such a plan. But of what authority is Dante in this matter? Because Raphael and other great painters have revenged themselves for real or fancied injuries, by placing

(1) *Hell*; cto. XXVII. The poet makes Guido attribute his damnation to his perfidious counsel to Boniface. Both Ferretti and Pepino derived the story from this source.

their cardinalitial or prelatical foes in ridiculous or painful positions, do we regard these pictures as sources of historical truth, when we wish to learn anything concerning these prelates? Dante, smarting from injuries received during the intestine wars of the Whites and Blacks, found a terribly effective way of revenging himself by casting perennial obloquy upon his enemies, in a poem which, he must have felt, was destined to be immortal. All were inexorably thrust into hell, and made to acknowledge the justice of their punishment, and thus to excuse the faction of the poet. That the tale of Guido's perfidy is but another instance of Ghibelline injustice, can easily be proved. This celebrated man, once a powerful enemy of the Church, was reconciled in 1286 (1). Boniface VIII. allowed him to join the Franciscans (2); and, according to the old biographer of the saints of Umbria (3), he "took the habit in 1296. He lived in constant prayer, humility, and example; and, on Sept. 23, 1298, while residing in the convent at Assisi, he passed holily to the Lord." Now Palestrina was surrendered in this very month; these two facts can scarcely be reconciled, in the supposition that Guido was at the siege shortly before the surrender. Again, the *Annals of Cesena*, Ricobald of Ferrara, and the *Bolognese Chronicles*, are silent as to the supposed trip from the convent, and the temporary assumption of the military life by Guido; is it likely that the chroniclers would not have noticed so important and unusual an event? Finally, Ferretti and Pepino, the only contemporary historians who relate the story, differ as to a very important fact. The former makes Guido come to Palestrina; the latter says that he refused to come on account of his age and his vows. The assertion that Palestrina was surrendered under promises which were not fulfilled, is easily refuted. The Colonna certainly charged Boniface with this perfidy, but how comes it that they cast themselves at his feet and sued for mercy, if, as they afterward contended, he had promised to be content with having his banner on their walls, while the town itself would remain under their rule? We are

(1) MALESPINI; *Florentine History*, ch., CCXXVIII., In MURATORI, *loc. cit.*, vol. VIII.

(2) WADDING, *Annals*, vol. V.

(3) Cited by TOSTI, *loc. cit.*, vol. II. p. 273.

told that they fled for their lives, rather than appear before the Pope; but the cardinal Gaetani, a nephew of Boniface, rebuked this falsehood in the Fifteenth General Council, and appealed to the evidence of the prince of Tarento, there present, and who had witnessed the humiliation of the Colonna family at Rieti, for the truth of his statement that they had "personally appeared before the aforesaid Supreme Pontiff... and confessed that they deserved punishment, and not favor. One of the same lords Colonna used the Gospel words: 'I have sinned, father, before heaven and thee; and am not worthy to be called thy son.' The testimony of Gaetani is corroborated by Pepino, Villani, the Chronicle of Orvieto, and Paolino di Piero.

We must now notice the account of the death of Pope Boniface, as transmitted to us by Ferretti of Vicenza, and which has generally been accepted by modern historians. Sismondi greedily swallowed so sensational a morsel, although, as Wiseman observes, he had, at the foot of the page he was quoting, the critical Muratori's point-blank declaration that the whole story is a downright lie. According to Ferretti, our Pontiff, in his last illness, became furious with impotent rage, turned his faithful servant out of the room, drew the bolt, gnawed a big stick to pieces (Sismondi omits the *baculo minutatim trito*, and that the stick was *satis procerum*), called upon the devil (also omitted by Sismondi), dashed his head against the wall, and with his gray hairs soaked in blood, strangled himself with the bed-clothes. Paolino di Piero was not content with Ferretti's assertion that Boniface gnawed his staff to bits; he increased the interest of the picture by making the raging Pontiff lacerate his own hands. Now this melodramatic scene, so entrancing to Sismondi and others of that ilk, loses all its horrifying features on critical inspection. It does not accord with the character of Pope Boniface, "great-souled and unterrified," as St. Antonine styled him, although it agrees with the prophecy attributed to St. Celestine V., that "he entered like a wolf, he will reign like a lion, and he will die like a dog." Platina, who cloaks the delinquencies of no Pope, and who accuses Boniface of ambition and avarice,

alludes to no such scene. Ciaconio believed in it, but he merely relied on Villani. Spondanus also credits the tale, but it is refreshing to find that Alexandre, determined partisan though he is of Philip the Fair, agrees with Vittorelli (1) in rejecting it as absurd. Those who were present at the death scene are more reliable witnesses than the malevolent Ferretti, and in the *Process* or posthumous trial of Boniface, it was proved that, when his death was imminent, "he made profession of all the articles of faith, according to the custom of the Roman Pontiffs, in the presence of eight cardinals. Concerning this fact there exist letters of our brother, the cardinal Gentili. . . . "He professed, in the presence of many cardinals and other honorable persons, that he had ever held the Catholic faith, and wished to die in it." Cardinal Stephanesius, who was in the chamber of death, says that the Pontiff departed placidly (2). But it pleased Providence to give a visible and tangible proof that the story of Ferretti and Paolino di Piero was a calumny, and of this evidence Sismondi, well-read as he was, could not have been ignorant. In the year 1605, three hundred years after our Pontiff's death, it became necessary to demolish the chapel in the Vatican, in which the body of Boniface was entombed. The sarcophagus was opened, and the body was found nearly entirely incorrupt, with an expression of extreme placidity. After a careful examination by medical men, a minute verbal process, describing the condition of the corpse, was drawn up by a notary, and it may be read in Rubeo. No trace of wounds could be found on the head; the skin was entire. The hands which have been represented as gnawed and torn by the despairing Pontiff, were found so beautiful "as to excite the admiration of all the beholders." As nature does not cicatrize wounds after death, this discovery completely refutes the lie which we have been discussing.

Much has been said about the arrogance of Boniface VIII. Sismondi adduces a passage of Stella (3), though he gives the tale on the authority of a greater name, Muratori, where

(1) *Lives of the Roman Pontiffs*; Rom. 1676.

(2) *Canonization of Celestine V.*, in MURATORI, *loc. cit.* vol. III.

(3) *Genoese Annals of George Stella*, in MURATORI, *loc. cit.*, vol. XVII.

we are told that Porchetto Spinola, archbishop of Genoa, having presented himself before the officiating Pontiff on Ash-Wednesday, was received with a shower of ashes in the eyes, and was further astounded by the unrubrical adjuration, "Remember, man, that thou art a Ghibelline, and with thy fellow-Ghibellines thou shalt return to dust." Perhaps the reader will be surprised to learn that instead of sanctioning this tale, as Sismondi would have us believe that he does, Muratori declares that "it smacks of the fabulous—*fabulam sapit*." Great must have been the arrogance of Boniface, thinks a modern publicist of some note (1), since, in his coronation procession, the king of Naples and the titular king of Hungary walked at his stirrups (2). It is strange that the men who carp Boniface and laud the humility of Celestine, find no fault with the latter for using the very ceremony so displeasing to them in the former. They also purposely forget that the sovereigns of Naples and Hungary were feudatories of the Holy See. Hallam says that our Pontiff appeared at the Jubilee clad in imperial robes, and wearing a diadem, and although this writer admits that he "has not observed any good authority referred to for the fact," nevertheless he is inclined to credit it, he says, because "it is in the character of Boniface." The cardinal Stephanesius, who knew Boniface well, held a different idea of his character. He says that "it has been so frequently repeated that Boniface was arrogant, haughty, violent, vindictive, and unjust, that I dread shocking the reader, when I declare that he was, on the contrary, good, pacific, and forgetful of injuries; and, nevertheless, this is the truth. In all the difficulties that he encountered, he counselled peace; he never punished, without having offered pardon, and he never refused this when it was asked" (3).

With reference to the "lamentable difference," as it is the fashion for French polemics to style the struggle between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair, it may be proper to note the judgment formed by our great Protestant adversary, Sismondi: "It was then that, for the first time, the nation and the

(1) REES; *Cyclopædia*, London, 1819.

(2) STEPHANESIUS; *loc. cit.* RAYNALD; year 1294.

(3) RAYNALD; y. 1303—1342.

clergy aroused themselves for the defence of the 'liberties' of the Gallican church. Greedy of servitude, they designated as 'liberties' the right to sacrifice their consciences to the caprices of their master, and to reject the protection which a foreign and independent head offered them against tyranny. In the name of these 'liberties' of their church, they denied to the Pope the right to take cognizance of the arbitrary taxes which the king imposed on the clergy, of the arbitrary imprisonment of the bishop of Pamiers, of the arbitrary seizure of the ecclesiastical revenues of Rheims, Chartres, Laon, and Poitiers. They denied to the Pope the right to direct the conscience of the king, to remonstrate with him about the administration of the kingdom, and to punish him, by censures or excommunication, if he violated his oaths. . . . Doubtless, the court of Rome had manifested a usurping ambition, and kings had to be on their guard against its omnipotence, but it would have been very happy for the people, if despotic sovereigns had still acknowledged that there was, above them, a power derived from heaven, which could check them in the path of crime" (1).

The action of Pope Clement V. and of the Fifteenth General Council concerning the memory of Boniface VIII. will be described in our chapter on this Council. We will now state, in conclusion, that religion owes to this Pontiff, the consoling institution of the Jubilee; ecclesiastical jurisprudence owes to him the Sixth Book of the *Decretals*; and general science owes to him the foundation of the *Sapienza* or Roman University. He composed the *Ave, virgo gloriosa*, and the prayer, *Deus, qui pro redemptione mundi*; and he left two fine orations on the *Canonization of Louis IX.* He is generally regarded as the author of the famous Bull *In cœna Domini*, although it was unknown in his time, and contains many additions of a posterior date. This constitution is the work of a far-seeing and all-embracing genius, and most of its articles are devoted to the prosperity of states and the well-being of peoples. Thus, in its fifth article, excommunication is pronounced on those "who impose new taxes, or increase those already in force, unless in the cases estab-

(1) *Loc. cit.*, vol. IV. c. 24.

lished by law." The Bull *In cœna Domini* was once published every year, but the sensitiveness of certain governments caused its abolition by Popes Clement XIV. and Pius VI.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE ALLEGED BARGAIN OF POPE CLEMENT V. WITH PHILIP THE FAIR.

The commonly received account of the election of Clement V. is based solely upon the narrative of John Villani (1). This author tells us that, after the death of Benedict XI., on July 27, 1304, the Sacred College found itself divided into two nearly equal factions,—one headed by Matthew Rosso Orsini and Francis Gaetani, the latter a nephew of the late Pontiff; and the other led by Napoleon Orsini dal Monte and Nicholas da Prato. After nine months of useless conclave, the cardinals da Prato and Gaetani agreed, says the Florentine historian, that the Gaetani party should select three capable Transalpine candidates (2), and from these the other factions should, in forty days, choose one on whom all could unite. In accordance with this compact, the choice of the Gaetani cardinals was Bertrand de Got, archbishop of Bordeaux, who, although a friend of the defunct Pontiff, "and no friend of the French king, because of injuries which his family had received during the Gascon war, at the hands of Charles de Valois," brother of Philip, was known, nevertheless, as "one yearning for honors and power; and being a Gascon, as therefore by nature a covetous man," and one likely to come to terms with the monarch. The agreement of the two contending parties, continues Villani, was reduced to writing; and, without the knowledge of the Gaetani faction, the da Prato cardinals sent the document, in eleven days, to Paris, "warning the French king, in their letters, that if he wished to recover his standing in Holy Church, and to rehabilitate his friends the Colonnas, he

(1) *Florentine History*, b. 8, c. 80; Venice, 1562.

(2) An Italian cardinal would have been unacceptable to Philip the Fair.

should be reconciled to his enemy, Raymond (read 'Bertrand') de Got, seeking him and offering him great advantages. . . . The king dispatched amicable letters to the archbishop asking for an interview; and in six days, attended by a small and trusty retinue, he held a parley with the said archbishop in a forest near the Abbey of St. Jean d'Angély. Having heard Mass together, and having sworn fidelity on the altar, the king addressed fair words to the archbishop, trying to reconcile him to my lord of Valois." Then, according to Villani, Philip said to the prelate: "You perceive, archbishop, that I can make you Pope if I so desire. Now, I promise that this honor shall be yours if you pledge yourself to grant me six certain favors." Stupefied with joy, says our chronicler, Bertrand threw himself at the royal feet, crying, "My lord, now that I realize that you love me more than any other does, and that you propose to render me good for evil, you have only to command, and I shall obey." The monarch then raised the archbishop, kissed him, and said: "These are the six favors I request: Firstly, that you reconcile me entirely with the Church, and pardon me for the evil committed in the capture of Pope Boniface. Secondly, that you restore me and my followers to communion. Thirdly, that you allow me to take, for my Flemish war, all the tithes in my kingdom during the next five years. Fourthly, that you promise to annul the memory of Pope Boniface. Fifthly, that you confer the honor of the cardinalate on my lord James and my lord Peter Colonna, and restore them to their pristine state; also that you raise certain other friends of mine to the purple. The sixth favor I shall communicate to you on some other occasion; it is, at present, a secret, and is very important" (1). Bertrand agreed to grant these requests, even swearing, adds Villani, on the Body of the Lord to keep his word. The parties then separated; and Philip immediately wrote to Cardinal da Prato that their Eminences might proceed with the election of the archbishop of Bordeaux, said prelate being his "per-

(1) They who accept the narrative of Villani wander in conjectures as to the nature of this sixth favor. The Florentine himself (b. 8. c. 101) and Masson (*Life of Philip the Fair*) hold that Philip wished Clement to give the Empire to Charles de Valois: others believe that the Empire was to be restored to the French permanently.

fectly confidential friend." The Florentine historian then notes that this message of the king reached Perugia in thirty-five days (from the time of Gaetani's letter to Philip), and that Bertrand de Got was, therefore, elected to the pontifical throne.

The above narrative of Villani, certainly very coherent and calm, was repeated by all the olden historians. St. Antonine, Genebrard, Baluze, Pagi, the authors of *Christian Gaul*, those of *The Art of Verifying Dates*, Fleury, and even the great Muratori, receive it without any express questioning (1). No wonder, then, that such writers as Giannone, Duchesne, Sismondi, and Hallam greedily accept it, and adorn it with their own amplifications. But the prince of modern historians, Cantú, exposes its weakness when he asks whether Villani was a third party to the absurd colloquy. "The people simply reduced to fact the ideas generated by the sequel" (2). The judicious Mansi also rejects the story (3). The Abbé Christophe gives many good reasons for preferring the very different narrative of Ferretti of Vicenza (4). And now, we would ask, of what authority is Villani? His diction is certainly Tuscan in its purity, and he is an ingenuous chronicler when he is unfettered by prejudice; but his writings are not always to be received as Gospel truth. Muratori, than whom no better judge in matters like this can be desired, says that Villani "gives us not a few fables when he describes remote occurrences" (5); and that in regard to the time of Frederick II. and the following period "he is not always to be believed" (6). And we know that Villani was very bitter toward all the Avignonese Pontiffs, and that he was ever ready to suspect each one of them of culpable condescension toward the French monarchs. Therefore, when he is uncorroborated by even one contemporary or quasi-contemporary authority, we should not rely implicitly upon his assertions; especially when, as in the present case, they present intrinsic marks of inaccur-

(1) Raynald seems to have some misgivings as to its truth; for he says: "If these things are true, what else than trouble for Christendom was to be expected?"

(2) *Universal History*, b. XIII., c. 6.

(3) Notes to the *Annals* of Raynald.

(4) *History of the Papacy in the Fifteenth Century*. Paris, 1853.

(5) Preface to his edition of Villani. (6) *Writers on Italian Affairs*. Vol. XIII., pt. 3

acy, and perhaps of falsehood. His story of the forest interview is not even hinted at by any one of the many contemporary biographers of Pope Clement V., such as Ptolemy of Lucca, John of St. Victor, Bernard of Guido, Amalric of Rosillon, or the anonymous Venetian. Similar silence is displayed by Ferretti of Vicenza, who finished his *Chronicle* in 1330, and who narrates in detail the acts of the Conclave of Perugia; by Pepin of Bologna, who wrote down to 1314, and was a severe critic of the Popes; by the *Chronicle of Parma*; by Dino Compagni, Trithemius, Matthew of Westminster, and the Continuator of Nangy.

Certainly this argument is purely negative; but it acquires force when we consider the intrinsic evidences of unreliability presented by Villani's tale. For instance, if we are willing to believe that the Guelph cardinals quietly granted forty days of delay to their opponents without suspecting any snare, which we find it difficult to do, we can not believe that even the Ghibelline cardinals would have descended to such infamy as is implied in the alleged compact with Philip the Fair. The documents concerning these personages which have come down to us show that they wished, indeed, to elect a Pontiff who would be friendly to Philip, but not that they were capable of laying the tiara in the dirt. Consider, for example, Cardinal Nicholas da Prato, to whom Villani assigns all the wire-pulling in the intrigue. From all accounts, this learned Dominican was an honorable man. Raised by the severe and uncompromising Boniface VIII. to the See of Spoleto, made Cardinal-Bishop of Ostia by the discriminating Benedict XI., he had successfully filled the office of peacemaker in Tuscany and the Romagna when faction fury was at its height. Albertino Mussato, a writer much lauded by Muratori, calls Da Prato "a man of great learning and wisdom." Dino Compagni styles him a man "of humble parentage; but gracious, wise, and of profound science." Even Villani says that he was "very learned in the Scriptures, subtle, wise, foreseeing, and very practical." It is difficult to believe that such a man, who, both before and after the pretended bargain, was always devoted to the true interests of the

Church, would, for no advantage whatever, place the tiara at the disposal of so ambitious a sovereign as Philip the Fair. What had he to gain by such infamy? He had attained, as bishop of Ostia, and, therefore, dean of the Sacred College, the highest dignity in the gift of the Pontiff. What could he obtain from Philip? History does not record that he received anything; but Villani does record that Nicholas da Prato strenuously opposed Philip's two dearest wishes—the condemnation of Pope Boniface VIII., and the election of Charles de Valois to the throne of the Holy Roman Empire (1).

Another intrinsic proof of the unreliability of Villani in this matter is found in his assertion that Bertrand de Got had been a foe of Philip, and that the reason of enmity was to be found in the injuries suffered by the Got family at the hands of Charles de Valois during the Gascon war. Not only do the records of the time recount none of these injuries, but they show that in this struggle a brother of Bertrand combated on the royal side, and received as a reward from Philip the counties of Lomagne and Auvillars. Again, that there had been no dissension between Philip and Bertrand before the pretended interview, is evident from the fact that, during the five years of the tenure of the See of Bordeaux by the latter, he was covered with honors by the king, and obtained an increase of the privileges of his bishopric, as is manifested by the patents collected by Rabanis in the archives of the Gironde. And all these concessions bear dates between March, 1300, and April, 1304. We must conclude, therefore, that the cardinals who met at Perugia in July, 1304, regarded Philip and Bertrand as friends, and that they would not have felt any need to urge the monarch to be reconciled with the archbishop.

Again, we must remember that it is only in the pages of Villani that Bertrand de Got appears as “a grasping Gascon,” ready to swear on the Body of Christ that he will reduce God's Church to slavery. Everywhere else he stands

(1) Villani tells how the cardinal freed Clement from the importunities of Philip concerning the condemnation of Boniface VIII., by advising him to submit the affair to a general council; and how he settled the imperial aspirations of Charles by having the Pope ask the electors to elect immediately Henry of Luxembourg.

conspicuous as a virtuous prelate as well as a man of spirit; and we are not obliged to recur to any such theory as that of Villani to account for his elevation to the Chair of Peter. His virtue was well known to the Roman court, especially his prudence, as evinced during his negotiations with the sovereigns of France and England, to each of whom he was a subject (1). It was not strange, therefore, when the electors deemed it wise to select a Transalpine prelate for the papacy, that they should think of Bertrand. While Pontiff, Clement V. was certainly over-condescending to King Philip the Fair, but he was never sacrilegiously vile, as Villani depicts him in the woods of St. Jean d'Angély; nay, this same historian describes him as resisting those desires of the king which he is said to have wickedly promised to gratify. And since we are speaking of these wishes of Philip, it is well to note that from their very enumeration by Villani arises a reason for suspecting the worth of his narrative. Take, for instance, the first two requests. Their object had already been attained. In April, 1304, Pope Benedict XI., the successor of Boniface VIII., had absolved Philip, his followers, and all France, from every censure (2), excepting only the sacrilegious Nogaret, the prime author of the crime of Anagni (3), and the wretched Sciarra Colonna. It is absurd, therefore, to suppose that Bertrand and Philip incurred the guilt of simony in order to obtain things already legitimately granted (4). Another error in the recital of Villani must also be noted as militating seriously against its historical value. He asserts that the election of Clement V. was effected by "compromise," as it is technically termed, and by the unanimous consent of the electors to the vote of Cardinal da Prato. Now, the solemn decree of that election, preserved in the Vatican, and first published by Raynald, informs us that the choice was made by secret ballot; that of the fifteen voters, all mentioned by name, ten voted for Bertrand; that then the other five joined the majority by "accession"; and that finally the result was proclaimed,

(1) Edward I., of England, was also Lord of Guienne; and Bordeaux was its capital.

(2) Martene: *Collection of Old Monuments*, Vol. I., col. 1411.

(3) Nogaret was not pardoned, even by Clement V., until 1311.

(4) Strange to say, Villani admits this reconciliation in his 66th chapter.

not by Cardinal da Prato, but by the rival leader, Cardinal Francis Gaetani.

Strong as are the reasons already adduced for the rejection of the tale of Villani, they become almost trivial when compared with an argument presented by M. Rabanis in an apposite work on this subject (1). Had the documents which this investigator unearthed been earlier known, many painstaking and zealous polemics would have been spared much chagrin. While Rabanis was delving in the archives of the Gironde in search of documents which might elucidate the history of the English domination in Guienne, he came upon a record which threw light upon another subject of equal interest to him—namely, the Pontificate of Clement V. Bundled among a lot of parchments referring to the rights and possessions of the See of Bordeaux, was a Register of all the movements and acts of Archbishop Bertrand de Got during a pastoral visit through his entire province, made from May 17, 1304, the day of his departure from Bordeaux, to June 20, 1305, the day when he received, in the Priory of Lusignan, the announcement of his elevation to the papal throne. In those days such registers were accurately drawn up and jealously preserved; for the suffragans and parish priests had rights to guard, as well as duties to perform toward the metropolitan visitor and his retinue; and these registers were safeguards against extortions. The document discovered by Rabanis is a French translation, made in the sixteenth century, of the original Act known to Duchesne, who, writing his *Life of Clement V.*, in 1653, styles it “an ancient Register still preserved in Bordeaux,” and cites it as an authentic account of a pastoral visit by Bertrand de Got. The authors of *Christian Gaul*, writing in the beginning of the eighteenth century, were also acquainted with this Register, and they quote it in their article on Bertrand. On examination of this document, Rabanis found that he possessed proof that the pretended interview, so particularly described by Villani, could not have taken place. Nor did he neglect to compare his discovered information with the Acts which referred to the movements of King

(1) *Clement V. and Philip the Fair. A Letter to M. Ch. Daremberg on the Interview between Bertrand de Got and Philip the Fair at St. Jean d'Angely.* Paris, 1858.

Philip at the time of Bertrand's pastoral visit. The results was a confirmation of the proofs obtained from the records of that journey (1).

Following the argumentation of M. Rabanis, we must first discover the precise date of the alleged colloquy between the two distinguished plotters. We find no trouble in this task, thanks to the excessive minuteness with which Villani endeavors to gain credit for his fable. He tells us that it took thirty-five days for the transmission of the message of Cardinal da Prato from Perugia to Paris, and for the arrival of the royal reply; and that then their Eminences immediately proceeded to the election. Now, it is certain that the election took place on June 5, 1305; therefore, thirty-five days back, the date of the courier's departure from Perugia for Paris, was the 1st or 2d of May. If we consider Villani's dates, and the nature of the business, eleven days (Villani's time) were consumed in the courier's trip to Paris; six days (Villani's time) then passed before Philip reached St. Jean d'Angély. One or two days ought to be added for preparations, accidents, etc. Therefore, it must have been the 18th or 20th of May when Bertrand and Philip met; and this date will appear the more probable one, if we reflect that the king had to return to Paris and then dispatch his reply in time for it to reach Perugia by the 5th of June. Where now were the two conspirators, we will not say on these precise days (the 18th to the 20th), but even about that time? As to the whereabouts of Bertrand, we are informed by the diary of the pastoral visit (2). After he had visited the dioceses of Agen and Périgueux, Bertrand found himself, in the middle of December, 1304, in that of Poitiers. He passed the beginning of 1305 in Maine, the Sevres, and Vendée. On April 18 he celebrated Easter at Luçon; then, going along the coast from parish to parish, he was at Beauvoir-sur-Mer on May the 10th; he visited the Priory of Fontaines on the 12th, and the abbey of Frontenaux on the 13th; he then remained four

(1) Rabanis first published his thesis in a memoir in 1846; but, at the request of M. Daremberg, he amplified the original, and produced the book before us.

(2) The ecclesiastical province of Bordeaux then contained, besides Bordeaux, the dioceses of Agen, Périgueux, Poitiers, Angoulême, and Saintes.

days at the Priory of Chaise-le-Vicomte ; on the 18th he was at the Priory of Les Essarts ; on the 19th he went to Monchamp ; the 20th found him at Segornay-le-Puybeliard, and the 21st at Chasteaumur ; the 22d was spent at Treze-Vents, and the 23d at the Abbey of Mauléon ; he then visited Mallièvre, and on the 27th he celebrated the Feast of the Ascension at Bressuire. We learn, therefore, from this Register, that from the 18th of May to the 20th Bertrand was in the priories of Essarts, Monchamp and Segornay, the nearest of which was twenty leagues from St. Jean d'Angély. In those days he could not have travelled such a distance and also kept his appointments, as we see he did. The roads of France were then no roads whatever ; nor had they been such, any more than those of the rest of Europe outside of Italy, since the days of Charlemagne (1). And through the entire months of April and May, according to these Acts, Bertrand was not near the designated forest.

But where was Philip at this time ? The public acts of his reign furnish irrefragable evidence as to his residences, and as to the time he had passed in each (2). During the whole of May he was never nearer to St. Jean d'Angély than Poissy, which was at a distance of one hundred and twenty leagues. In the latter part of April he was at Plessis, near Senlis, at Villers-Cotterets, near Soissons ; and at Paris, which he left on the 3d of May. From the 3d to the 18th he was at Germigny in Brie, at Becoiseau, and Châtres-sous-Monthéry. On the 19th he was at Poissy, and on the 25th at Cachant, near Paris. On the 1st of June he was again at Poissy. A partisan of the Villani theory may urge here that precisely during these six days—between the 19th, when the records place him at Poissy, and the 25th, when he was at Cachant

(1) Even in the time of Francis I., 1515-47, there were only three carriages in Paris, one belonging to the Queen, one to Diana of Poitiers, and the third to Rene de Laval. The first public conveyance is heard of in 1587, and it ran from Paris to Orleans. Travelling was performed altogether on horseback or in litters. Italy, of course, had fine roads; but in France the weak successors of Charlemagne had neglected the roads which that monarch had made out of the ancient Roman routes. In vain had Philip Augustus tried to introduce something like the old system. In England the first turnpike is found in the reign of Charles II. From all this we perceive the absurdity of supposing that Bertrand de Got travelled twenty-five leagues in a very few hours, as, according to Villani's story compared with the Register, he must have done in order to be supposed by his retainers to be during this time, enjoying the rest of the just in his ostensible lodgings.

(2) '*Memoirs of the French Academy of Inscriptions*, Old Series, Vol. XX., cap. I.

—Philip might have spurred to St. Jean d'Angély, held the famous parley, and returned. But we must recollect that on the 20th Bertrand was at Segornay; on the 21st at Chasteaumur; on the 22d at Treze-Vents; on the 23d at Mauléon (certainly we may pause here; for Philip had to be back in Cachant on the 25th); and the nearest of these places was too far from the alleged rendezvous to permit of Bertrand's being there, unless we believe that some kind fairy substituted another man in his place, giving to that substitute the name and appearance of Bertrand, fitting him for the making of pastoral visits and the administration of Confirmation, etc. But, granting for the moment that Bertrand could have reached the forest at the supposed time, how could Philip have made what was really a cross-country ride of two hundred and forty leagues in less than six days? That would have been his task if he left Poissy on the 19th, held the alleged interview, and was at Cachant on the 25th.

But enough has been adduced to show that Villani's tale of the interview in the woods of St. Jean d'Angély is a fable; that the presumed intrigue of the cardinal-electors has no foundation; and that no compact existed between King Philip the Fair and Bertrand de Got. What, then, is the truth concerning the election of Pope Clement V.? We know of no olden author who vies with John Villani in portraying the hidden motives and actions of the great (modern times have given us a Duc de Saint-Simon and a Voltaire). But, in default of such contemporary aid in investigating the conduct of the conclave of Perugia, we are content to rely upon Ferretti of Vicenza, who at least agrees with all the monuments of the time that have reached us. According to Ferretti, Philip the Fair used every art, through the deposed cardinals, James and Peter Colonna, to secure the election of a Pontiff who would be favorable to his interests. Other monarchs also had their special views to forward; while the Orsini cardinals, Napoleon and Matthew Rosso, coveted the tiara,—the former undoubtedly for himself, and the latter either for himself or for a nephew. But the Perugians soon tired of the delay, and forced the roof from the quarters of the conclave, trusting that exposure to the elements would

compel the wranglers to come to a decision. The same citizens also blockaded the building, and prevented the introduction of any other sustenance than bread and water. Thus pressed, their Eminences, realizing that they could not unite upon an Italian, turned their eyes to the regions beyond the Alps, and the friends of Philip proposed the name of Bertrand de Got. This nomination pleased both Guelphs and Ghibellines; the former, because the prelate had been appointed by the heroic Boniface VIII., and had nobly defended that Pontiff; the latter, because he was friendly to King Philip. Accordingly, Bertrand was elected.

But why should Villani fabricate such a falsehood, and how could he expect that it would be received as truth? We do not believe that the Florentine historian told a deliberate lie. He believed as most of the Italians of his day believed, and he regarded their apparently well-founded suspicions as incontrovertible facts. The bribing proclivities of Philip the Fair were notorious, and the Italians became prejudiced against Clement V., because of his great condescension to that monarch. Above all, they blamed that Pontiff for transferring the papal residence to France,—an error which entailed much misery on their country, and was destined, as they speedily foresaw, to prove a source of agony to all Christendom. There were many tales current among the Italians of that period accounting for this reduction of their greatest glory to a “Babylonian captivity,” and portraying Clement V., in no complimentary guise. Thus Bernardino Corio says that Bertrand de Got was chosen as Pontiff simply because the cardinals thought that he was dead (1); and there were narrated many curious tales which showed that the indignation of the Italian clergy, as well as of the Italian laity, rendered them prone to credit almost anything which would derogate from the personal merits of Clement V. (2). But we are pleased by the course of several

(1) In his *History of Milan*, Corio says that the cardinals had just heard of the death of Bertrand; and that they thought that by electing a dead man they would gain time, and evade the starvation regimen to which the Perugians were reducing them.

(2) Dante, in his *Hell*, canto 19, places Clement V. therein, because of the crime of simony. Villani tells how a papal chaplain had a vision of a fiery palace prepared in hell for Clement; and how, when the Pontiff was informed of the dream, “he was never again cheerful, and soon afterward died.”

distinguished, though not Catholic, modern authors, in manifesting a disposition to do justice to the memory of this Pontiff. Thus Littré says: "No credence can be accorded to the anecdote narrated by the chronicler John Villani to the effect that the king and the future Pope met in an abbey in the depths of the forest near St. Jean d'Angély, and there entered into a bargain of sacred things, sealing it with an oath on the Host" (1). Renan admits that "the pretended interview of St. Jean d'Angély has been regarded as a fable for some time" (2).

CHAPTER XXXIV.

THE FIFTEENTH GENERAL COUNCIL.—SEQUEL OF THE CONTEST WITH PHILIP THE FAIR.

The decree of convocation for this Council was issued by Pope Clement V. in 1307, and in it the Pontiff assigns the following as his reasons for summoning the bishops together. Firstly; the cause of the Templars, who were accused of heresy, obscenity, and other crimes, was to be considered. Secondly; action was to be taken in reference to the teachings of the famous Franciscan, Peter John Oliva (3), and in regard to the heresies of the Fraticelli, Dulcinists, Beguards, and Beguins, to whom we have already alluded. Thirdly; means were to be devised for the recovery of the Holy Land. Fourthly; ecclesiastical discipline needed reformation. The original intention of the Pontiff had been to assemble the Council in 1309, but the meeting was postponed until

(1) In the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for September 15, 1864.

(2) *Ibi*, March 1, 1880.

(3) Oliva was born in 1247, at Serignan, in the diocese of Beziers, and died in the odor of sanctity at Narbonne in 1297. He was firmly opposed to the right of Franciscan convents to possess property, and the friars of Provence, who belonged to the faction of the "Spirituals," rallied around him and formed the Congregation of Narbonne. He venerated St. Francis almost a superhuman personage, and pretended that the Pope could no more change the Franciscan rule than he could the Gospel. After his death, the general, John de Muro, prohibited the friars from reading his writings, but Pope Sixtus IV., himself a Franciscan, annulled this decree. Long before Oliva died, he had been charged with rashness, and in 1278 extracts were made from his book on the *Praises of the Holy Virgin*, to prove the charge, but Wadding says that the general, Jerome of Ascoli, obliged the compiler to burn his work. Oliva's opponents accused him of recognizing the whore of Babylon in the Roman Church, but his disciple, Ubertino of Casale, showed the falsity of the charge. He was a prolific author, but many of his works have perished.

Oct. 16th, 1311, when the first session was held in the cathedral of Vienne. According to the Continuator of Nange, there were present, besides the Latin patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, one hundred and fourteen bishops; Villani and St. Antonine put the number at three hundred. In the first session, Pope Clement laid before the members the business to be transacted, and there followed many deliberations, especially in regard to the cause of the Templars. The second session was held on April 3d, 1312, in the presence of King Philip, who sat, says the Continuator of Nange, "at the right of the Supreme Pontiff, but on a lower chair." The Pope preached, and then, "with the approbation of the Sacred Council," he promulgated the sentence of abolition of the Order of the Temple. We shall treat of this subject at some length in the following chapter. The third and last session of the Council was celebrated on May 6th.

In the Fifteenth Council, three doctrines of Oliva were condemned; namely, the assertion that the side of Christ was pierced while He was yet living; the opinion that the rational soul is not the "form" of the body; and the teaching that the "habit" of faith and of the virtues is not infused by baptism into infants. Against the first error the Council declared that "having emitted His spirit, Christ permitted His side to be pierced with a lance, that thence water and blood might flow, and thus be formed our holy mother the Church, the immaculate and virgin spouse of Christ, even as from the side of the first man, while he slept, Eve was formed as a wife unto him." Against the second error of Oliva, the Pontiff decreed that "with the approbation of the Sacred Council, we reprobate as erroneous and contrary to Catholic faith, the doctrine or position that rashly asserts that the substance of the rational or intellectual soul is not, *per se* and essentially, the form of the human body; defining, that if any one hereafter presumes to assert, or defend, or obstinately hold, that the rational or intellectual soul is not, *per se* and essentially, the form of the human body, he is to be regarded as a heretic." Against the third error of Oliva, the Pontiff, recognizing the existence of two theological opinions, one of which held that in baptism of infants guilt was ban-

ished, but grace not conferred, while the other taught that the virtues were infused "as a habit," though not, for that time, "as to use," receives the second opinion as more probable, declaring: "Considering the general efficacy of the death of Christ, which is applied by baptism to all the baptized, we, with the approbation of the Sacred Council, have deemed right to select as more probable, and as more consonant with the sayings of the saints and of modern doctors of theology, the second opinion, which holds that in baptism informing grace and the virtues are conferred both on infants and adults." In our own day the second of the above decrees has been opposed to the partisans of Gunther as a teaching of the Church contrary to their peculiar opinion, and it was in regard to the proper interpretation of the decree, that the Guntherites disputed. Dr. Clemens says (1) that the proposition "the soul is the substantial form of the body," signifies that the soul is the principle which vivifies the human body and gives it its form, and that this expression is familiar to all who know anything about the philosophical language of the olden time. The Guntherites thought that the proposition in question contradicts the necessary dualism of the soul and body; and Dr. Baltzer contended that the expression "*forma corporis*" is to be taken in the sense that the soul, in its union with the body, is not the vivifying principle of the body, but its living form, i. e., without the soul the body cannot be conceived as living. Pope Pius IX. in a letter to the archbishop of Cologne, in 1857, and in another to the bishop of Breslau, in 1860, censured the doctrine of the Guntherites, and especially that of Baltzer. Therefore their explanations are not to be received, when they tend to distinguish a living principle, proper to the body, and distinct from the soul—a vitalist dualism condemned by Pius IX. The Pontiff, certainly, does not formally pronounce that, according to the General Council of Vienne, the soul alone is the substantial "*formans*" of the human body, but he does say that it is the sole vital principle, the sole principle constituting the living humanity, the sole vital form.

(1) *The Speculative Theology of Gunther and Catholic Doctrine*, Bonn, 1858.

Many of the disciplinary Constitutions of the Fifteenth Council are inserted in the collection of *Clementines*, although in the same collection are found many which were not issued in this council. The most interesting are those which regulate the ministrations of mendicant friars. In the Clementine *Religiosi*, on *Privileges and the Excesses of the Privileged*, excommunication, with reservation to the Holy See, is decreed against religious "Who presume, without special permission of the parish priest, to administer to the laity the Sacraments of the Eucharist or Extreme Unction, or to solemnize marriages." They are allowed, however, according to the ancient privileges granted by Rome, to administer the Sacraments to members of their own households, and to the sick in their own hospitals. In virtue of holy obedience, and under pain of damnation, they are commanded, "In their sermons, not to calumniate ecclesiastical prelates, or to entice laymen from their own churches, or to pronounce indiscreet indulgences. And they must not, when they are present at the making of wills, interfere with proper restitution, or prevent testators from leaving legacies to the mother churches; nor shall they endeavor to obtain legacies for their own brethren or convents, to the prejudice of others." At one moment it appeared that the regulars were about to lose all their privileges. The archbishop of Bourges insisted that the Templars would not have become so corrupt and impious, had they been subject to the bishops; and the defenders of the exemptions of the regulars could scarcely reply to the argument. However, when both sides of the question had been discussed, the Council was content with interdicting to regulars the exercise of such functions as seemed to be the prerogatives of the secular clergy. One of the most noteworthy proceedings of the Council was its command that the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist should be administered to those condemned to death, and this in spite of such lay judges as cruelly prohibited said administration—another instance of the Church correcting the inhumane legislation of our ancestors. Those who believe that it was only in the sixteenth century that the Oriental languages began to be cultivated in Europe, should read the decree of this

Council concerning their study; it is ordered that in future, Hebrew, Arabic, and Chaldean shall be publicly taught wherever the Roman court may be established, as well as in the universities of Bologna, Paris, Salamanca, and Oxford; in Paris, the professors are to be paid by the king of France, and elsewhere by the Pope and bishops.

In this Council an end was made to the "lamentable difference" between Boniface VIII. and Philip the Fair. One would have imagined that all obstacles to peace were removed by the death of Pope Boniface, but Philip was implacable, and avowed his determination to procure the condemnation of his adversary's memory. By the Bull *Quanto nos, fili*, Pope Benedict XI., the immediate successor of Boniface, absolved Philip from the censures pronounced by that Pontiff; by another, *Ut eo magis*, he revoked the reservation to the Holy See of the cathedral and regular nominations in France; by a third, *Sanctæ matris Ecclesiæ*, he absolved all the culpable ecclesiastics and nobles, excepting William de Nogaret; and by a fourth, *Dudum Bonifacius*, he annulled the absolution of the French from their allegiance to Philip, and re-established everything as it had been before the difference, the case of Nogaret alone excepted. Even the Colonna family were received into favor, although Benedict would not restore the cardinalitial dignity to James and Peter, and would not allow the rebuilding of Palestrina. But Philip soon found that Pope Benedict XI. could place a limit to his concessions. By a Bull dated at Perugia, June 7, 1304, the Pontiff declared that excommunication had fallen on all concerned in the horrible crime of Anagni, and he summoned all such to appear personally before himself. The name of Philip does not appear in this Bull, *Flagitiosum scelus*, but the world knew that the monarch had instigated the crime. After such a manifesto, there was no probability of a condemnation of Boniface by Benedict XI. But shortly after the publication of this Bull, the Pontiff was seized by a fatal illness, and on July 7, he was dead. So prompt a death, and in such circumstances, did not appear natural, and men only differed as to the authors of the murder. Ferretti of Vicenza names Philip, and certain-

ly this prince gained by the demise of Benedict, and he was fully capable of plotting the assassination of any opponent, while he had followers willing to execute his desires. But Ferretti is alone, and his historical accuracy is not of the highest order. With the advent of Clement V., a Frenchman and devoted to Philip, the success of the king's hopes appeared more probable. We have seen already that Bertrand de Got was not such a creature of Philip the Fair as Villani would have us believe; that the famous conference of St. Jean d'Angély never occurred. Nevertheless, Clement was very pliant in the hands of Philip; he had transferred the Papal residence to France; very soon he abrogated the Bull *Clericis laicos*, the origin of the difference with Boniface VIII.; he revoked all the proceedings against the king; and although he would not annul the Bull *Unam sanctam*, which contained a doctrinal definition, yet he so interpreted it, that the declaration of Boniface seemed not hostile to the pretensions of Philip (1); he even restored James and Peter Colonna to the Sacred College, and he promoted, in one Consistory, twelve of Philip's creatures to the cardinalate. With such grounds for hope, the king pressed his claim, during a conference with the Pontiff at Poitiers in June, 1307, but Clement deferred a definite reply, trusting that time would mollify the resentment of the monarch. As a token of his friendship, he quashed the proceedings against the criminals of Anagni. But with the march of time, the desire for revenge increased in Philip, and finally he demanded that Pope Boniface should be condemned as a heretic; that his name should be expunged from the catalogue of Pontiffs; and that his body should be exhumed, burnt, and the ashes thrown to the winds (2). At this insolent proceeding, the Papal court was horrified; Ghibellines as well as Guelphs, Frenchmen as well as Italians, wondered where such insensate pretensions would terminate (3). Thanks to the blunder of Clement V.—a blunder for which all Christendom was about to weep

(1) "We do not understand this Bull," says Clement V., "as at all prejudicial to France, or as importing that this kingdom is more subject to the Roman Church than it was. We wish things to be as they were before the publication of this decree." *Proofs of Difference.*

(2) VILLANI, b. VIII., c. 91.—NICH. TRIVETUS, *Chronicle*—DINO COMPAGNI, *Chronicles*—MURATORI; *Ital. Writers*, vol. IX.

(3) VILLANI, *loc. cit.*—ST. ANTONINE; vol. III., tit. 21, c. 1.

—the Pope and his court were settled in the midst of Philip's dominions, and were exposed to a violence that knew no scruples. To grant the demands of the monarch was impossible to honor, to justice, and to truth; and if they were resisted? Clement thought of flight, but the surveillance of Philip could not be evaded. At this juncture the cardinal Nicholas da Prato thus advised Pope Clement: "Holy father, I discern a remedy for the present evil. It is to convince the king, if it is possible, that his demand covers a difficult question—one concerning which the cardinals are divided; that such a question can be treated only in a General Council; that, finally, an examination into the charges against Pope Boniface will be more solemn, and therefore the king's satisfaction will be more complete, if it is made in so grave an assembly. If he objects that the prejudices of the fathers will influence their judgment, say that you will not mention this affair in your Bull of convocation; that you will allege no other reasons for the Council than a reformation of morals and the general interests of the Church. The need of the Council having been shown and acknowledged, you will fix Vienne in Dauphiny as the place of meeting; for, besides that its central position will make it convenient for all, its independence of the French kingdom will free you from any restraint on the part of the king." The expedient of the cardinal da Prato succeeded; Philip could not well refuse to submit his cause to a General Council, for he had already requested one. But, strange as it may seem, the cause of Pope Boniface VIII. took up very little of the time of the Fifteenth Council; so little trace of it do we observe in the *Acts*, that we are obliged to recur to contemporary writers to be sure that it was seriously discussed. Suffice it to note here that the memory of the great Pontiff was completely vindicated. The charges of illegitimate occupancy of the chair of Peter, and of heresy, were refuted by Gentile di Montefiore, a celebrated canonist, by John de Murro, by the cardinals Francis Gaetani, Peter of Spain, and above all, by the cardinal Richard of Siena, who thus partly expiated his treachery to Boniface VIII. at Anagni. The hideous calumnies of William Plasian were despised by the

fathers of the Council, and all declared that Boniface VIII. had been a legitimate and orthodox Pontiff (1).

Before closing this chapter we must notice the shrewdness of the cardinal da Prato, as exhibited in defeating a plan of Philip the Fair, which, if it had succeeded, would have greatly injured the independence of Italy and of the Papacy. After the assassination of the emperor Albert (May, 1308)—itself the punishment of the murder of Adolphus of Nassau—King Philip put forward, among the candidates for the imperial sceptre, his brother, Charles of Valois, and he caused him to be recommended by his partisans in the Sacred College. Everything seemed to favor his wishes; the electors could not agree; Philip was well informed of every intrigue; and it was evident that he intended to force the Pontiff to countenance the pretensions of Valois. When Clement learned all this, he realized the danger that the Papacy and Italy would incur, if such a man as Philip attained such enormous power. He sought the advice of the cardinal da Prato, and that diplomat at once counselled him to hasten the election of an emperor, ere the plans of the French monarch could be matured; and he suggested for the post Henry of Luxembourg, an ardent and religious prince and a valiant knight, of whom, however, no one had dreamt in connection with the empire. Clement appreciated the wisdom of the counsel, and the cardinal undertook to effect it—a task of no small difficulty. Surrounding all his actions with impenetrable mystery, he sent a trusty envoy to the archbishops of Mentz and Treves; these gained over two other electors, thus securing a majority of the electoral college, and on Nov. 27, 1308, Henry of Luxembourg was chosen king of the Romans. In speaking of this election, Sismondi falls into many errors. 1. He puts to the account of “the secret favor” reserved by

(1) We must here note that on April 23, 1311, Clement V., issued at Avignon, a Bull revoking all sentences not inserted in the text of the *Decretals*, so far as the said sentences prejudiced the rights, liberties, and honor of the kingdom of France; declaring that, in his conduct towards Boniface VIII. the zeal of Philip had been just, but mistaken; and decreeing that neither Philip nor his successors should ever be disturbed because of the “lamentable difference.” He even ordered that the aforesaid sentences should be erased from the registers, and given to the flames. The Fifteenth Council approved of these concessions, and Simon Vigor, in his *Proofs of the Difference, etc.*, cites a detailed memorandum of the Bulls which, by order of Clement V. were corrected or erased.

Philip when he is said (by Villani) to have promised the tiara to Bertrand de Got, "the demand that the Pontiff should assist him in procuring the imperial crown for his brother." Now further on, Sismondi says that this favor, said to have been reserved at St. Jean d'Angély, was the establishment of the Roman court in France, the destruction of the Templars, and (which Villani puts in the fourth favor) the erasure of the name of Boniface VIII. from the Roman catalogue. 2. Sismondi says that "the election was published on Nov. 25 or 27;" the decree (see Baluze, vol. II.,) gives the 27th as the date. 3. Sismondi says that "the Pope hastened to confirm the election on the feast of the Epiphany, in the following year." But the letter of Henry, announcing his election to Clement, is dated in June of the following year (see Raynald, y. 1309, no. 10); the embassy could not have arrived at Avignon before the end of the month; the *Acts* show that the ambassadors were received in audience on the Calends of July, and that the Bull confirming Henry's election was dated 4 Cal. Aug.

CHAPTER XXXV.

THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TEMPLARS. *

Some authors have held that the first institution of Military Orders, particularly that of St. George, is to be ascribed to the emperor Constantine; but it is generally conceded that the idea of chivalry was a fruit of the Crusades, and that it originated at the close of the eleventh century (1). Like

* This chapter appeared as an article in the *Amer. Cath. Q'tly Review*, vol. xvi.

(1) It has been debated whether chivalry, as we fancy it, ever really existed, or whether it is not merely a pretty dream, like the Golden Age. If you read the authors of those days, says Cantù, "you will find them all lamenting the bygone time, and deploring the decay of chivalry. . . . We may well believe that the chivalry of the romances, that is, an era of valor, of loyalty, of spontaneous order, of happiness, of disinterested sacrifice, of chaste love, no more existed than did the idyllic blessedness of the Arcadian shepherds; but that books have modified it, and substituted an ideal era for the true one. Nevertheless, there was considerable reality in chivalry, and its members formed an efficient organization, with initiatory forms, rights and prerogatives. . . . Its principal theatre was the south of France, whence

most of the institutions of the Middle Age, the idea of Military Orders came from the Church; it was her inculcation of religious devotion upon the soldier, even in the exercise of his profession, that gave birth to these organizations. As far back as the year 1022, in the time of the Fatimite caliphs, some Neapolitan merchants had established a hospital for pilgrims, under the patronage of St. John the Baptist, near the Holy Sepulchre. They assigned it to the care of certain religious who came to be known as Hospitalers. The rector of this institution was Gerald, a native of Scala, near Amalfi; he conceived the first idea of the Order of the Hospital of St. John, known in History, at first as Knights of St. John, then as Knights Hospitalers, afterward as Knights of Rhodes, and finally as Knights of Malta. Pope Paschal II. took the new Order and its possessions under his protection; Calixtus II. conferred upon Raymond Dupuy, the second provost, the title of Master, and he confirmed the statutes which Raymond had drawn up in 1104. This Order was composed of three classes of brethren (1), namely, ecclesiastics, for spiritual matters; laics, for menial service; and knights, whose duty it was to protect pilgrims. In 1252, Innocent IV. gave to the head of the Hospitalers the title of Grand Master (2).

Following the example of Gerald de Scala and Raymond Dupuy, two illustrious chevaliers named Hugh des Payens and Godfrey de St. Aldemar, with seven companions, founded in 1118, another Military Religious Order which, taking its name from the temple of Solomon, near the site of which King Baldwin II. lodged the first knights, came to be known as the Order of the Temple. For nine years the Templars

It spread into all Spain, already chivalrous by nature. . . . Italy, devoted to commerce, science and religion, cared little for the punctilios of chivalry, unless in Sicily, where it was introduced by the Normans. The Suabians wondered that the Hungarians possessed no chivalry, and they sent a message to them, praying in the name of woman that they would fight in a more courteous manner, that is, with the sword; they replied by scourging the envoy. . . . England, more aristocratic than chivalrous, shows us only Richard the Lion Heart, and he was formed to the arms and poetry of France; the heroes of the Round Table lived only in the pages of romance; Edward III. and the Black Prince arose only from contact with France. The Greeks and the Russians never knew the institutions of chivalry, but they penetrated into Poland."—*Universal History*, b. xi., ch. 4.

(1) From the French word *Frères* came our *friars*, and their name in every language. The Latin chroniclers style them *frerii*; the Greeks, *phreri*.

(2) *Lives of the Grand Masters of the Holy Order of St. John of Jerusalem*, by the Commander, Brother Jerome Marulli. Naples, 1636.

received no novices, and so poor were they, that one horse was made to serve for two knights ; whence, says Matthew of Paris, originated the representation on the seal of the Order. The Templars took, from the first, the ordinary religious vows, with a fourth, to protect pilgrims ; but in 1128, St. Bernard composed for them a special rule which was both mystic and austere. The Templar swore to dedicate his life to warring against the infidels ; to never decline battle unless the odds were more than three to one, to never ask for quarter ; and to never give up, as ransom, "one piece of wall or one palm of land." St. Bernard wished the community-life of the knights to be frugal but pleasant ; personal property there was none, and the will of the individual was to be merged in that of the superior. The Divine Office was, as a general thing, of obligation ; but on occasions of military duty, private prayer was substituted. Thrice a week the members ate meat ; two ate from one plate, but each had his own bottle of wine. When a knight died, his ration was given to the poor for forty days. Hunting, in the ordinary sense of the term, was forbidden ; but the knights might kill ferocious wild beasts. They were never to be idle, said St. Bernard ; when not on the march, their weapons and armor should claim their attention. Games, spectacles and buffoonery of every kind were prohibited to the Templars. Their horses should be spirited but plainly caparisoned. When battle was imminent, the knight should prepare cautiously for it, being armed within by faith and without with iron. He should charge the enemy with confidence, being secure of victory or of martyrdom. In every danger, continued the saint, the Templar should say to himself : "Living or dead, we belong to the Lord ; glory awaits the conqueror, heaven the martyr." Though not so aristocratic an Order as that of the Hospital (1), the Temple soon received among its votaries the scions of the first families of Christendom. From all parts of Europe the knights received money and provisions ; few wills were made without clauses in their favor ;

(1) The Knights of the Hospital were obliged, before admission, to show a noble descent of four generations by both parents ; the chaplains and servant-knights were also of noble birth, though not necessarily by four descents.

many sovereign princes donned the white mantle. At the close of the twelfth century the wealth of the Templars was so great that their landed estates numbered nine thousand; in the kingdom of Valencia alone they owned seventeen fortified towns. Their riches and privileges soon engendered corruption, and thirty years after they had adopted his rule, St. Bernard was forced to tell them: "You cover yourselves and your horses with silk; you paint your lances; your shields, saddles, and spurs shine with gold, silver and gems; your flowing tresses impede your sight; your long trains interfere with your walk; fine gloves cover your delicate hands. Discord is rife among you because of unreasonable anger, of inordinate desire of glory, and of love of earthly riches." The jealousy of the Templars in regard to the Hospitaller was a chief cause of the loss of Palestine to Christendom. Instead of regarding every Islamite as an enemy, they entered into an alliance with the Old Man of the Mountain; they gave refuge to a fugitive sultan; they warred on the Christians of Cyprus and Antioch, devastated Greece, and refused to contribute to the ransom of St. Louis. Indeed, public accusations were made against the Templars long before the time of Clement V. William of Tyre charged them with disobedience to the patriarch of Jerusalem, and with disturbing the churches in their domains (1). In 1200, King Leo I., of Armenia, complained to Pope Innocent III., that the knights had not only invaded his territories, but had refused to aid him in resisting the attacks of the infidels (2). Even Innocent III., who had given many privileges to the Templars, lamented, in 1218, that the knights "had no respect for the Apostolic See," and that "they merited to be deprived of privileges so fearfully abused" (3). In 1244, Frederick II. charged the Templars with receiving Mussulman princes into their houses and with allowing Mohammedan rites in their cloisters; and he adds that they were given up to the pleasures of the world (4). Gurtler gives many instances of Templar avarice in circumstances when religion needed their assistance. It is not surprising, therefore, that after the loss of the Holy

(1) *Deeds of God through the Franks*, vol. 1.

(2) In DUPUY, p. 137.

(3) *Ibid.*, p. 141.

(4) *Ibid.*, p. 152.

Land, the Templars were regarded as entirely useless. Nevertheless, like the Hospitalers, they would have been allowed to subsist, had not the world been horrified by their crimes. "While the common people were frightened at these accusations, the great ones of the earth charged the Order with an aspiration for universal dominion; with the intention of founding an aristocratic republic which would embrace all Europe—a very improbable design on the part of knights entirely dependent on the will of a grand master Philip hated the Order because it had refused to enroll him as a member, and would not sign the appeal against Boniface VIII. ; he hated it because he wanted its riches." Such is the judgment of Cantù in regard to the suppression of this Order, and many other historians of merit hold the same opinion. The object of the present chapter is to show that the Order of the Temple deserved suppression; that, whatever may have been the motives which actuated Philip the Fair, Pope Clement V. performed his simple duty in putting an end to an organization which had survived its usefulness and had become a scandal to Christendom (1).

On the feast of the Annunciation, 1307, the Faculty of Paris, having been consulted by King Philip as to his powers in the premises, issued a doctrinal judgment, attested by the seals of fourteen doctors, in which it was declared, that unless requested by the Church, the secular magistracy could

(1) The following are the principal works on this subject: 1. *The History of the Military Order of the Templars*, by Peter Dupuy, in 4to, Brussels 1751. After one has read the many works that this suppression has called forth, he finds that he can come to no satisfactory conclusion, unless he examines the original documents. Hence he is grateful to Dupuy for the care with which, in 1650, he extracted many from the archives at Paris. 2. *The History of the Templars*, by Nicholas Gurtler, of Basel; Amsterdam, 1712; a work of some research but very hostile to the Church. 3. *A Critical and Apologetical History of the Knights of the Temple called Templars*, Paris, 1789; by M. J., a Premonstratensian canon; an enthusiastic, but not critical, apology for the Order. 4. *An Essay on the Charges Against the Templars*, by Fred Nicolai; Amsterdam, 1783. Nicolai was a Protestant, but impartial and judicious. 5. *Historical Memoirs on the Templars*, by Grouvelle; averse to the Order, but unsatisfactory as to proofs. 6. *Historical Monuments Relative to the Condemnation of the Knights of the Temple*, by Raynouard; Paris, 1813; the best defence of the Templars ever attempted, but too much like the author's tragedy on the same subject which caused much excitement in France. 7. The excellent work of the Abbe Christophe, *The Papacy in the Fourteenth Century*, vol. i., b. 4; Paris, 1853. 8. The incomparable *Universal History of Cantu*, b. xiii., ch. 6. All the Acts of the Pontifical Commission in the cause of the Templars were published by Moldenhauer in 1791; and the statutes of the Order were edited in 1794 by the Danish author, Munter. In his *Collection of Unedited Documents Concerning the History of France (Series 1, Political History)*, Michélet edited the Process of the Templars, of which Dupuy had given only extracts.

take no cognizance of the crime of heresy, or of the cause of a religious Order or of its members; but that, in case of imminent danger, the accused might be arrested, and then given over to the custody of the Church (1). In accordance with this decision, but not before October 13th, and after the grand master had complained to the Pope (August 24th), and demanded a juridical process (2), all the Templars in France were arrested. On the 14th the clergy of Paris, and on the 15th the people, were informed of the charges against the knights. Then William of Paris, of the Order of Preachers, and inquisitor-general in the kingdom, undertook the necessary investigations, and interrogated one hundred and forty knights of the house in Paris. From the Continuator of Nange and the *Acts* of this inquiry, taken from the Royal Archives in 1650 by Dupuy, we learn that the following were the accusations. 1. On their entrance into the Order, the knights were commanded to deny Christ and to spit thrice upon the crucifix; if the novice hesitated, imprisonment and torture forced him to yield. 2. Obscene signs of submission were made to the preceptors by the candidates. (*Ad preceptum preceptoris, nec-non preceptorem ipsum—quod nominandum quasi turpissimum—inferius in posterioribus osculabantur immunde*). 3. Although they had foresworn the society of women, sodomy was a prevalent and permitted practice of the Templars. 4. They were in the habit of adoring an idol, in the shape of a golden head with a long beard and fiery eyes. According to Hammer, in his "Mystery of Baphomet Exposed," this head was called "the head of Baphomet." He says that he found twelve of these heads in the prison of Vienna, with Arabic, Greek, and Latin inscriptions entitling them *Metis* or Wisdom; hence he concludes that *Baphomet* is derived from *Baphimiteos*, which would mean a baptism of the spirit or of fire—a Gnostic or Ophitic idea. These superstitious signs, says Hammer, the Templars must have derived from their intercourse with the Ishmaelites, and they have been frequently found, he adds, in the houses and tombs of the knights. He declares that he himself discovered several in the Templar churches at Stenfeld and

(1) Cited by Dupuy.

(2) This fact explodes the charge that the arrest was secret and unexpected.

Wultendorf. Teleky, in his *Voyage in Hungary*, says that the same figures are found in the Templar church of St. Martin, in Muran. As for the obscenities ascribed to the knights, Hammer credits the charges, because of the many obscene anaglyphs found in the houses and sepulchres of the Order ; and he comes to the conclusion that the principal members and a large number of the rest were guilty of apostasy, superstition and gross impurity (1). 5. The priests of the Order were accustomed, when pretending to celebrate Mass, to omit the words of consecration.

Among the knights questioned as to the truth of these accusations, were the grand master, James de Molay ; Guy, the brother of the dauphin of Auvergne ; and Hubert de Perault. There were one hundred and forty in all, and only three of them pronounced the charges false. Some protested that they had long since repented of having joined the Order, and had asked Rome for a dispensation ; others insisted that they had already confessed their crimes to episcopal penitentiaries. The inquisitor, William of Paris, afterward held an examination of one hundred and eleven Templars at Troyes, and although these knights denied the adoration of the head of *Baphomet*, they admitted the truth of the other charges. At Caen, thirteen other knights admitted their guilt, when questioned by commissioners delegated by the inquisitor. At Pont de l'Arche, ten knights were interrogated by Peter de Hangest, governor of Rouen, with the same issue. At Carcassonne, John de Cassanhas, preceptor of the

(1) See Mignard's *Hidden Practices of the Templars*, Dijon, 1851. The latter work is a dissertation on a casket found in 1789 on the Essarois estate of the marquis du Chastenay. This casket is made of lime-stone, and is about 25 centimetres long and 20 wide. On it is an image in relief, which Mignard lithographed. The image is of a sort of masculo-feminine being, standing naked, wearing a crenulated crown, and holding in its hand a chain which is surmounted, on the right, by the moon, and on the left by the sun ; at the feet of the image is a death's head, set in a star and a pentagon ; Arabic characters surround the main figure. There are also three other masculo-feminine figures. From the records of the Chastenay family it is proved that the property on which the casket was found was once that of the Templars ; and we know that the important priory of Voulaîne-les-Temple was near Essarois. Following the interpretative systems of Nicolai and Hammer, Mignard finds a Gnostic meaning in the picture. In the Arabic inscription are found the *Ogdoagde* or Creator, and his seven *eones* or emanations ; the fusion of the two sexes—the Gnostic *eones* were hemaphrodite ; the denial of Christ : " If thou deniest, pleasure will environ thee." Basilides regarded this denial as the sign of true liberty ; as to the Sodomitic habits, the followers of Valentine and Basilides were addicted to such vices. This chest, concludes Mignard, reveals the key of the *Cabal*, with which the Templars were reproached, and proclaims infamous mysteries.

house of Noggarde, also confessed the alleged crimes. At Cahors, forty-four Templars admitted their guilt to the royal commissary. The *Acts* of all these inquiries were preserved, at least in Alexandre's time, in the royal archives, and had been diligently examined by Dupuy.

Pope Clement V. did not approve the high-handed measures of Philip the Fair in the affair of the Templars. He suspended the authority of the Inquisition in France, and called the cause of the knights to the Holy See, requesting the king to surrender the persons and properties of the accused to the care of two cardinals deputed for that purpose. Indeed, so displeased was the Pontiff, that he complained, eight months afterward, to the minister William Plasian, and declared that nothing could excuse the illegality of commencing so grave a prosecution without the consent of the Holy See (1). Philip reluctantly complied with the papal request, and he sent many of the accused knights to Poitiers, where the Pontiff was residing, that Clement might himself inquire into their guilt. The Pope questioned seventy-two, and they all avowed the crimes charged by the French inquisitor. We present the following rather lengthy extract from the diploma of Clement V. to the king, commencing with the words, "Reigning in Heaven," as it throws much light on this entire subject.

"Some time ago, when we were first promoted to the height of the pontificate, and even before we went to Lyons, where we were crowned, and after that, in other places as well as there, we received secret information that the master, preceptors, and other brothers of the Temple, and even the Order itself, to which had been assigned the defence of the patrimony of our Lord Jesus Christ beyond the seas, had fallen into the horrible wickedness of apostasy against the same Lord, into the detestable crime of idolatry, into the execrable vice of the Sodomites, and into various heresies. But, taught by the example of our Lord, and by the doctrines of canonical Scripture, we wished not to lend our ear to such accusations; for, it seemed improbable, nay, incredible, that religious men who had shed their blood for Christ,

(1) *Baluze*, vol. 1., p. 20.

and so often had exposed themselves to death for His sake, who had shown such signs of devotion in the divine offices, fasts, and other observances, should so far forget their salvation as to perpetrate such deeds. At length, however, you who had heard of these same iniquities, and moved, not by avarice—for you do not intend to claim or appropriate the property of the Templars, but have taken your hands altogether away from it, freely and devoutly yielding it up to us and to the Church, to be guarded and administered by our deputies—but excited by zeal for the orthodox faith, and following in the footsteps of your ancestors, having informed yourself, so far as you could, sent to us by messengers and letters many and extensive reports on these matters. Meanwhile, the infamy attaching to the Templars was becoming widespread, and we ourselves heard from a certain knight of the Order—a man of high nobility, and who was once of great influence in it, who swore to what he said, that a candidate to the Order, at the suggestion of the receiver or of his deputy, denied Jesus Christ; that he spat on a crucifix in contempt of Him crucified; that then, both candidate and receiver did things not befitting human decency; therefore, urged by the duty of our office we were compelled to hearken to so many great complaints. Finally, we learned from public report, from you, and the dukes, counts, barons, and other nobles, as well as from the clergy and people of your kingdom, what we announce with great grief, that the master, preceptors, and members of the said Order, and the Order itself, had been charged with the aforesaid and other crimes, and that the premises seemed to be proved by many confessions, attestations and depositions of the said master, preceptors, and members of the said Order, made before many prelates and the French inquisitor into heretical depravity, and shown unto us and our brethren. Since then, the aforesaid rumors and clamors have so increased against the Order, and against each and every one of its members, that they cannot be disregarded without grave scandal, nor tolerated without imminent danger: We, following in the footsteps of Him, whose place, although unworthy, we hold on earth, deemed it proper to inquire into the aforesaid things. Having called

into our presence many of the preceptors, priests, soldiers, and other brothers of the said Order, men of no light reputation, and they having sworn to tell us the simple and full truth in the premises, we interrogated and examined seventy-two of their number, many of our brethren diligently assisting. Their confessions were reduced to authentic writing, and were read in our presence and that of our brethren. After a few days we caused these avowals to be read in the Consistory, and before the accused, and to be explained in the vernacular of each one. Persevering in their confessions, they all, expressly and voluntarily, approved of them as they were read."

The Pontiff then recites how he had proposed to personally interrogate the grand master, and the preceptor of Normandy and others; but some of them being infirm and unable to travel, he had decided to take other means to discover whether they admitted the truth of the confessions made before the French inquisitor.

"Therefore," he continues, "we commissioned our beloved sons, the cardinals Berengarius of the Title of Sts. Nereus and Achilleus, and Stephen of the Title of St. Cyriacus *in thermis*, priests, and the cardinal-deacon Landulph, of the Title of St. Angelus, of whose prudence, experience, and fidelity we are sure, to diligently inquire from the aforesaid master and preceptors into the charges made against the members of the Order and against the Order itself, and to report to us whatever they could discover, referring also to us the confessions, reduced to writing by public authority, conceding to them the power to confer upon the said master and preceptors absolution from the excommunication which they had incurred, if the accusations were true, providing that they, as they ought to do, humbly and devoutly besought that absolution. These cardinals interviewed the master and preceptors, and explained the reason of their coming. And as *the persons and goods of all the Templars of the kingdom were in our hands*, the cardinals declared to them, by the Apostolic authority, that they might open their minds freely and without fear. Then, the master, and the preceptors of France, of the lands beyond the seas, of

Normandy, Aquitaine, and Poitiers, having touched the Holy Gospels of God, swore that they would tell the full and simple truth before the three cardinals, in presence of four public notaries, and of many other public men. Before these, each one freely and voluntarily, without any coercion or fear, deposed and confessed: Among other things, to the denial of Christ, and the spitting on the cross, when they were received into the Order of the Temple; and some of them said that they had received many brethren with the same form, namely, the denial of Christ and the spitting on the cross. Some, also, confessed certain horrible and indecent things, about which, that we may spare their shame, we keep silence. They also avowed the truth of the confessions made some time ago before the inquisitor into heretical depravity; and those confessions and depositions of the aforesaid master and preceptors, reduced to writing by four public notaries, in the presence of the said master and preceptors and of certain worthy men, after a few days were read to them, by order and in presence of the aforesaid cardinals, and explained to each one in his own vernacular. Persevering in them, they all expressly, and voluntarily approved them as they were read. And after these confessions and depositions, they all, upon their knees, and with clasped hands, and with no slight flow of tears, besought of the cardinals an absolution from the excommunication which, because of the aforesaid things, they had incurred. Then, the cardinals expressly, and according to the form of the Church, extended the benefit of absolution by our authority, for the Church does not close her bosom to the returning one. Coming, then, into our presence, the cardinals presented to us the confessions and depositions, and all that had happened in regard to the said master and preceptors; everything being reduced to writing by public authority. From which confessions, depositions, and relations, we find that the aforesaid master and preceptors were grievously delinquent in the aforesaid matters, although some in a greater and some in a less degree."

If any confidence is to be placed in the solemn assertions of a Roman Pontiff, we have now shown the truth of what we undertook to demonstrate, namely, that the Templars

acknowledged their guilt of the terrible crimes with which they were charged. But more light will fall upon the subject if we notice the following facts: In October, 1310, a Council of the province of Sens was held, and, according to the Continuator of Nange, "a diligent inquiry was made into the deeds of the Templars, and into everything regarding them; and their demerits having been weighed, and their quality and circumstances considered, with the approval of the Sacred Council, and with the advice of men learned in the Divine and Canon Law, it was adjudged and defined, that some of them should be simply dismissed from the Order; certain others, however, having performed an enjoined penance, were allowed to depart free and unharmed; some were detained in close confinement; and many, having relapsed into heresy, were delivered to the secular power" (1). Bzovius quotes a Vatican MS., from which it appears that the archbishops of Florence and Pisa made an inquiry into the charges against the Templars, embracing therein all Lombardy and Tuscany; and that it resulted in proving the accusations well founded. In England, says Walsingham: "By command of the king (Edward II.), all the Templars in the realm were arrested, because of imputed indecencies and enormities contrary to the Catholic faith" (2). Pope Clement V. appointed as judges for the trials in Edward's dominions, the patriarch of Jerusalem, the archbishop of York, the bishops of Lincoln, Chester, and Orleans; the abbots of Lagny and of St. Germain, in Paris; Richard de Vaux, canon of Narbonne, and Guy de Vichy, a London pastor. In 1309, a Provincial Council was held at Canterbury for the consideration of this question, but we have no documentary evidence as to its result. But that the English Templars were condemned is evident from the process, as found in Wilkins; although it appears that the guilt of the English knights was less general than that of the continental brethren. We shall notice this fact more particularly when we come to consider the arguments adduced by the apologists for the Templars. In Aragon, as we are told by

(1) At year 1310.

(2) *History of England*, by Rymer, b. iii., nos. 30, 34, 43, 301.

Zurita (1), there came from the French king, "on the 17th of the Calends of November, 1307, an embassy, such as he had sent to all Christian princes, requesting each of them to undertake the defence of the Catholic faith in his own dominions against the Templars. The king received this request while residing in the royal castle of Valencia; and on the 3d of the Nones of December he ordered the arrest of all those sectarians, and the sequestration of their property. John Lotger, of the Dominican Order, Apostolic inquisitor for the kingdom of Aragon, exercised the utmost severity in enforcing the law, repressing the guilty and their partisans. A large number of these shut themselves in the strong castles of Carthage, Montyon, Miravet, Villed, and Alfambra, hoping to escape the penalty following their indictments. In Catalonia, also, having no other hope, they acted in a similar manner. Then the king ordered them to be subdued by force." Pope Clement appointed the bishop of Valencia, the royal chancellor, as judge in the cause of all the accused Templars in Spain. We shall have occasion to notice the assertion that the Spanish Templars were pronounced innocent of the alleged crimes (2); but here we would remark that, according to Zurita, the knights were guilty of contumacy toward their legitimate judges, and of rebellion against their sovereign; which crimes, committed precisely because of the accusations brought against them, would indicate a consciousness of guilt.

All the above inquisitorial, pontifical, and episcopal *Acts*, as well as others of less importance (3), were laid before the Fifteenth General Council, and in its second session, held on April 3, 1312, Pope Clement V., having preached a sermon on the text, "The wicked shall not rise again in judgment nor sinners in the council of the just," and having adapted it to the existing circumstances of the Templars, promulgated the following decree: "With the approbation of the

(1) Jerome Zurita (b. 1512) was historiographer of Aragon, and private secretary to the king. He wrote a collection of *Annals of the Crown of Aragon* (6 vols. fol., 1562-79) commencing with the rise of the kingdom and ending with Ferdinand the Catholic.

(2) The authors of the *Catholic Dictionary* say that "in Spain and Portugal the knights were put on trial on the same charges, but honorably and enthusiastically acquitted."

(3) Such as the investigation in the province of Sens, that in the province of Ravenna and that in Castile.

Sacred Council, and not without grief and bitterness of heart, by our ever-valid and irrefragable decree, not by means of a definite sentence, since we could not, according to the inquiries and processes held in the premises, so pronounce *de jure*, but by way of provision and Apostolic ordinance, we have abolished the Order of the Soldiers of the Temple of Jerusalem, and its state, name, and habit; because of the master and brethren and other persons of the said Order, residing in every part of the world, being stained with various and diverse not only wicked, but even unmentionable obscenities, depravities, and foulnesses, on which we are now silent because of their filthiness. We subject the said Order to perpetual prohibition, especially commanding that no one shall dare to enter the said Order, or to receive or wear its dress, or to present himself as a Templar. If any one does so, he incurs, by the very fact, excommunication. By our Apostolic authority we have decreed that all the property of the aforesaid Order be held at the disposition of the Apostolic See. With the approbation of the same Sacred Council, we give forever, concede, unite, incorporate, apply, and annex, out of the fulness of our Apostolic power, to the Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, and to the Hospital itself, the house of the Soldiers of the Temple and all their other houses, churches, chapels, oratories, towns, castles, villas, lands, granges, possessions, jurisdictions, revenues, rights, all movable and immovable goods, with all their rights and appurtenances, on this side and beyond the sea, in any part of the world where they may be found whatever, at the time the master and certain knights of the Temple were arrested, that is, in the month of October of the year of the Lord 1308, the said Order and the said master and brethren of the Soldiers of the Temple, either by themselves or others, held and possessed . . . excepting such goods of the late Order of the Soldiers of the Temple as are found outside of the realm of France, in the kingdoms and dominions of our beloved sons, the kings of Castile, Aragon, Portugal, and Majorca; these we have deemed proper to especially except and exclude from the above donation, concession, union, application, incorporation and annexation; reserving

them, nevertheless, to the disposition of the Apostolic See"(1).

With regard to the clause, "not by means of a definitive sentence, since we could not, according to the inquiries and processes held in the premises, so pronounce *de jure*," it is to be observed, that these words by no means imply a deficiency of power on the part of the Pontiff to abolish, definitely and *de jure*, any religious Order or community whatever, when he deems such action conducive to the good of the Church. The only reason for the existence of any religious Order or religious institution is the good of the Church; it is only by a decree of the head of the Church that a religious Order attains a legal status, and only so long as he and his successors will that said decree shall retain its force, does that Order remain a legitimate organization. What then did Clement V. mean by the above clause? We must remember that the entire Order of Templars, as an Order, had not been called to judgment: (2) that in some provinces, the Order, as such, had been acquitted. Hence the Pontiff deemed it proper to abolish the Templars, as Durand of Mende is said to have put it, not "according to the rigor of the law" by a definitive sentence, but "by the fulness of his power," by way of Apostolic ordinance. Raynald (3) gives the testimony of one of the fathers of the Fifteenth Council, a "bishop conspicuous for piety and knowledge," whose name he omits, but whom Alexandre says many regarded as Durand of Mende, one of those delegated by Clement V. before the Council, to inquire into the cause of the Templars. This prelate informs us that in the process preliminary to the issue of the decree of abolition, some of the fathers thought that the Order ought not to be abolished without every observance of law, whereas others contended that it "should be destroyed without delay, both because of the grave scandals said Order had furnished Christendom, and because more than two thousand witnesses had shown its guilt of error and heresy." The bishop himself deemed it "ex-

(1) The property of the Templars in the Iberian peninsula was afterward appropriated to defray the expenses of the Crusades against the Mohammedan invaders of that land.

(2) Those who undertook the defence of the knights before the Apostolic commissioners at Paris, declared that they possessed no legitimate "procuracy," and that they could not act as procurators without the commission of the grand master.

(3) *Annals*, at year 1311, No. 55.

pedient for the Church of God and the Christian faith that the Pope, either by the strict letter of law (*de rigore juris*), or by the fulness of his power, should abolish that most infamous Order which, so far as it could, had rendered fetid the odor of the Christian name among the incredulous and the heathen, and had weakened the faith of some Christians and without delay, I say, even though the Order was good at its first institution ; since we read in Dist. 63, cap. *Verum*, that if our predecessors effected anything which, though good in their day, lapsed into error and superstition, as is patent in the case of the said Order, it should be destroyed by posterity without delay . . . again I say without delay, lest this obstinate spark of error become a flame to fire the whole earth, and then there happen what Jerome spoke of, saying: ‘Arius was only a spark in Alexandria, but not being extinguished, his flame scorched the entire world.’” Such is the interpretation of the qualifying clause in the Clementine decree given by two authors quoted by Alexandre ; namely, Walsingham (1) and the Continuator of Nange (2). The former says that when the members of the Council debated whether “the entire Order could be condemned because of the citations of particular guilty members, as it was evident that the said Order had not been cited, the said Council decided (it should be done) not *de jure* ; therefore Pope Clement inserted this clause.” The Continuator of Nange says that the Pontiff “condemned the Order of Templars, not by means of a definitive sentence, because the Order had not been convicted as an Order ; but merely by way of provision and ordinance. However, because the manner of reception, which hitherto they had refused to divulge, was suspected of old, and had now been revealed by many principal men of the Order, the Apostolic authority, with the approval of the Sacred Council, both wiped out the name of the Order, and abolished its habit ; for the Order was now useless, since no good man would wish to enter it, and other evils were to be removed and scandals to be avoided.”

(1) *English History*, y. 1311.

(2) Y. 1310.

It is asserted by certain apologists of the Templars (1) that Pope Clement V. abolished the Order by his own authority, in a secret Consistory. When this objection is made by a Catholic, it may be met with the reply that the sole authority of the Pontiff was sufficient in the premises. But the assertion is untrue. The decree of suppression was drawn up on March 22, 1312, but it was published on April 3d, in full Council, the Pope declaring that it was issued *with the approbation of the Holy Council*. Against this declaration of the Pontiff a certain writer (2) alleges that the fathers, with only four exceptions, evinced a repugnance to the decree. It is impossible to avoid accusing this writer of bad faith in this matter. He appeals to the *Annals* of Raynald (y. 1311, No. 55), but if the reader will examine for himself, he will find that in the cited passage the annalist simply narrates how the fathers were divided as to the *manner* of condemnation, and how a bishop (supposed to be Durand, cited above) insisted on an immediate abolition, whether it were to be effected, as some wished, *de rigore juris*, or as others preferred, "by way of Apostolic provision." There is no mention or insinuation that the prelates disagreed with Pope Clement as to the necessity of suppressing the Templars.

Coming now to the arguments adduced by the apologists of the Templars, we first notice the one based on the authority of Villani, St. Antonine of Florence, Dante, Boccaccio, Trithemius, and Paul Emilius. Of what value is the authority of Villani in the subject-matter? His diction is certainly Tuscan in its purity, and he is a lucid and ingenuous chronicler when unfettered by prejudice; but his writings are not always to be taken as gospel truth. Muratori, than whom no better judge in such matters can be desired, says that "this historian gives us not a few fables when he describes remote events" (3), and that, in regard to the time of Frederick II., and the following period, "he is not always to be believed" (4). And we know that Villani could never

(1) Thus Voltaire in his *Essay on Universal History*; and C. G. Addison, in his *Knights of the Temple*, London, 1841.

(2) Addison.

(3) In Preface to his edition of Villani's *History*.

(4) *Writers on Italian Affairs*, vol. xiii., pt. 3.

forgive the blunder of Clement V., whereby the Italians had to lament the seventy years of the "Babylonian captivity." As for St. Antonine, we must respect his sanctity, admire his canonical and moral science; but as a historian we must place him in the same category with John of Salisbury—among those who feed upon popular rumors, but who cannot digest such deceptive morsels. Like Villani, Dante, Boccaccio, and most Italians of that day, he naturally regarded the papal residence at Avignon with a religious and patriotic aversion; and was ready to credit Clement V., the cause of the "captivity," with many foolish and wicked actions. Thus, he records the popular notion that this pontiff was guilty of lust, simony, and necromancy; although the most reliable records of his time show Clement to have been an upright, though, perhaps, too compliant a pastor. And it may be remarked that St. Antonine, when treating of the events of Clement's reign, is a mere transcriber of Villani; two-thirds of his sentences are literal translations from this author's Italian work. Seldom, indeed, does he seem inclined to venture an opinion which he is ready to defend as his own. Nearly every passage is introduced by a "they say," or, "it is believed," or, "many dignitaries assert." Therefore, since he must be regarded in the same light with Villani, we decline his authority in this matter of the Templars, especially because he is directly refuted, as we shall soon prove, by contemporary or quasi-contemporary authors of undoubted reliability.

Dante can be of little avail in defence of the knights; for, although he condemns Clement V. to hell (1), it is because of that pontiff's reputed simony that the poet so writes, rather than on account of the abolition of the Order. We may here observe that when Dante's politics required such obliviousness, he quite forgot his enmity to "the Gascon," as he often styled Clement in his letters; transcendent as was his genius, he was very human in his policy. Thus, when he heard that Henry of Luxembourg, just elected "king of the Romans," was about to descend into Italy, he wrote, in 1310, a letter "to the kings Robert of Naples, and Frederick of

(1) *Hell*, canto 19.

Sicily ; to the senators of Rome ; to the dukes, marquises, counts, and all the peoples of Italy " (1), in the interest of unity and peace ; in which letter, since hitherto Pope Clement had been favorable to Henry, the poet forgot his trick in the " Comedy," and tried to unite Guelphs and Ghibellines in honoring that pontiff. Encouraging his countrymen to obey Henry, Dante exclaims : " Open the eyes of your minds, and see how the Lord of heaven and earth has given us a monarch. This king is the one whom Peter, the vicar of God, commands us to honor ; he is the one whom Clement, the successor of Peter, illumines with the light of the Apostolic benediction." And in a letter to Henry, he thus vituperates rebel Florence : " With the cruelty of a viper she tries to wound the bosom of her mother, when she directs the horn of rebellion against Rome, who made her in her own image and likeness. With perverse obstinacy she tries to nullify the consent given in your favor by the Roman Pontiff, who is the father of fathers " (2).

Boccaccio is represented as favoring the innocence of the Templars, but he also merely echoes popular Italian rumor, naturally ready to second any report hostile to the pontiff who had transferred the papal residence to France.

Trithemius is also presented as an apologist for the Templars, since he tells us that Clement V. condemned them, " at the instigation of King Philip, by whose favor he had been made Pope ; the Templars were very wealthy, and that he might obtain their possessions, the king, falsely, as many think, charged them with heresy." But this author shows himself unworthy of credence in anything concerning the Fifteenth Council ; for he asserts that it lasted two years, whereas it is certain that it lasted only seven months. Again, he, like St. Antonine, hesitates as to his position, for he inserts the qualifying clause, " as many think." Paul Æmilius is also adduced to defend the knights. He asserts that the

(1) This letter of Dante's was known of old only by means of an anonymous translation into Italian, supposed to be by Marsilio Ficino. But in 1843, Torri published the Latin original from a Vatican MS.

(2) An Italian translation of this letter was first published by Doni in 1547, but it being suspected as not very faithful, the original Latin text was greatly desired by the learned and the curious. It was finally discovered by Moschini, prefect of the Marcian Library, in Venice, in 1827.

movable goods of the Templars were kept by Philip, and only the immovable handed over to the Hospitalers; but that this is untrue will be shown when we come to the defence of the king in this matter. Papire Masson is also quoted by the friends of the knights; but as he simply relies upon Villani, we reject his authority in the premises.

To the above authors, quoted by the Templarites in order that they may prove that the vile passions of Philip the Fair found ready instruments in a Roman pontiff and his court, and in nearly all the bishops, inquisitors, kings, and magistrates of his time, we now oppose some contemporary authorities of greater weight than any adduced against our position. The testimony of the Continuator of Nange has been already given. Bernard Guido, a Dominican, and for eighteen years an inquisitor at Toulouse, died in 1331, leaving a reputation for great learning and sanctity. Among many valuable works, he wrote a *Chronicle* reaching to 1330, which he dedicated to Pope John XXII. Speaking of the year 1307, he says: "On the feast of St. Edward the Confessor, the 3d of the Ides of October, by order of the king and Council, all the Templars in France were arrested; everybody wondered that this ancient Order of knights, so greatly privileged by the Roman Church, should be thus treated, for, excepting a few sworn secretaries, all were ignorant of the reason. However, the cause was finally manifested and given to public execration; namely, their profane rite of profession celebrated with a denial of Christ, and by a spitting upon the crucifix in contempt of the Crucified. Many of them, even dignitaries of the Order, acknowledged this abominable, execrable, and unmentionable ceremony of initiation, of which hitherto all (outsiders) had been ignorant. Some of them, however, though subjected to question and torture, would not confess. Finally, the Roman See, *which at first had regarded the accusation as incredible, and had been greatly displeased at the arrest* (1), became better informed at

(1) Here Bernard directly contradicts the assertion of St. Antonine that Clement V. had "conceded by Letters Apostolic that all the Templars, throughout the world, should be arrested on the same day." We may also passingly remark that these arrests did not take place on the same day. Those in the French dominions occurred on October 13, 1307. those in England, on January 10, 1308; those in Aragon, in November, 1307.

Poitiers, where the curia was residing; for, several of the Templars, being brought before the Pope and some cardinals, there avowed that the previous confessions were true; and therefore, it was then ordered, that the Templars should be arrested everywhere, and the truth be brought to light." The testimony given in the Fifteenth Council, by the "bishop renowned for learning and sanctity," supposed to have been Durand of Mende, may also be examined. Albertino Mussato (d. 1329) has the following: "About seventy-two of the masters, preceptors, and soldiers of the house of the knights of the Temple of Jerusalem having been convicted, and having confessed, awaited the Apostolic censures; and, O shame! although we ought not to relate such infamous things, yet, they are to be spoken of for the punishment of the transgressors, and that posterity may be more cautious in avoiding what our age has experienced; these abominable beasts, endowed with human forms, these brothers—or rather enemies—armed with the sign of the cross, long ago devoted their souls to Satan in their reception into the Order, by a denial of Christ, by a spitting on the cross, and by other things not to be mentioned for the sake of human shame." Mussato, well remarks Alexandre, was an Italian, and therefore not likely to be sympathetic with the court of Avignon; therefore, his testimony is of double weight. Walsingham, whose *English History* is one of the best sources of information for the historian, tells us in his *Life of Edward II.*, that "the Templars were accused and convicted of this, that when they received any one into the Order, all but the brethren having been removed, they led the candidate to a private place, *et totaliter denudaverunt et tunc unus accederet ad eumdem, et eum oscularetur in posteriori parte. . . .* Then, a cross was brought forward, and he was told that Christ was not crucified, but a certain false prophet, who was condemned by the Jews to death for his crimes. Then, the candidate was made to spit thrice upon the cross, and it was thrown to the ground, and they made him trample upon it with his feet. After this, they showed him the head of a certain idol, which they daily adored. Besides these things, it was deposed against them, that they were polluted with the vice of sodomy. . . . Hence,

when a Provincial Council was called at London, to consider these accusations, the accused Templars acknowledged the rumor, but not the fact, unless on the part of a few. Nevertheless, all finally admitted that they could not clear themselves of the accusations, and hence the Council condemned them to perpetual penance." When Walsingham says that the Templars admitted "the rumor, but not the fact," he evidently alludes only to the English knights; for at the moment he is talking of the Provincial Council, convened in 1309 by the English primate, Robert of Winchelsea, and when he speaks of the Templars in general, he says that the charges were proved (1). To these testimonies of authors contemporary, or nearly so, with the abolition of the Templars, we may add that of a more modern writer, one who is frequently quoted by the apologists of the Order, namely, the famous Jesuit historian, Mariani. After enumerating the charges against the knights, this author asks: "What will the reader now say? Will he regard these accusations as founded in fact, or rather as fictions, and not unlike the tales of silly old women? Certainly, Villani, Antonine, and others, reject them as calumnies; but the more general report, and a nearly universal consent, condemns the Templars. . . . That the Order so soon degenerated into every kind of wickedness, would scarcely be credible, unless the *Diplomas of Clement*, from which we have drawn these things, and which are extant among the archives of the great church of Toledo, were proof that the reports were not unfounded; for he affirms that sixty-two (seventy-two) of the Order when questioned before himself, admitted the mentioned crimes, and sought pardon."

The partisans of the Templars insist upon the comparative innocence of the English knights, and tell us that "in Spain they were honorably and enthusiastically acquitted. In Germany also they were acquitted" (2). That the English

(1) "*Depositum fuit contra Templarios et compertum*"—In his essay on the *Accusations against the Templars*, the Protestant Nicolai explains the contradictions of the witnesses, in reference to the initiations, by the fact that there were various kinds of receptions, and that all the knights did not receive the same secrets. Many of the depositions show this to have been the case.

(2) *Catholic Dictionary*, by Addis and Arnold. In this work we are told that "whatever confessions individual Templars made, were extorted by torture . . . and were invariably retracted when the victims found themselves out of the king's power. The Pope, Clement V., interfered so far as he dared, but too weakly and irresolutely to save them . . .

Templars showed a far better record than their continental brethren is true ; and " if it be fair," says Lingard, " to judge from the informations taken in England, however, we may condemn a few individuals, we must certainly acquit the Order " (1). But it would not be fair to so judge ; nor was Pope Clement V. guilty of any such unfairness. He did not form his decision from an inspection of isolated cases, nor should we so form one. Again, we must remember that the English Templars had three years in which to defend themselves, for so long did their trial last : that Archbishop Robert of Winchelsea, who presided, was one of the most inflexible and independent prelates who ever sat in the chair of Canterbury, and that neither he nor his suffragans had anything to expect or fear from Philip ; and yet, after mature deliberation, the English knights were condemned. We may well refuse, therefore, to believe, even with regard to this portion of the Order, that it was condemned " upon evidence so flimsy that in the present day a man could not be convicted on it of the most trifling offence " (2). As for the acquittal of the knights in the Synods of Salamanca and Metz, the innocence of some of the Templars does not acquit the entire Order, as was well understood by Mariana: " In the cause of the Templars it was decreed that their name and Order should be entirely abolished. To many this decree seemed cruel, nor is it probable that those crimes were found in every province, contaminating all the members. However, by the destruction of this Order, a warning to avoid similar iniquities was given to all, especially to religious, whose value and strength consist more in a reputation for virtue than in anything else " (3). It must be observed, however, that according to the same Mariana, The Order was dissolved in France, and all its wealth seized by the king." The assertions as to torture and Philip's avarice are noticed by us in the text. The remark on Pope Clement's conduct is unjust to that Pontiff. So soon as he heard of the king's initiative, he reserved the cause of the knights to himself, and took their property under the protection of the Church. He " dared to interfere " just so long as justice demanded his intervention. He secured to the accused a fair trial before himself, in one case, and before his deputies, in all the others. To have gone further than this, to have shielded the impenitent, and to have continued the Papal sanction to so foully stained an institute, would have been worse than weak and irresolute.

(1) *History of England*, vol. iii., ch. 1.

(2) Thus in the *Catholic Dictionary*.

(3) B. xv., ch. 10.

the prelates assembled at Salamanca gave no final and positive decision of acquittal in regard to the Spanish knights; but "referred the ultimate settlement of the whole affair to the Roman Pontiff." The apologists of the Templars do not gain sympathy for their clients by adducing the action of the Synod of Metz. The German bishops there assembled to consider, by order of Clement V., the case of the Templars, did not acquit the knights; but referred the matter to the Holy See. And even that leniency was procured by violence; for Serarius and Mariana tell us that Hugh, count of the Rhine, and twenty armed Templars burst into the Synod, "terrifying the fathers by their ferocity;" whereupon, lest a tumult might arise, the archbishop received their protest, and promised to use his influence with the Pontiff to secure their not being disturbed (1).

Voltaire insists that King Philip, in his anxiety for vengeance on the Templars, many of whom had been outspoken against his oppressions, and in his covetousness of their great wealth, prepared in advance the mine which, in his own good time, he exploded. Villani tells us that the grand master had condemned the prior of the Templars of Montfaucon to perpetual imprisonment because of immorality and heresy; that during his confinement the prior became acquainted with one Nasso, a Florentine, also a prisoner; that this pair, with a view to obtaining their release, invented the famous charges against the Order. Such, says Voltaire, was the origin of Philip's scheme. But while this narration of Villani may be true, and Mariana receives it as such, nevertheless, the evidence of the worthy pair was not uncorroborated. "The first witnesses," says Mariana, "were two members of the Order; the prior of Montfaucon in the county of Toulouse, and Nasso, a Florentine exile—not sufficiently reliable, as was shown by the testimony of many. Then came others, among whom was a chamberlain of the Pontiff himself, who had joined the Order in his eleventh year, and who related what he had seen and done" (2). But the favorite argument of Voltaire and the other apologists is derived from the tortures which, they say, extorted the con-

(1) B. viii., ch. 92.

(2) B. xv., ch. 15.

fessions of the Templars. James Molay, the grand master, and others who were burnt at Paris, retracted these extorted avowals, and died protesting their innocence, and that of their Order. Even the Continuator of Nange, an author whom we often quote in favor of our thesis, gives the following melancholy picture. When treating of the year 1310, he says: "Outside the city of Paris, in the fields not far from the abbey of St. Anthony, fifty-nine Templars were burnt to death. All of these, with no exception, acknowledged none of the imputed crimes, but constantly and perseveringly declared that they were unjustly put to death." And at the year 1313 he writes: "When the aforesaid four, the general or transmarine master of the Order of the Temple, the visitor for France, and the masters of Aquitaine and Normandy; the final disposition of whose cases the Pope had reserved to himself, had without exception, publicly and openly confessed the imputed crimes, and had persisted in that confession, and had appeared to wish to finally persist in it, a council was held with great deliberation on the Monday after the feast of St. Gregory, in the vestibule of the great church at Paris, by mandate of the Pope, and the aforesaid four were adjudged to perpetual imprisonment by the lord-cardinal of Albano and two other cardinal-legates, the archbishop of Sens, certain other prelates, and other persons versed in Divine and Canon Law, specially summoned to Paris for this case. But behold, when the cardinals had thought an end had been put to the business, two of the aforesaid, namely, the transmarine master and the master of Normandy, suddenly and unexpectedly defending themselves against the cardinal who had delivered a sermon, and against the archbishop of Sens, returned to a denial of their confession, and of all that they had acknowledged, most irreverently and to the wonder of many. Then the cardinals handed them over to the provost of Paris, who was present, to be merely guarded until the morrow, when their case would be more carefully considered. So soon as the news of what had occurred reached the king, who was then in the royal palace, having counselled with his courtiers, but wisely (*prudente consilio*) calling no clergyman to the

conference, he commanded that both should be burnt at the same stake, on a little island of the Seine between the royal gardens and the church of the Hermits. They appeared to undergo the burning willingly and readily, and their final constancy in death excited the wonder of all the beholders. The two others were confined in the prison to which they were sentenced." Now Voltaire asserts that the confessions of the Templars were drawn from them by torture. While, on the one hand, we would not attempt to defend the use of "the question" in a law court, neither would we, on the other, assert with Voltaire that every confession so obtained is valueless. But granting the worthlessness of every evidence so evolved, is it true that the testimony because of which the Templars were abolished was extracted by torture from unwilling lips? We do not deny that the torture was applied in some instances, but certainly there was no such thing in the case of the hundred and twenty-four knights examined before the inquisitor at Paris, or in that of the seventy-two interrogated by the Pontiff at Poitiers; and yet these knights, and others similarly situated, admitted their guilt (1). This is shown by the *Acts* of the trial, by the diploma "Reigning in heaven" already cited, and by the other diploma given by Raynald at the year 1307, No. 12. As for the fact that the grand master and other Templars died asserting their innocence; that the former and the master of Normandy retracted their former confessions; such facts by no means prove that the Order was unjustly suppressed.

(1) Speaking of the prosecution of the Templars of Lombardy and Tuscany, conducted by the archbishops of Pisa and Florence and by a Roman canon, Cantu's love of truth forces him to say: "Here the accused had no fear, as they would have had in France, of being sent to the stake: for they were being tried by an ecclesiastical tribunal which assigned as punishment only repentance and retraction. This adds to the reliability of the deposition which they swore to have made, 'not out of hatred, or out of love; not for reward or because of fear; but merely for the sake of truth.' Some of the accusations were admitted by all; some others only by certain knights, and as regarding particular cases and persons, or as being matters of heresy, or as being customary beyond the sea. But, above all, they agreed in admitting the most jealous secrecy of the chapters, and the guilt of infidel blasphemy. *If, therefore, the wicked prosecutions instituted in France tempt us to regard the Templars as innocent, and as victims of Philip the Fair, the calm with which the Church proceeded, the processes instituted during many years in Italy and in other lands, and without violence, allow us to suppose that many of the knights were guilty, and that the king of France should not be compared with Clement V., who, by suppressing the Order, 'not de jure, but by way of provision,' saved innocent individuals, and disappointed the royal greed by assigning its wealth to the defence of the Holy Land.*"—*Heretics of Italy*, Discourse viii.

Criminals very frequently die with lies on their lips ; and that James Molay lied most solemnly, either at the stake or in his repeated and spontaneous confessions, is indisputably proven. We are not bound to explain his vacillations. It is well to know, however, that in the inquiry held at Chinon in Touraine on August 18–20, 1308, by three cardinals deputed by the Pope, the grand master was so astounded on hearing the many depositions which had been made at Paris and at Poitiers, that he kept silence on all the points saving that of the denial of Christ, which he expressly admitted to have been practiced. When interrogated at Paris on December 26, 1309, he disavowed this confession, and accused the commissioners of forgery ; demanding afterward to be judged by the Pontiff. Whom ought we naturally suspect of falsehood, the three cardinals or James Molay ? The Pope had insisted on the observance of the strictest equity in the premises ; the king had consulted the universities, the clergy, and the parliaments ; nor did he need any forgeries, as we have seen, to attain his end, the extinction of the Order. We would therefore suspect the grand master of falsehood, rather than the cardinals. When finally the Fifteenth Council had been held, and the Templars had been suppressed, Clement V. appointed new commissioners to close the process ; namely, three cardinals, the archbishop of Sens, several bishops, and many learned men. Before these, Molay, Guy of Auvergne, and two others again avowed their guilt, “and on March 18, 1313, they were condemned to perpetual imprisonment. A platform, on which they were to affix their confessions, was erected in front of Notre Dame,” but at the commencement of the ceremony, Molay and Guy suddenly retracted their avowals. For the grand catastrophe the Papal commissioners were not responsible. That was consummated in obedience to an order from King Philip, after they had delivered the culprits to the custody of the provost of Paris, intending to deliberate as to the sentence on the following day.

The grand master and the brother of the dauphin of Auvergne retracted their confessions, but we must remember that thirty or forty thousand other knights, who had

been condemned to different kinds of punishment, survived the "persecuting" Philip and Clement, and did not retract or attempt to justify the Order. Again even Michelet admits that "in the interrogatories which we publish, the denials are nearly all identical, as though according to a settled formula; while on the contrary, the avowals are all varied by special circumstances, often very naive, which facts give them a peculiar stamp of veracity. Contrary, indeed, would have been the case, if the avowals had been extorted by torture; then they would have been nearly alike, and the diversity would have been found in the denials" (1).

In his zealous championship of the Templars, the prince of modern incredulists asserts that "seventy-four of them, who had not been accused, undertook to defend the Order, but were not heard." Bergier's reply to this absolute falsehood is worthy of the reader's attention: "In other places the apologist cites the *History of the Templars*, by Peter Dupuy. Now this historian relates that these seventy-four defenders of their Order were heard by the commissioners for the first time, on Saturday, March 14, 1310, and that they deputed four of their number to speak in the name of all. Not only were they heard, but they presented requests and memorials in writing. The verbal reports of their speeches were exactly drawn up, and the author of the *History of the Gallican Church* has copied them. They protested against the confessions made by the accused; like the apologist, they declared that these admissions had been extorted by threats and promises, or that those who made them were wicked persons; they demanded to be judged by the Pope, and by the Council of Vienne, then about to assemble. Now what follows from this defence? Simply that those seventy-four Templars were innocent, for they were not accused; that until then they had been ignorant of the crimes of their brethren, and that they found it difficult to credit them. But this is only a negative proof;

(1) The name of Michelet is dear to all well-informed Masons, and should be cherished by all Templarites. In the *Collection of Unedited Documents Concerning the History of France*, published by care of the Minister of Public Instruction, this writer gave to the world the verbal process of the Templars. Speaking of the interrogatory undergone by Molay and two hundred and thirty-one knights before the Pontifical commissioners at Paris, he says: "This inquiry was conducted slowly, and with much care and kindness."

ignorance proves nothing; they adduced nothing positive capable of destroying the confession of the accused." Voltaire endeavors to evade the charges of obscenity among the knights by pleading that "this infamy never could have become a law among them. I do not doubt at all that many of the Templars yielded to those excesses which have been, at all times, the inheritance of youth; but these are passing vices, which it were better to ignore than to punish." To this characteristic remark we again reply with Bergier: "Here the author confounds two methods of reception. It is to be presumed that the public reception, performed by the grand master or others, was decent; but there was another, a private one invented by the libertines of the Order, to which the new knights were subjected, and in which were committed those abominations and profanations already mentioned. Many witnesses declared that they had been forced into this latter rite by prison and torture. It is well known that wicked persons desire to have accomplices in their crimes. The majority of those who were executed were not young men; therefore their vices were not passing ones. It is but too true that aged libertines are more given to excessive lubricity than are young people." Voltaire pretends to find it difficult to believe that the Templars denied Jesus Christ, and asks what had they to gain by renouncing a religion which cherished them, and for which they had so gloriously combated? But many impious men, and among them Voltaire himself, blaspheme against the religion which has nourished them; and what they have to gain we do not know. As for the combats of the Templars in the cause of the faith, these had long been, at least for the French members, things of the past.

We now come to the assertion that the suppression of the Templars is to be ascribed to the covetousness of King Philip the Fair (1). Mosheim, Potter, Voltaire, in fine, all the apologists of the proscribed Order, assign this as the prime cause of the abolition. St. Antonine says that "many dignitaries asserted that the knights were innocent, and

(1) The *Catholic Dictionary* says that Philip "coveting their wealth, laid a deep plot for their destruction . . . all its wealth was seized by the king."

condemned without just cause, in order that their property might be confiscated. They were afterward despoiled of their goods by the Pope, and their revenues applied to the House or Hospital of St. John. But as the property had already been seized by the king of France and by other princes, it had to be redeemed at a heavy price; whence these latter religious were rendered very poor. . . . It was ordered (in the Fifteenth Council) that all the goods of the Templars should be assigned to the Hospital of Jerusalem, and as they had already been seized by the various lay lords, the Hospitalers were compelled to pay a large sum to the king and others who held the property." And we are told by Paul Emilius that Philip's treasury "retained possession of the movable property, while that affixed to the soil was given by a Pontifical decree to the Hospitalers of St. John." Even Walsingham inveighs against Philip, in this matter, although he admits that the king did not gain his point. He says that "Philip, king of France, thought to make one of his sons king of Jerusalem, and to obtain for him all the revenues of the Templars. . . . But he did not attain his wish in regard to the property, for the Pope assigned it to the Hospitalers." Now the innocence of Philip in this matter is proved, firstly, by the Diploma, "Reigning in Heaven," of Clement V. The Pontiff says to the king: "At length, however, you who had heard of these same iniquities, and moved, not by avarice, for you do not intend to claim or appropriate the property of the Templars, but have taken your hands altogether away from it, freely and devoutly yielding it up, to be guarded and administered by our deputies." The same is proved, secondly, by the letter sent in March, 1311, by Philip to the Pontiff, requesting that the property of the Templars be assigned either to some new Military Order, or to some old one engaged in the cause of the Holy Land. It is shown, thirdly, by the instrument of transfer of the property in question to the Hospitalers. In this document, dated August 24, 1312, we read: "Since the aforesaid properties, inasmuch as they are in our kingdom, are under our special care and protection, and it is known that we fully possess in them,

either mediately or immediately, the right of patronage ; and having been induced by you, together with the prelates united in Council, to give this consent : We, therefore, whose interest it is, accept this disposition, ordinance, and transfer, and give to it our consent ; perpetually reserving to ourselves, and to the prelates, barons, nobles, and others of our kingdom, all our and their rights such as hitherto obtained in said properties." The same is evinced, fourthly, by the agreement entered into between Louis X., the son and heir of Philip the Fair, and Villaret, the grand master of the Hospitalers, on February 14, 1315, in which it was arranged that the knights of the Hospital should pay the king 260,000 livres, for which sum, expended by the monarch in the prosecution of the Templars, the ceded property had been pledged ; not that, says the agreement, the Knights of Rhodes had not already been in the enjoyment of the Templar revenues, by virtue of the possession given them by authority of King Philip, but because there were many expenses to be liquidated, dating from the time when the Templars were arrested.

We would now observe in conclusion that much of the sympathy which has been manifested for the Templars is due to the connection supposed—whether rightly or not, is of little importance—to subsist between the unfortunate Order and Freemasonry. "We shall see," says Condorcet, "whether we ought not to number among secret societies this celebrated Order, against which Popes and kings so barbarously conspired" (1). In his valuable work on secret societies, Deschamps derives Masonry from four sources, Gnosticism, Manicheism, the Albigenses, and *the Templars* (2). "The Masons," he says, "and all the philosophical revolutionists and Jacobins had a great interest in defending the Templars," and then he proceeds to show, from Masonic authorities, how these sectaries claim a descent from the proscribed Order. Among the authorities cited by this zealous and indefatigable writer, we select one which will prove of interest to the reader. On April 8,

(1) *Historic Tableau of the Progress of the Human Mind*, epoch 7.

(2) *Secret Societies and Society, or the Philosophy of Contemporaneous History*, vol. i., b. 2, ch. i., § 5; Avignon, 1882.

1839, M. de Banville, an ex-officer of the Grand Orient of France, spoke as follows in a Lodge of the Knights of the Cross : " The Masonic Order is an emanation from that of the Temple, with the history and misfortunes of which you are acquainted, and reasonably it can have no other origin. Masonry was born in Scotland, and originally it was a prudent and ably arranged disguise conceived by some knights of that country in order to hide the continuation of their illustrious Order from the keen eyes of its powerful enemies. The heroic William de Moure, grand prior of England and Scotland, directed from his prison the knights of his language in the creation, organization and development of the Masonic rite, destined to shield, from the eyes of the profane, the proscribed, and anathematized Order of the Temple. We may conceive how this local transformation, in the language of Scotland, of the Order of the Temple into that of Masonry, was enveloped in secrecy ; how the unfortunate Templars, calumniated by vile renegades, cowardly betrayed by ignoble apostates who tracked them like wild beasts in nearly every land of Christendom, forced to hide their names and quality under pain of the most frightful persecution and of the most horrible torture, innocent victims of a king's avarice and a Pope's jealousy ; succeeded in inventing, that they might recognize and aid each other *in all, for all, and everywhere*, in France, Germany, and Sweden, where Masonry soon penetrated, those sacred passwords, signs, and grips, which have come down to us from generation to generation. How can we otherwise explain, on the part of a vast philanthropic association, organized for the honorable purposes of giving to suffering humanity the consolations and alms of Christian charity, those severe commands to *say nothing, write nothing, signify nothing*, concerning the praiseworthy object of this secret society, under pain of incurring the certain effects of an atrocious vengeance, exposing the traitor to have his throat cut, his heart and entrails torn out, his body burnt and reduced to ashes, the ashes thrown to the winds, and his memory execrated by every Mason ? All this would become a revolting absurdity, without the explanation, so simple and satisfying to reason,

that the knights of the Temple had a powerful interest in hiding themselves under the mantle of Masonry, specially organized by themselves for that purpose. I therefore affirm that the Masonic Order was established in the fourteenth century by the knights of the Temple, in obedience to the grand prior of Scotland, and that this beautiful institution emanated from that centre, and easily propagated itself in the European countries, then covered by our proscribed predecessors. I could easily adduce numerous proofs, drawn from a comparison of the rituals in use in the two Orders, and at first it would astonish one to notice the same system of reception, proceeding by way of physical and moral tests" (1). This theory of the Templar origin of Freemasonry is well developed in the *Masonic Manual* or *Tiler* of Willaume, and in the *Philosophical and Interpretative Course* of explanations of the symbols and mysteries of Masonry, published by Ragon, founder of the celebrated Lodge of the Trinosophists—a work solemnly authorized on June 24, 1840, by the Grand Orient of France. In contradiction to the above theory may be adduced the opinion of Guyot, printer to the French "Templars," who published in 1825 a *Manual of the Knights of the Temple*, in which he contended that the Masonic claim is false; that Molay named his successor; and that the Templars continued to have an uninterrupted succession of grand masters down to Fabré-Palaprat, elected in 1804. As Philip d'Orleans was grand master of these "Templars" in 1706, it is amusing to read that they sign with their blood the oaths of obedience, poverty, chastity (!), fraternity, hospitality, and military service; and that each "knight" is obliged, if he can possibly do so, to visit the Holy Land once in his life. Lenoix, in his *Origin of Freemasonry*, insists that St. Bernard, who gave their rule to the knights, was a Mason. If this impudent assumption surprises the reader, he should know that Ragon, whom the adepts of Square and Triangle uphold as a pre-eminently authoritative writer on Masonic subjects, declares that the chevalier (*sic*) Gerson, or Thomas A' Kempis, the author of the *Imitation of Christ*, was also a Mason,

(1) *The Globe*, a journal of Masonic initiations, Paris, 1839.

and that his book, "the masterpiece of one deeply initiated, undoubtedly gave rise to the mystic veil with which, under the titles of 'Rose-Cross,' 'Knight of the Eagle and of the Pelican,' the last mysteries of Masonry are covered" (1).

CHAPTER XXXVI.

THE POPES AT AVIGNON.

While Pope Clement V. resided at Poitiers or at Bordeaux (1305-9), the pressure, and even tyranny, exercised toward the Pontiff by King Philip the Fair had demonstrated the necessity of a fixed residence of the papal court where the head of the Church could enjoy freedom of action. But Clement V., probably with little displeasure, did not deem it feasible to restore the papal residence to the Eternal City. The factions of the nobility, headed by the Orsini and the Colonna, held Rome in a state of chronic disorder; and therefore Clement decided to locate his court in the city of Avignon, which, although nominally subject to the House of Anjou, was, thanks to the spirit of its citizens, virtually independent, and which was nearly enclosed in the County of the Venaissin, a possession of the Holy See (2). Petrarch, like all the Italian writers of that day, could see no beauty in the rock-perched town, "little and disgusting." He knew of no place "so stinking," and declared that it was "a shame to make it the capital of the world." The Italian contemporaries of Clement V. manifest their indignation at the Pontiff's unfortunate action by such expressions as "scandal to the universe," "the exile of the Holy See," and the famous one, "the captivity of Babylon."

But while it is certain that Rome and all Italy suffered by the prolonged absence of the papal court, and by the consequent preponderating influence of the French kings in the affairs of Europe; while it is true that to the papal residence in France may be traced the causes that produced the Great

(1) *Loc. cit.*

(2) It became such in 1228, by a treaty between Pope Gregory IX., represented by Cardinal d'Ossat, and King Louis IX. with Count Raymond of Toulouse.

Western Schism, it would be unjust to Clement V. to suppose that he foresaw the many evils entailed by his determination, or that he realized that his immediate successors would persist in absenting themselves from their See. There were powerful reasons for his conduct. In France, his own land, where the affair of the Templars had detained him for six years, he saw himself respected and loved, while his own capital was a prey to anarchy, and many of his near predecessors had been compelled to fix their residence in Viterbo, Perugia, or Anagni; Tuscany could not afford the Sovereign Pontiff a refuge, for it was harassed by the feud of the Whites and Blacks; Venice was at issue with the Holy See, because of the claims of both parties to the marquisate of Ferrara; either of the Two Sicilies would have been a more precarious asylum than France.

The advent of the papal court was a happy thing for Avignon. She soon came down from her rocky perch, and extended herself over the plain; whole quarters of elegant streets, flanked by magnificent palaces, appeared; and the arts and taste of Italy soon made the city one of the most beautiful in Europe. In the year 1348 Pope Clement VI. bought Avignon from Queen Jane of Naples, heiress to the counts of Provence. In 1791 it was definitively annexed to France. Seven Popes resided at Avignon: Clement V., John XXII., Benedict XII., Clement VI., Innocent VI., Urban V., and Gregory XI.,—all, quite naturally, French, and all of whom did honor to their country, despite the assertion of Henri Martin that "Avignon was then a Gomorrha,"—a calumny which is refuted by its own exaggeration. Pope Clement V. died on April 20, 1314, and was succeeded by John XXII., whose pontificate was so eventful that we shall devote to it a special chapter.

BENEDICT XII.

On the death of John XXII., 1334, the cardinal Comminges seemed to be the most likely candidate for the tiara; but when the other French cardinals, so devoted to their monarch that they closed their eyes to the interests of the Church, demanded from his Eminence a promise to retain

the papal residence in France, the noble prelate declared that he would throw off the purple sooner than violate his conscience. He was convinced, he said, that the Papacy was incurring great danger by its transfer from its natural seat. Consternation seized upon the electors; whereupon some one suggested the cardinal Fournier, a Cistercian monk, and since his election appeared very improbable, many deemed it advisable to vote for him, while still looking for the coming man. This manœuvre made Fournier Pope, for, to the dismay of the intriguers, he received more than two-thirds of the suffrages. Although devoted to the court of France, Benedict XII. soon realized the necessity of withdrawing the Holy See from its painful and anomalous position in Avignon; but the French cardinals persuaded him to change his mind. One of the first questions considered by Benedict XII. was that of the Beatific Vision, which, as we shall see in the following chapter, was left undetermined by John XXII. Benedict greatly desired that the faithful should be provided with dogmatic certainty in so important a matter; hence he published, in 1336, the Decretal *Benedictus Deus*, defining, by Apostolic authority, that the souls of the just enjoy, immediately after death, the intuitive vision of God; *i. e.*, that they "see the Divine Essence, face to face." This pontificate witnessed another attempt to terminate the Greek Schism. It was undertaken by the celebrated Barlaam, abbot of the monastery of the Holy Saviour at Constantinople; but its sole result was the abjuration of the originator. It was during this pontificate that Petrarch was crowned as poet-laureate at Rome, on April 8, 1341.

CLEMENT VI.

Pope Benedict XII. having died on April 23, 1342, the cardinal Peter Roger, a Benedictine monk and archbishop of Rouen, was elevated to the papal throne on May 6, and assumed the name of Clement VI. During this reign an end was put to the schism of Louis of Bavaria, that prince dying in 1347. Clement had continued the severity of the two preceding Pontiffs towards Louis, and had procured the election of Charles of Luxemburg, son of King John of

Bohemia, after having threatened, in case of inaction on the part of the German electors, to himself choose an emperor by virtue of his apostolic authority. Shortly after his elevation, he received a Roman deputation headed by Stephen Colonna and Petrarch, now a Roman citizen. These deputies were charged to make the then usual request for the restoration of the Popes to their proper residence, and Petrarch supported the petition in pathetic and beautiful Latin verses (1). After a delay of two months, the Pontiff replied to the request that the times were not propitious.

INNOCENT VI.

When the cardinals went into conclave after the death of Clement VI., Dec. 5, 1352, men thought that the majority would vote for Birel, the general of the Carthusians. Were we in doubt as to the evil effects produced by the Avignon exile, it would be dissipated on learning that the leaning of their Eminences toward Birel was affected by the following frank remarks of the cardinal Talleyrand de Perigord: "I perceive, brothers, that you would like to elect the general of the Carthusians. Undoubtedly he merits the honor; but you forget one very important fact, namely, that we are much attached to the world and its glory, whereas your favorite despises them. If elected, he will reduce us to primitive simplicity, and will proscribe our sumptuous equipages, etc. Neither power nor nobility will terrify him; he knows no fear when the good of the Church is concerned" (2). Notwithstanding this telling argument, their Eminences did not elect an unworthy, or even a weak man. Stephen Aubert, bishop of Ostia, was not a remarkable personage; but he was upright, and as Pope Innocent VI., he proved worthy of his sublime office. His pontificate was chiefly remarkable for the obliteration of the petty tyrants who had nearly annihilated the political authority of the Holy See in the States of the Church—a conquest achieved by the skill and valor of Cardinal Ægidius Albornoz.

(1) *Songs*, B. 2, ep. 5.

(2) DORLAND; *Carthusian Chronicle*, B. iv., ch. 22. *Brief History of the Carthusian Order* in Martene and Durand's *Ancient Writers*, vol. vi.

BLESSED URBAN V.

When the conclave consequent on the death of Innocent VI., in Sept., 1362, had progressed for several days without any prospect of election, the cardinals resolved to depart from established usage, and to seek a candidate outside the Sacred College. They chose William Grimoard, abbot of the Benedictine monastery of St. Victor at Marseilles, who took the name of Urban V. Matthew Villani tells us that Grimoard had publicly exclaimed, when he heard of the death of Innocent VI.: "If I could see a Pope seriously trying to restore the Holy See to Rome, I would willingly die to-morrow." Be this as it may, in 1366 the Christian world was informed that in the following year the Holy Father would enter his episcopal city. Naturally this decision produced great discontent in the French court; and King Charles V. sent to Avignon the learned and eloquent Nicholas Oresme, to persuade the Pontiff to remain in France. In full Consistory the orator pronounced a prolix discourse, garnished with Scriptural quotations and historical allusions, none of which applied to his thesis. His entire would-be argumentation was intended, and in good faith, it would seem, to show that the Roman Pontiff ought to remain under the sheltering wings of France: 1st, because that nation had always protected the Holy See; 2d, because ecclesiastical science was more honored in France than in any other land; 3d, because a French city, Marseilles, was then the geographical centre of Catholic Europe; 4th, because France was better governed than any of the Italian states; 5th, because France was the native land of Urban V., and our Saviour never left His own country; 6th, because a sea-voyage would be dangerous to the Pope and his court (1). It is not surprising that, as Petrarch informs us, this discourse hastened the pontifical preparations for departure. However, Urban did not effect his design without much opposition from the French cardinals; in fact, the only members of the Sacred College who did not formally refuse to accompany him were the cardinals Orsini, Capoccio, and the bishop

(1) DU BOULAI; *History of the University of Paris*, vol. iv.

of Viterbo—the only Italians then wearing the purple. But the Frenchmen valued their hats, and when the Pontiff threatened to take these away, the opposition subsided (1).

On April 30, 1367, the pontifical court bade farewell to Avignon; on June 3, the fleet anchored off Corneto, and on the 9th the Pontiff entered Viterbo. But not before October 16 did a successor of St. Peter, for the first time in sixty-three years, kneel at the shrine of the Prince of the Apostles. And, alas! in less than three years the chief pastor again sought a foreign residence, and no other reason can be assigned for this abandonment of his legitimate post than mere home-sickness. French writers try to palliate his weakness, but none can adduce any more probable reason for his return to France than that he yearned for home. He explained his resolution to the Christian world by the necessity of being on the spot while trying to reconcile the kings of France and England. In vain did the holy Swedish princess, afterward canonized as St. Bridget, threaten Urban with the anger of God and an early death if he effected his design (2); in vain the Roman Senate besought him to remain. On September 5, 1370, he embarked at Corneto, and on the 24th he re-entered Avignon. The menace of St. Bridget was soon accomplished; in the fulness of his strength Pope Urban V. was suddenly attacked by an illness which threatened his life. Then he swore to return to Rome, if Almighty God would permit it; but his hour had come, and, wrapped in his Benedictine habit, which he had always retained, he died on the 19th of December, 1370.

GREGORY XI.

On the first day of the conclave (Dec. 30) the unanimous voice of the Sacred College raised to the Papacy the cardinal deacon, Peter de Beaufort, nephew of Clement VI. While yet a student, his maturity of judgment was so pronounced, that Ubaldo Ubaldi, the first jurisconsult of the age, often consulted him, and would give his opinion, saying, "Our master thus pronounces." The new Pontiff was or-

(1) *Chronicle of Bologna*, in Muratori, vol. xviii.

(2) *Revelations of St. Bridget*. F. iv. c. 138. GOBELIN, *Cosmodromium*, c. 73.

dained priest on January 4, 1371 ; then consecrated bishop, and crowned as Pope under the name of Gregory XI. From the very beginning of his pontificate Gregory was resolved to restore definitively the Holy See to the Eternal City, and in October, 1374, he wrote to the emperor Charles IV. : " We wish to put off no longer our visit to the Holy City, and we have resolved, with the help of God, to set out next September." He announced his determination to all the European sovereigns ; but the commencement of 1376 found him still at Avignon, trying to make peace between France and England. His final departure is generally regarded as due to the influence of St. Catherine of Sienna.

On September 13, 1376, the Holy See bade a lasting farewell to Avignon. Marseilles was reached on the 20th, and the Pontiff found awaiting him twenty-two galleys, most of which belonged to, and were manned by, the Knights Hospitalers ; the most beautiful ship of the fleet, however, had been sent by Florence, although this republic was then at war with the Holy See. Sail was spread on October 2, and after a stormy voyage, and many forced delays at intermediate ports, the papal court disembarked at the port of Corneto on the 6th of December. Here the Pontiff remained until January 15, 1377, when he ascended the Tiber, and on January 17 landed at St. Paul's. On the 18th, the Feast of the Chair of St. Peter at Rome, he made his triumphal entry into the capital of Christendom, and the Romans rejoiced because " the captivity of Babylon " was at an end.

It is frequently asserted that on his death-bed Pope Gregory XI. avowed his regret for having restored the papal residence to its legitimate site. Gerson says that, holding in his hands the Blessed Eucharist, the dying Pontiff enjoined upon the attending cardinals never to be influenced by the imaginary visions of hallucinated men and women ; that Gregory admitted that his own facility in this regard, had brought the Church to the verge of a schism (I). Now, these words attributed to Pope Gregory reflect too seriously upon the veracity and good sense, to say nothing of the approved sanctity, of St. Catherine of Sienna, of St. Bridget.

(1) *Examination of Doctrines*, p. li. consid. 3.

of Sweden, and of the Blessed Alfonso of Aragon, to have been uttered at so solemn a moment by so wise and holy a man. Gerson is, in many matters, a grave authority ; but in this matter, unsupported as he is by contemporary testimony, we must decline to accept the many absurdities implied by his assertion. Whatever the great chancellor knew about the deeds and sayings of Pope Gregory XI. he had acquired from others ; at the time of the Pontiff's death he was a boy of fourteen in the schools of Paris, and we find no corroboration of the above assertion in any work by an author contemporary with the Pontiff. Gerson was a cultivator of the Avignon idea, and he would probably lend a credulous ear to any tale that would aid to put it in action.

And what must we think of Gregory's supposed foresight of the Great Schism? To one, like Gerson, living amid the troubles of that schism, it would be easy to trace it back to certain seeming causes ; but there was nothing in the circumstances of Rome or of the Church while Pope Gregory XI. was dying, except the obstinacy of the French cardinals, which could have justified the supposed gloomy forebodings of the Pontiff. And would this obstinacy, this home-sickness, this false idea of patriotism, in fine, this consummate and unmitigated selfishness, of the French cardinals have justified a Pontiff in lamenting his having performed an act which was praised (save in France) throughout Christendom as an act of common utility? Had the Romans no rights at all in the matter? Had they no right to insist that their bishop should reside among them? Had they no right to the personal protection and government of their Pope-king? Had the Universal Church no claims in the premises? Was the Papacy to continue to be an appendage of the French crown, a mere contributor to its convenience and glory, merely because of the ultra-nationalism of certain creatures of the French monarch, or because of their want of sympathy with the legitimate aspirations of the Pope's temporal subjects, or because said creatures, forsooth, found the Roman Campagna less suited to their effeminate constitutions than were the beautiful plains of the Venaisin? Again, at the very time that Pope Gregory is said to have

expressed his disgust with the "hallucinations" which had contributed to his removal from Avignon to his proper residence, his principal "hallucinator," St. Catherine, was acting as his agent at Florence (1). And the Pontiff well knew that God had favored His servant with supernatural gifts; for, in the Bull of Canonization of St. Catherine, Pope Pius II. expressly certifies that she had acquainted Gregory with her knowledge of his secret vow to proceed to Rome.

That ultra-Gallican, Maimbourg, easily concludes that "when this Pontiff viewed the condition of Italy on the spot, he regarded it with an eye different from that with which he had judged it when in distant Avignon; and, finding himself at the point of death before he could prevent the evils which he foresaw, he deplored the horrors menacing the Church. Well did he see how the Romans, who, contrary to their promise of entire submission, had usurped sovereign authority over the city, leaving to the Pontiff only a shadow of power, would master the conclave, and would not suffer the election of a Pope from beyond the Alps, lest such a one would again transfer the Holy See from Rome. Well did he see, on the other hand, that the French cardinals, then composing more than two-thirds of the College (there were twenty-three members,—eighteen French, four Italians, and one Spainard) would afterward protest against the violence used towards themselves, and that hence the first election would prove to have been not free and canonical. These considerations, together with the little power vouchsafed him in Italy, in spite of the fine words that had drawn him from France, made him believe that he had left the country at an unpropitious time, and caused him to take, some time before his death, the resolution to return to Avignon" (2).

In expressing such opinions, Maimbourg was true to the Aulico-Gallican principles which were soon to entail the catastrophe of his life, but nothing that Pope Gregory XI. witnessed or experienced at Rome could have given to that Pontiff any foreknowledge of the embroglio that ensued af-

(1) BOLLANDISTS: *Life of St. Catherine of Sienna*, v. iii. c. 8, Nos. 420-425.

(2) *History of the Great Western Schism*, by the Rev. Father Maimbourg, of the Society of Jesus, Paris, 1678, b. I. p. 12.

ter his death. But granting that he foresaw that his countrymen of the Sacred College would rend the seamless garment of Christ sooner than abandon their project of confining the papal residence to France, of making the pontifical dignity hereditary in the French family, would Gregory XI. have been justified in returning to Avignon? Were the wishes of a mere faction to be respected sooner than the desires of Christendom; the fancied interests of France rather than the real ones of the Pope's own temporal subjects—yea, rather than those of all other nations? Nor would a return to Avignon have obviated all danger of schism. The fact is, the exile at Avignon had prepared the way to a schism, which, if it arrived not in one way, was almost certain to come by another. Such was the temper of the Romans at the time—owing to the decayed grandeur of their city, and the terrible anarchy of which they were victims,—that a little encouragement would have caused them to resist the authority of an Avignonese Pontiff. In August, 1376, Luca Savelli arrived at Avignon, and informed the Pope that the abbot of Montecassino had already been asked whether he would accept the tiara if it were tendered him by the clergy and people of Rome; and that the prelate had answered that, as a Roman citizen, he could refuse nothing to the Romans. The papal legate at Rome had also informed the Pope of this manoeuvre (1), and Gregory perceived that an aversion of the threatened danger was of sufficient importance to make him ignore the disturbed state of the peninsula.

As for Maimbourg's statement that Pope Gregory XI. foresaw that "the Romans would master the conclave," it is certain that the Romans did no such thing. The Pontiff may have foreseen, as Maimbourg says, the rebellion of the French Cardinals; that is probable, for he knew those prelates well. The French cardinals plunged the Church into the vortex of schism; and they were more than aided

(1) GONZALO ILLESCAS, *loc. cit.*, p. 40. BALUZE, *loc. cit.*, v. i. p. 437. *Idem*, note, p. 1194. —St. Catherine seems to allude to this plot, when she is so precise as to the time Gregory ought to arrive in Rome. "My amiable Father, you seek my opinion concerning your return. I reply, on the part of Jesus Crucified, that you ought to come to Rome as soon as possible. If you can, come in the beginning of September; if you can not, wait not for the end of the month." (*Letters*, epist. ii.)

by Charles V., whom Maimbourg deems "one of the most pious and one of the wisest of French monarchs, for whose sacred person the ultramontane continuator of Baronio's *Annals* (Oderico Rinaldi, commonly called Raynald) loses all respect when he asserts that this great prince 'was the author of the schism, into which he forced his subjects to enter by tyrannically oppressing the liberty of the bishops and doctors of his kingdom.'" Had Gregory XI. humored the French cardinals, he would have merely postponed the schism; the only reason for its birth would have subsisted, so long as the French desired to retain the Pope in France, while Rome and the rest of the world wished him to dwell in his own house; and such divergence would, of course, have been perennial. At the first check upon French vanity, in the shape of a definitive restoration of the papal residence to its legitimate site, the smouldering fire would have burst into flame.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

THE PONTIFICATE OF JOHN XXII.: THE QUESTION OF THE BEATIFIC VISION, AND THE SCHISMS OF THE FRANCISCAN "SPIRITUALS" AND OF LOUIS OF BAVARIA.

Pope Clement V. having died on April 20, 1314, the conclave assembled at Carpentras, the capital of the Venaissin in France. It soon became apparent that the twenty-three cardinals—fifteen French and eight Italian—were at serious issue on a very important question. The Italians declared that their votes would be cast only for him who would promise to restore the papal residence to the episcopal see of the Pontiff, the Eternal City; while the French electors, nearly all creatures of the French court, insisted upon a continuation of that residence under the shadow of the Gallic monarch. To add to the embroglio, bloody outrages on the retainers and friends of the Italian cardinals were perpetrated by the Gascon followers of two nephews of the late Pontiff, who were anxious to secure the tiara for one of their own family. These miscreants having threatened the Italian cardinals with death, their Eminences, French as well as Italian, made

an opening in the wall of the palace where they were debating, and fled, some to Avignon, and the others to Orange, where they had leisure to reflect on the consequences resulting from the transfer of the pontifical court from Rome. It was not until June, 1316, that the count of Poitiers, brother of Louis X., was enabled, by various pretexts, to unite the electors at Lyons, where he confined them in a Dominican convent, assuring them that their future liberty depended on their election of a Pope. After a debate of forty days, the choice was found to be James d' Osa, cardinal-bishop of Porto, who took the name of John XXII.

James d'Osa was, according to Villani, Ferretto, St. Antonine, Masson, and Muratori, of lowly origin,—some make him the son of a cobbler, others of an innkeeper. Of remarkably small stature, and very ugly of feature, his talents alone had made his fortune. Born at Cahors, he was attracted by the superior civilization of Italy, and went to Naples, where his pennilessness excited the sympathy of a Franciscan friar, and he procured a position in the household of King Charles I. (Anjou.) In time he was ordained; and, participating in the secret councils of the Government, he was employed in many embassies, exciting much admiration for his perspicacity and insinuating eloquence. He became successively ordinary of Frejus and Avignon, and he shone at the Council of Vienne. At the termination of this assembly, he was made cardinal and appointed to the See of Porto. Three events of this pontificate demand our attention: the question of the Beatific Vision; that of "the bread of the Franciscans" which culminated in the schism of the communistic "Spirituals," and the schism of Louis of Bavaria.

In three of his sermons, Pope John XXII. pronounced the opinion that the souls of the just do not enjoy the intuitive vision of God before the resurrection of their bodies on the Last Day; that until that event, they are under the protection and consolation of the Humanity of Jesus Christ. However, our Pontiff did not hold that the souls of the just are excluded from heaven until the Last Judgment; in his Bull for the canonization of St. Louis of Toulouse, as also in his Profession of Faith for the king of Armenia, he had

already declared the contrary. But the three indicated discourses of John XXII. (1), contradicting a generally received opinion, scandalized very many; although Mosheim greatly errs when he asserts that this Pope, because of his opinion, "incurred the public reproof of nearly the entire Church." That which is now an article of faith on this point, was then a matter of opinion. In 1333, Gerard Eudes, general of the Franciscans, stopped in Paris on his way to Scotland, where he was to negotiate for a peace between that kingdom and England. During some leisure moments he defended the opinion enunciated by Pope John, and immediately the ever turbulent students of the University demanded his punishment. King Louis X. took up the matter, and heard the defence made by Gerard in the presence of ten doctors in theology, four of whom were Franciscans. These ten condemned the opinion in question; whereupon the royal zealot threatened to have Gerard burned as a heretic, adding, says Villani (2), that if the Pope held such a view, he also was unorthodox. We notice this episode, because it seems to have been the foundation for the assertion made by the famous Peter d'Ailly, seventy-three years after the death of John XXII., and during the heart-burnings of the Great Western Schism, that King Louis X. had threatened to burn Pope John as a Patarine, if he did not retract—an assertion corroborated by no author of the time, and which is in contradiction to the spirit of that period, as well as to the respect always manifested by Louis X. toward the Holy See. When our Pontiff heard of the excitement in Paris, he wrote to Philip de Valois, defending his own private views as conformable to Scripture and Tradition, and insisting upon perfect freedom being allowed to theologians in the premises, until the Apostolic See should deem it proper to pronounce definitively on the matter (3). He also ordered a commission of doctors and prelates to compile all that Tradition contained concerning the Beatific Vision (4). It is evident, therefore, that when Pope John sustained his

(1) They were delivered during the Advent of 1329, on All Saints' Day of 1331, and on the Eve of the Epiphany of 1332.

(2) B. x., ch. 230.

(3) RAYNALD, y. 1333, No. 46.

(4) *Idem*, y. 1334, No. 27.

theory, he did so as a private theologian and in the full exercise of his right. He had no intention to give an authoritative decision. This is confirmed by his conduct on his death-bed; for, on Dec. 3, feeling that his last hour was near (he was then ninety years of age), he sent for the cardinals then in Rome, and in their presence caused to be read a paper in which he professed his belief that "the purified souls of the just are in heaven with Jesus Christ, and in the society of the angels; that they see God and the Divine Essence face to face, so far as their condition allows. He declared that in whatever he had said or written on this subject, he had done so merely by way of conference, and not by way of decision; and that he submitted all his words and writings to the judgment of the Church and of his successors" (1).

When Pope John XXII. donned the tiara, the glorious Order of St. Francis had flourished for a century, and had given many saints and doctors to the Church. For thirty years, however, it had been suffering from one of those crises which, sooner or later, must attack all human organizations. Certain foes of the Order had decried the Franciscan rule as illicit and impossible; and Pope Nicholas III., in defence of the friars, had issued a constitution, in which he said that, in the voluntary renunciation of all property, "the disciples of St. Francis are neither suicides, nor tempters of God; because they confide in Providence, without rejecting the means employed by human prudence."

While this decision silenced the contemners of the Franciscan rule, it excited a diabolic pride in certain fanatics of the Order, the chief of whom was John d'Oliva, a friar of Bèziers. According to this zealot, the Roman Church was "the prostitute of Babylon;" the Franciscans renewed the evangelical life, and they should have merely the use, not the ownership, of the means of subsistence. By their firmness, the superiors of the Order prevented for a time a division in their ranks; but on the accession of Pope St. Cœlestine V., the malcontents obtained from the Holy See permission to follow the dictates of their "piety," under the name of

(1) *Idem, ibi*, No. 37.

“Hermits of Pope Cœlestine,” in one of the isles of the Grecian Archipelago. Very probably they would have soon died out, had they not been made interesting by opposition. Pope Boniface VIII. refused to molest them, until he was wrongly led to believe that the Hermits recognized St. Cœlestine V., not him, as Pontiff (1). He then ordered the patriarch of Constantinople to compel the return of the Hermits to their pristine condition. But the majority of the zealots disobeyed the mandate, and settled in the Sicilies and in Southern France, where they assumed the name of “Spirituals.”

John XXII. preferred persuasion as a means of reuniting the Franciscans; and in his decretal *Quorumdam exigit* he reminded its members that “poverty and chastity are good, but obedience is better.” Soon the evil assumed a phase in which the entire Franciscan family was to be involved. The friars began to doubt as to whether, when they were eating, the food could be termed their own. The reader may smile, but not one of the friars did so when this question was propounded; and the more fanatical advanced the theory that poverty is a universal precept, and that all temporal possessions, on the part of any individual whomsoever, must be regarded as a “species of idolatry.”

At this juncture the general, Michael of Cesena, who had been notably stern toward his subjects, showed that he himself could not obey. In a general Chapter held at Perugia, he and seven provincials, among whom was the celebrated William Occam, declared that it is “a faithful expression of Catholic doctrine to say that Jesus Christ, the model of perfection, and the Apostles, His imitators, wishing to teach perfection to others, possessed nothing by right of property, either privately or in common.” On November 12, 1323, the Pontiff issued a decretal pronouncing this proposition heretical; but Michael of Cesena, Occam, and a few others, rebelled against the sentence. Finally, having summoned Michael to his presence, the Pope declared him insensate and a rebel to ecclesiastical authority. The friar persisted in his obstinacy, and the Pontiff ordered that he should not

(1) St. Cœlestine V. had abdicated, and had been succeeded by Boniface VIII.

be allowed to depart from Avignon. Preparations were made for the prosecution of the recalcitrant; but he contrived to escape, and made his way to Pisa, where he was joyfully welcomed by Louis of Bavaria, then in open revolt against the Holy See. Nicole and Sismondi smile at this matter of the *fraticelli*, as the Spirituals were called. They discern only an amusing folly in the obstinacy of these religious; and they charge John XXII. with cruelty, especially in his having countenanced the execution, at Marseilles, of four of the delinquents. But while the error of the Spirituals was certainly eccentric, it was also disastrous. Many moderns in our day have smiled at the vagaries of Saint Simonism, Fourierism, etc.; but now they tremble when these insensate theories menace society under the guise of Socialism, the child of *fraticelli* Communism. Again, the Spirituals had excited seditions in Sicily, Tuscany, and Narbonne. In 1315 they instigated an uprising of the populace against the Dominicans of Carcassonne, devastated the church and convent of those friars; and then, turning on the Conventuals, expelled them from their homes, and installed themselves in their place (1).

We can here offer only a sketch of the struggle between Pope John XXII. and Louis the Bavarian. After the death of the emperor Henry VII. (Luxembourg) in 1313, the electors were divided into two factions—one desiring the elevation of Frederick, duke of Austria, and the other declaring for Louis, duke of Bavaria. Two coronations followed, and both were illegal: that of Louis at Aix-la-Chapelle, where that prince was crowned by the archbishop of Mentz, who had no right to perform the ceremony, and that of Frederick at Bonn, not the proper place, but at the hands of the archbishop of Cologne, the legitimate minister of the function. Both parties vainly tried to secure the approbation of Pope John XXII. He called both to his tribunal, in the meantime forbidding each to use the name and style of emperor. At first the contestants submitted to what was the public law of the time; but, inspired by their confidence in the valor of their respective vassals, they appealed to arms, and Frederick fell into the

(1) WADDING: *Annals*, y. 1317, Nos. 11 and 12.

hands of his rival after the defeat at Muldorf, in 1322. The Pontiff then issued an admonition to Louis ; and in 1327 the misguided prince, yielding to the suggestions of a horde of apostate friars, published the most infamous libels against Pope John ; and having declared him a heretic, and having fallen into errors in matters of faith, he was formally deposed by the Pontiff even from his hereditary duchy of Bavaria. Louis now resolved to institute an anti-pope. In January, 1328, he entered Rome at the head of four thousand horse. Most of the clergy fled from the desecrated capital of Christendom ; and when Louis convoked the Roman Senate and people to confer with him on matters of great import, only his Germans surrounded him. Enraged because of the disgust tacitly manifested by the Romans, Louis ordered Sciarra Colonna, the infamous insulter of Pope Boniface VIII., to compel such of the clergy as had remained to officiate in their usual sanctuaries. All refused to obey. On the 16th the same Sciarra Colonna, "in the name of the Romans," placed the imperial crown on the head of Louis ; an excommunicated prelate, Albertini, bishop of Ellora, having given the unction. On the 18th Louis appeared in the grand Square of St. Peter's, in full imperial state ; and, ascending an elevated throne, imposed silence on the spectators. An Augustinian friar, one Fabriano, then thrice demanded whether any one was present to defend "the priest James of Cahors, who calls himself Pope John XXII." There was no reply. A German priest preached a sermon on the text, "This is a day of good tidings;" and then Louis uttered a violent diatribe against the Pontiff, concluding with these words: "We, the prince, on the requisition of the syndics of the Roman people, and by consent of the clergy and the same people of Rome, as well as by that of the prelates of Germany and Italy, declare, pronounce, and publish that James of Cahors is a notorious and manifest heretic, and that he is therefore fallen from all ecclesiastical power, dignity, and authority : and is amenable to all the punishments decreed by the canon and the civil law. Hence we depose him, and declare him deposed, from the Supreme Pontificate."

But this ridiculous impiety did not pass unrebuked ; and if the too frequently rebellious family of Colonna incurred fresh disgrace by the participation of Sciarra in this sacrilegious farce, another Colonna now performed an act of heroism which merited and received the thanks of Pope John. Four days after the exhibition in the Square of St. Peter's, a son of Stephen Colonna (James, a canon of the Lateran) appeared in the Square of St. Marcellus ; and, having attracted a crowd of more than a thousand persons, he read the pretended sentence lately issued by the Bavarian, and then declared : " The Roman clergy have learned that a certain syndic has appeared, in their name, before Louis of Bavaria, who styles himself emperor, and that he has preferred certain charges against Pope John XXII. Now, this pretended syndic could have had no authority for such action ; for the canons of St. John Lateran's, of St. Mary Major's, and all the other religious bodies, had gone out of Rome, because of the presence of excommunicated men, and knowing that if they remained they themselves would incur excommunication. Consequently, I protest against all that Louis the Bavarian has done. I uphold Pope John XXII. as Catholic and legitimate ; and I declare that this man who styles himself emperor is not such, but is excommunicated, together with all his followers. All these things I offer to prove, either by reason or by arms, in a neutral place." The young Colonna then crossed over to the church of St. Marcellus, and affixed to its door a copy of the papal Bull despoiling the Bavarian of all his dignities. The arrogant Louis was at St. Peter's during this intrepid proceeding ; and when he heard of it, he sent troops to seize its author. But Colonna was already on his way to his family stronghold of Palestrina.

The work of Louis was not complete until he had found a creature willing to play the part of anti-pope. This person was a Franciscan friar, one Peter Rainalluccio da Corberia, whom Villani calls a wise and learned religious, but whom Pelayo (more reliable in matters pertaining to the Avignonese Popes) knew at Rome as a " real hypocrite." On May 12 the Bavarian led this wretched man to the Basilica of the

Apostles, placed a ring upon his finger, and proclaimed him Pope under the name of Nicholas V. Ere long, however, the Romans became tired of paying tribute to Louis; his own troops were constantly being seduced by the Guelphs, and deserted him in numbers. He therefore returned, almost alone, to Germany, where he vainly strove for a reconciliation with Pope John. Rainalluccio, who had been tolerated for a moment by the Romans, only because of their animosity toward a foreign and distant Pontiff, soon fled for his life. When, in 1330, he fell into the hands of John XXII., instead of having his head struck off, as would have been his lot had he been a rebel and a rival to any other sovereign than a pope-king, he received an apartment in the papal palace as his prison, and passed the remaining three years of his life in penance and study. Louis remained obstinate, and during the three following pontificates he prolonged the horrors of schism and of war until his death, in 1347.

Pope John XXII. died in 1334. Had this Pontiff been a monk, his life could not have been more simple. His table was never furnished with costly dishes, and he ate but moderately. During the nineteen years of his pontificate, he always arose in the middle of the night to recite the Office and to pass some time in study (1). Probably with the sole exception of Philip II. of Spain, no sovereign ever led so retired a life; during his entire reign he never took a walk for pleasure. His cabinet was his world. His business capabilities were immense, and he taxed them to the utmost; all affairs that came before him were decided by himself. His attainments were vast and varied: he was an adept in theology, jurisprudence, and history, and he was familiar with the natural sciences. One of his chief cares was that of the universities of Europe. He severely reproved such of these as conferred the doctorate too easily; and he condemned any waste of time in these institutions in conducting investigations which were satisfactory to curiosity rather than useful (2). The University of Cambridge owes its origin to him (3). As for his zeal concerning the purity of the faith,

(1) VILLANI, B. ii.

(2) RENAZZI: *University of Rome*, vol. 1.

(3) RINALDI, at year 1318, Nos. 2, 3.

it was unadmired only by Louis of Bavaria and a lot of apostate friars. He had no respect for the opinions of the crowd ; he thought that " all that it praises is blameworthy ; all that it meditates is futile ; all that it says is false ; all that it condemns is good ; all that it glorifies is infamous " (1).

Had he not been one of the Avignonese Pontiffs, John XXII. would have been praised by all historians ; but his reputation has suffered from the all but fatal blunder of Clement V. in establishing the papal residence in France. The Italian chroniclers, upon whom we must chiefly rely for any knowledge concerning that and kindred matters, were naturally enraged at that transfer, and hence they saw but little good in an Avignonese Pope. But there is no foundation for the accusations brought by Sismondi and other modern Protestant writers against our Pontiff. Sismondi asserts that John XXII. preferred to live at Avignon as a subject of the French monarch, rather than be a sovereign at Rome. It was not the fault of John XXII. that he found the seat of the Papacy in France ; and circumstances prevented his restoration of that seat to its proper home. This fact Sismondi himself eloquently narrates. And in what was John XXII., whatever may be truly said of some other Avignonese Pontiffs, the subject of the king of France ? With what show of justice can Sismondi insist that " John was less the head of Christendom than an instrument of the French monarch ? " This Pontiff owed the French sovereign nothing, not even his mitre of Frejus ; and he never regulated his actions by the royal wishes. Did he do so when he refused to place the revenues of the Holy See at the royal disposal ? Did he do so when he threatened the king with anathema, if he visited Avignon attended by other than a pacific escort of honor ?

Pope John XXII. has been styled luxurious. It is not the part of luxury to arise at midnight to pray, or never to leave a modestly furnished room unless for consistory or sacerdotal functions. He can scarcely lead a luxurious life who is always surrounded by theologians and canonists, and whose apartments are ever shut to women. And Sismondi

(1) In Bzovius, at year 1334, No. 2.

the author of this charge, offers not even one proof to sustain it. But John XXII. "disturbed the Empire by his extravagant pretensions." Sismondi was thoroughly cognizant of the falsity of this charge; for no one was better aware than himself that, according to the public law of the fourteenth century, as had been the case since the very foundation of the Empire in the person of the Frankish Charlemagne, no one could validly claim the imperial dignity unless certain legal forms had been observed, or without the pontifical confirmation of his election. Now, Louis of Bavaria had been chosen by a mere portion of the seven electors; and the Holy See quite properly, and in the full exercise of its acknowledged prerogative, declined to accord its confirmation of his faulty election. All usurpation, therefore, was on the part of the rebellious Bavarian; and the Pontiff advanced no "extravagant pretensions," but was rather the defender of the constitution of the Empire.

Sismondi tells his readers that John XXII. "permitted, and encouraged by his example, perhaps, a corruption of morals which rendered his court a scandal to Christendom." *Perhaps!* Well, this is mere assertion; but, granted that there were scandals at the court of Avignon during this reign, and omitting any stress upon the fact that they were grossly exaggerated by the Italian anti-Avignonese writers, what reason have we for the supposition that *perhaps* the Pope encouraged these aberrations? Sismondi will reply that "this man, so unworthy of the title of father of the faithful, named as his representative in Lombardy Cardinal Bertrand du Poyet, who was styled his nephew, but was believed to be his son." In order to prove this alleged paternity, Sismondi adduces the authority of Villani (1) and Petrarch (2). But these two authors merely allege vulgar rumor as the source of the criminating belief, and they even record that the report had its sole origin in a certain resemblance between our Pontiff and Poyet. We may well believe that the calumny had an exceedingly narrow foundation, when Villani and Petrarch, Italians by nationality, and therefore unrelent-

(1) B. ii., ch. 6.

(2) *Letters* No. 3, without title.

ing foes of every Avignonese Pope, did not dare to offer it to a too willingly credulous public as indubitable truth. And let us not forget that, with these two exceptions, all the olden writers extol the morality of John XXII. Thus, John, canon of St. Victor, says that he bore the reputation of a good life—" *habens testimonium bonæ vitæ*" (1). The Continuator of Nangis deems his life praiseworthy—" *vitæ laudabilem*" (2). Nay, Villani himself tells us that he was "modest, magnanimous, and of exemplary piety" (3).

Hence we conclude that the imitators of Sismondi would do less violence to truth were they to heed these words of Sismondi himself: "The partiality of John XXII. for the French, his weakness for the two courts of Paris and Naples (House of Anjou), his determination to keep the papal residence in Provence, so embittered the Italians against him, that we ought to doubt the truth of many scandalous stories told of him by his contemporaries."

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

THE CHARGE OF HERESY AGAINST DANTE.*

Protestant polemics are so oppressed by the consciousness of the modern origin of their system, that they would fain seek relief in the idea that the Lutheran movement was foreshadowed, at least, long before its author's time; that during the centuries when Roman influence darkened the Christian world, there were always a few pure spirits, some clear intellects, to cherish devotion to the true and the good, and who may, therefore, be regarded as precursors of the "Reformation." Alongside of Arnold of Brescia, John Huss, Jerome of Prague, and Wycklif, a place is given to Dante, child though he was, and pre-eminently, of Catholic theology and of Catholic philosophy. And it is remarkable that a few Catholic writers have also denied the orthodoxy of the first of poets. The most famous of these is the prince of

(1) In Baluze.

(2) At year 1316.

(3) B. ix., ch. 79.

* This chapter appeared in the *Amer. Cath. Quarterly Review* for Oct., 1887.

paradoxists, the Jesuit Hardouin, who, in 1727, styled Dante an impostor wearing the mask of orthodoxy. In the time of Bellarmine there appeared *An Advice to Beautiful Italy*, by a "French Nobleman," in which the author defended the thesis so flattering to the innovators. He was triumphantly refuted by the great controversialist; and also, in a reply to the *Mystery of Iniquity*, by the able Dominican, Cœffeteau. The skeptical Bayle warns us to bear in mind that there are good reasons for doubt as to both the orthodoxy and heterodoxy of Dante. In our own day Ugo Foscolo (1) and Gabriel Rossetti (2), men of much literary acumen, flattered the prejudices of their English hosts by proclaiming their great countryman "as desirous of reforming Christianity and Italy by means of heavenly revelations." But no author has shown more erudition in the ungracious task of aspersing the memory of the divine poet than Eugene Aroux, who arrives at the conclusion that Dante's works are socialistic, revolutionary and heretical (3). Cantù has ably refuted the arguments of Aroux, as, indeed, this author seems to have admitted (4). According to him, as well as according to Foscolo, Rossetti, etc., the Paterine sect was never entirely exterminated in Italy, but continued as a species of Freemasonry, preserving and transmitting certain doctrines—"mysteries of Platonic love," as Rossetti terms them,—which tended to subvert the authority of the Church and of civil governments. Aroux thinks that this heresy was cherished by all the chivalry of the day, and especially by the survivors of the Templars, who, he insists—and with some reason—established a new school of Masonry. Aroux thinks that Dante wished to show that the Papal supremacy was the visible kingdom of Satan, manifested in the "comedy of Catholicism." When Dante says that salvation will be his who follows "the pastor of the Church," he signifies that we must obey the head of that hidden sect of which he was an adept. That is, Dante

(1) *A Discourse on the Divine Comedy*. London, 1825.

(2) *The Anti-papal Spirit, which produced the Reformation*. London, 1832.

(3) *Dante a Heretic, a Revolutionist, and a Socialist*. Paris, 1854.

(4) "The system of Aroux was not received by the studious; he complained that I was the only one in Italy who paid it any attention. I wrote him an open letter against his system, and he recognized in it not only a friendly courtesy, but certain arguments which he could not answer."—CANTÙ, *Heretics of Italy*.—Discourse 7. Turin, 1865.

was a Templar, and devoted to a revenge of the suppression of his order. The word "love," says Aroux, is the key of all the mysteries in Dante's works. Francesca is something more than the mistress of Paolo; by her we must understand the poor little protesting church of Rimini, then a nursery of heresy. This is a strange theory. It is hard to understand how Dante would form so sublime a work, always wishing everything to be taken in a sense different from the plain and natural one. And even though Aroux had given us the key to the poet's meaning, we cannot understand why Dante so frequently comments on himself in such a manner that the Guelphs must suppose one thing, the Ghibellines another.

Now, it is certain that in the time of Dante men did not regard him as a heretic, socialist, or, (in the modern sense), a revolutionist. He died clothed in the habit of the Franciscans. His remains were lovingly laid to rest in a church, and a Papal legate—more recognizant than the poet's countrymen of his merit—erected a mausoleum to his memory. Immediately, all over Italy chairs were established and endowed for the explanation of the *Comedy*, and often in churches. Thus, by a decree of the Florentine government, dated August 7, 1379, Boccaccio was appointed to such a chair in the church of St. Stephen (1). By command of the fathers of the Council of Florence, the *Comedy* was translated into Latin prose by the Franciscan, John of Serravalle. In the Logge of the Vatican, our poet is depicted among the fathers of the Church. His portrait was hung in the church of Santa Maria del Fiore, in Florence, as it is now found in the façade of Santa Croce. "And when," remarks Cantù, "united Italy wished to celebrate, in 1865, the sixth centenary of his birth, the bitterness which has taken possession of our revolution manifested itself by proclaiming the hostility of Dante toward the Popes and religion. But while the official mob wallowed in such mud, the best thinkers and writers of Italy declared the truth, showing us Dante, the poet, angered against Bon-

(1) MANNI: *History of the Decameron*, p. I., c. 29.—Boccaccio occupied this chair three years, and was succeeded by Antonio Piovano in 1381, and by Philip Villani in 1401. Bologna soon imitated Florence, and for ten years Dante was explained by Benvenuto dei Rambaldi. Pisa assigned the same charge to Bartolo da Buti, in 1385. (SALVINI: *Consular Annals of the Florentine Academy*, in preface. MAZZUCHELLI: *Italian Writers*, v. II., pt. 4. MURATORI: *Writers on Italian Matters*, v. XX.)

iface VIII., the personal enemy of the Pontiff's faction, and indignant because of the abuses of the Papal court—then oppressed by kings and by demagogues; but ever reverent to the keys, and devoted to the faith of which Rome is the centre and the legitimate interpreter."

We propose to cite several of the many passages of the *Comedy* which prove Dante's orthodoxy. But before doing so, we would draw the attention of the reader to some facts which explain, though they do not justify, all the virulence which the poet manifests toward certain Pontiffs. Like nearly all unappreciated and persecuted men, Dante showed his humanity in peevishness and anger. Add to this that he was an intense Ghibelline, both by philosophy and in practice. He was heartily devoted to the idea of the emperor's universal monarchy, having nothing of the modern *Italianissimo* in his composition. All who opposed the emperor were mercilessly excoriated; witness his treatment of Lombardy, Genoa, Pisa, Pistoja, and his assignment of Brutus and Cassius to the lowest hell, alongside of Judas. He could condemn an emperor only when he would not visit "his" Rome, weeping because of her master's absence. Witness his curse on Albert. (1) Again, Dante was a "White."

(1) In his *Illustrious Italians*, art. Dante (Milan, 1873), Cantù asks whether the divine poet had any aspirations for Italian unity, and he replies: "Yes, but after his own fashion; and in accordance with his own philosophical, theological, juridical, ethical and political principles, which he always combined: Peace can be procured only when there is some person who will unite men according to their divisions in nations and states; a universal monarch, who is the principle of the unity, of the human race as a civil society, just as the Pope is that principle in the moral society. But earthly happiness is ordered toward eternal blessedness, the true end of society; hence the monarch ought to be subject to the Pope, as a son is to his father, and as the moon, a lesser luminary, depends on the sun, the greater luminary. There is no question, then, of an emperor according to the Ghibelline mind, but of a head unifying civil society, without violence, without interfering with the various states; one who will remove causes of disturbance and scandals; who will make the world more similar to God, by making it one; who will be above cupidity, and, therefore, a dispenser of justice to all, peoples and princes. This universal emperor is the continuator of the monarchy of the Romans, which was like a confederation of peoples preserving, under one head, their own institutions; a patronage rather than an empire ('*Patrocinium orbis terrarum potius quam imperium poterat nominari*'—*Mon.*, II., 5); and the world never was and never will be so perfectly ordered as when it was subject to the one prince and commander of the Roman people. So testifies the Evangelist St. Luke (*Conviv.*, IV., 5). Therefore, when Dante sees every Italian province at war, and even citizens of the same town in civil strife, he calls on the Roman emperor to come and restrain such ferocity, and to unify Italy in the peace of order, without any interference with the particular institutions of each province. Dante thought that such unity would ensure the greatest amount of liberty of life and movement; such unity was very different from the centralization advocated by modern mediocrities, and very far removed from the servility of the Ghibellines of his day.

The expulsion of this faction from Florence had been caused by the favor shown by Boniface VIII. to Charles of Valois; consequently Boniface was to be treated as an enemy. Finally, Dante combated not so much the Pontiff-kings as he did the spirit of democracy. When he declaimed against Constantine, it was not because of the Romagna supposed to have been given to the Pope, but because of the imperial dignity which, according to the Guelphic pretensions of the poet's time, had been transferred to the Pontiff. He shows his mind in his *Monarchia*, b. III., c. 10. where he reproves Constantine for leaving to the Popes the imperial power, which was one and indivisible. Again, Dante greatly extolled Charlemagne, the asserter of the Pope's temporal sovereignty; and he also exalted the countess Matilda, the most profuse of all donors of dominion to the Holy See. No, the reason for Dante's imperialism must be sought elsewhere than in hostility to the Pope's temporal patrimony. "Dante wished for reforms," says Cantù, "but he felt that they would be sterile without one supreme master over all human society, who would cause it to progress, who would draw from Christian principles their practical consequences. In the mind of Dante, the emperor should rule all kings, and, therefore, he should rule even the king of Rome; while Boniface VIII. and John XXII. claimed for themselves the imperial authority, especially when it was disputed."

He who is familiar with the writings of Dante can scarcely avoid an impression that his invectives against certain Pontiffs are prompted by his intense devotion to, and his consummate respect for, the chair they occupied. Sometimes, indeed, it is evident that he is actuated by party spirit; but, as a rule, he attacks only such Pontiffs as he deems guilty of acts bordering, at least, on simony; only such as he regards as abusers of the excommunicating power. An Italian, he was naturally and rightly averse to a removal of the Papal residence from the legitimate seat of the Papacy. This sentiment of indignation was unshared only by those who saw no injury, no insult, to the tiara, in making it an appendage to the crown of a foreign ruler. All Italian authors of that day, from the saintly Catherine of

Sienna to the buoyant Petrarch, cursed the wretched blunder of Clement V., and begged the Pope-kings to return to their proper and only legitimate home. It is true that Dante locates Pope Anastasius II. in hell, because of alleged sympathy with the heresy of Photinus (*Hell*, cto. xi.); but the poet erred in accepting the authority of Martin the Pole, Gratian, and others, who asserted that Anastasius restored the Eutychian, Acacius, and communicated with the Acacian, Photinus. For it is certain, according to the testimony of Evagrius (b. iii., c. 23), Nicephorus (b. xv., c. 17), and Liberatus (*Nestorian Cause*, c. 18), that Acacius died before the election of Anastasius II. ; and that Martin the Pole, Gratian, etc., confounded Pope Anastasius II. with the emperor of the same name, who favored Acacius, and was killed by lightning. With this one exception, Dante's invectives against certain Pontiffs came from motives which have no relation with Catholic faith.

There is scarcely a heretical doctrine which Dante does not explicitly condemn ; not one does he even implicitly favor. There is not one apparently anti-Catholic passage in his writings which must not be interpreted in a Catholic sense. We would prefer to quote the Italian text, but as that is not familiar to every reader, we shall use the English version by the Protestant Cary, warning the reader that in many instances the Anglican minister very much weakens the Catholic force of the original.

I. Hearken to Dante speaking of the Roman Pontiff, *Parad.*, cto. 24 :

"O everlasting light
Of Him, within whose mighty grasp our Lord
Did leave the keys."

And in *Hell*, cto. 2 :

"It seems in reason's judgment well deserv'd;
Sith he of Rome, and Rome's empire wide,
In heaven's empyreal height was chosen sire;
Both which, if truth be spoken, (1) were ordain'd
And 'stablished for the holy place, where sits
Who to great Peter's sacred chair succeeds."

(1) Here Cary's Protestantism induces him to misinterpret, or at least to minimize, the poet's meaning. The text has "to tell the truth."— "*a voler dire il vero.*"

In *Hell*, cto. 19, Dante thus addresses Pope Nicholas III.:

“If reverence of the keys restrain’d me not,
Which thou in happier time didst hold, I yet
Severer speech might use.”

In *Purgatory*, cto. 20, he thus speaks of Sciarra Colonna’s insults to Boniface VIII., much as he hated that Pontiff:

“To hide with direr guilt
Past ill and future, lo! the flower-de-luce
Enters Alagna! in His vicar, Christ
Himself a captive, and His mockery
Acted again! Lo! to His holy lip
The vinegar and gall once more applied!
And He ’twixt living robbers doom’d to bleed!
Lo! the new Pilate, of whose cruelty
Such violence cannot fill the measure up.

* * * * *

Oh, Sovran Master! when shall I rejoice
To see the vengeance, which Thy wrath well-pleas’d
In secret silence broods?”

In *Parad.*, cto. 30, he thus recognizes the holy office even of Clement V., the cause of the “Babylonian Captivity:”

“Nor may it be
That he who in the sacred forum sways
Openly or in secret, shall with him
Accordant walk; whom God will not endure
I’ th’ holy office long.”

II. *Parad.*, cto. 5, Dante thus acknowledges the teaching authority of the Church:

“Be ye more staid,
O Christians; not, like feathers by each wind
Removable; nor think to cleanse yourselves
In every water. Either Testament,
The Old and New, is yours; and for your guide
The shepherd of the Church. Let this suffice
To save you.”

And in the *Convivio*, tr. iv., c. 5, Dante thus reproves heretics: “Most vile and most foolish little beasts, who presume to speak against our faith, and who wish to investigate the ordinances of God; accursed be ye, and your audacity, and all who follow ye!”

III. In *Parad.*, cto. 25, he thus recognizes the necessity of good works:

“ Hope, said I,
Is of the joy to come a sure expectance,
Th’ effect of grace divine *and merit preceding.*”

IV. In *Purg.*, cto. 16, the free will of man is admitted :

“ Brother, he began, the world is blind ;
And thou in truth com’st from it. Ye, who live,
Do so each cause refer to heaven above,
E’en as its motion of necessity
Drew with it all that moves. If this were so,
Free choice in you were none ; nor justice would
There should be joy for virtue, woe for ill,
Your movements have their primal bent from heaven ;
Not all ; yet said I all ; what then ensues ?
Light have ye still to follow evil or good.
And of the will free power.”

V. In *Purg.*, cto. 13, the souls in purgatory pray to the saints :

“ And when we pass’d a little forth, I heard
A crying, ‘ Blessed Mary ! pray for us ;
Michael and Peter ! all ye saintly host ! ’ ”

And in *Parad.*, ctos. 32 and 33, Dante represents Mary’s “own faithful Bernard” as exhorting him to pray to her :

“ Grace then must first be gain’d ;
Her grace, whose might can help thee, then in prayer
Seek her ; and with affection, whilst I sue,
Attend, and yield me all thy heart.”

Then the poet pours forth his praises to the

“ Virgin mother, daughter of thy Son,
Created beings all in loveliness
Surpassing, as in height, above them all ;
* * * * *
So mighty art thou, lady ! and so great,
That *he who grace desireth, and comes not*
To thee for aidance, fain would have desire
To fly without wings.”

Seldom, indeed, has Mary’s intercessory power been more lauded than in this address, and if the reader will peruse it in its entirety he will probably agree with us in regarding it as not unworthy of a place in the liturgy of the Church.

VI. In *Parad.*, cto. 5, Dante thus evinces his respect for the monastic vows :

“ Of what high worth the vow, which so is fram’d
That when man offers, God well-pleas’d accepts ;

For in the compact between God and him,
This treasure, such as I describe it to thee,
He makes the victim, and of his own act.

* * * * *

The matter and the substance of the vow
May well be such, to that without offence,
It may for other substances be exchange'd,
But at his own discretion none may shift
The burden on his shoulders, unreleas'd
By either key, the yellow and the white."

Here, as in *Purg.*, cto. 9, l. 118, Dante alludes to the golden key of science and the silver one of power, which the mediæval artists always placed in the hands of St. Peter. The idea, taken from the *Glossary in cap. 16 Matth.*, was that, before using the absolving or dispensing power, the Pontiff should use the golden key of science to discover the true state of affairs.

VII. The whole *Purgatory* is a proof of Dante's belief in the Catholic doctrine of a middle state of suffering for sin, and of the efficacy of prayer for the dead. But we would ask the reader's attention to the following passages. In *Hell.*, cto. 1, Virgil promises to consign Dante to the care of a more worthy spirit, who will lead him, after his visit to hell, to a region where he may view those

" who dwell
Content in fire, for that they hope to come,
Whene'er the time may be, among the blest."

In *Purg.*, cto. 26, a suffering soul begs the poet

" say to Him
One ' Pater Noster ' for me, far as needs
For dwellers in this world, where power to sin
No longer tempts us."

And in cto. 11, our relations to the souls in purgatory are thus noticed :

" Well beseems
That we should help them wash away the stains
They carried hence, that so, made pure and light,
They may spring upward to the starry spheres."

VIII. Hear Dante's encomium on Sts. Francis and Dominick, the founders of the two great mendicant orders. In *Parad.*, cto. 11, he says :

“The Providence that governeth the world,
 In depth of counsel by created ken
 Unfathomable, to the end that she
 Who with loud cries was spous'd in Precious Blood,
 Might keep her footing toward the Well-Beloved,
 Safe in herself and constant unto Him,
 Hath two ordain'd, who should on either hand
 In chief escort her; one seraphic all
 In fervency; for wisdom upon earth,
 The other splendor of cherubic light.

* * * * *

Forth on his apostleship he (St. Dominic) fared;
 Like torrent bursting from a lofty vein;
 And, dashing 'gainst the stocks of heresy,
 Smote fiercest, where resistance was most stout.”

Two passages, above all others, are confidently adduced as indicative of Dante's heresy. In *Hell*, cto. 19, the poet addresses Pope Nicholas III. in these bitter terms :

“Your avarice
 O'ercasts the world with mourning under foot
 Treading the good, and raising bad men up,
 Of shepherds like to you, th' Evangelist (“Apoc.,” 17)
 Was ware, when her, who sits upon the waves,
 With kings in filthy whoredom he beheld,
 She who with seven heads tower'd at her birth,
 And from ten horns her proof of glory drew,
 Long as her spouse in virtue took delight.”

Nevertheless, Dante acknowledges Nicholas III. as supreme pastor :

“If reverence of the keys restrain'd me not
 Which thou in happier time didst hold, I yet
 Severer speech might use.”

In *Purg.*, cto. 33, Dante is said to exult in the coming of Luther :

“Without an heir forever shall not be
 That eagle, he, who left the chariot plum'd,
 Which monster made it first and next a prey,
 Plainly I view, and therefore speak, the stars
 E'en now approaching, whose conjunction, free
 From all impediment and bar, brings on
 A season in the which, one sent from God,
 Five hundred, five, and ten, do mark him out,
 That foul one, and the accomplice of her guilt,
 The giant both shall slay.”

Here Luther is supposed to be predicted in the "five hundred, five, and ten," the Roman numbers, D. V. X., forming the word *dux* (leader). And in the following passage the aspersers of Dante's name see the Roman Church in the "beast," and Luther, (*Lutero*), in the *veltro*, "greyhound."

"This beast

At whom thou criest, her way will suffer none
To pass, and no less hindrance makes than death;
So bad and so accursed is her kind,
That never sated in her ravenous will,
Still after food more craving than before.
To many an animal in wedlock vile
She fastens, and shall yet to many more,
Until that greyhound come, who shall destroy
Her with sharp pain, He will not life support
By earth nor its base metals, but by love,
Wisdom, and virtue, and his land shall be
The land 'twixt either Feltro."

Much as we admire Dante, we are not disposed to credit him with the gift of prophecy. "Most of our poet's interpreters," says Lombardi, (1) "hold, either as certain or as probable, that the indicated leader is the Emperor Henry VII." But Lombardi himself contends that Can Grande, lord of Verona, is signified. And certainly the passage applies more naturally to Can Grande than to Luther. Dante shows us, in *Parad.*, cto. 22, that he relied on this great baron, the chosen leader of the Ghibelline league, to reform the world. Again we know that Dante had received many favors from Can Grande, and it is quite likely that he would adopt this poetical and easy method of showing his gratitude. Finally the indicated birthplace or residence of the leader cannot be assigned to the German friar; whereas Verona, the fief of Can Grande, was midway between Feltro of Romagna and Feltro of the Marca Trevigiana—"the land 'twixt either Feltro."

The passages above quoted are as strong as any adduced to show the heterodoxy of Dante. In fact, the only argument worthy of attention is the one based upon a supposition which is purely gratuitous; namely, that the "Comedy," like many other Italian and Provençal compositions, was

(1) In his *Notes on the Comedy*, 3d Rom. edit., 1821, p. 484.

conceived and executed according to a metaphorical system, in order to deceive the Inquisition. Such is the theory of Rossetti and of Aroux ; and as the reader may be curious to know how it is developed, we shall show, by way of example, how the latter author interprets the interview between the poet and the spirit of the unfortunate Francesca da Rimini (*Hell*, cto. 5). We must imagine Dante writing as follows, in the midst of his presumed grief for the persecution of the Waldensians of Rimini :

“ How many sweet thoughts of peace and evangelical charity, how many hopes of a brighter future—‘*quanti dolci pensieri, quanto desio,*’—have our brethren nourished ! And this has brought them to so fearful a fate—‘*menò costoro al doloroso passo!*’—Oh, daughter of the valleys (*Valdese*), buried in grief, humble church so cruelly treated, thy martyrs inspire me with pity, and force me to feign orthodoxy—‘*Francesca, i tuoi martiri a lagrimar mi fanno tristo e pio.*’—But tell me ; when thou wert timidly desired by the noble hearts of Rimini—‘*al tempo dei dolci sospiri,*’—how did they manifest their trembling yearnings—‘*i dubbiosi desiri,*’ for the religion of love ? Then Francesca replies : If thou wouldst know the first germ of our love—‘*la prima radice del nostro amore,*’—I, a poor Vaudoise obliged to feign orthodoxy, will tell you—‘*come colui che piange e dice.*’—Thou knowest that our propaganda was effected by means of Provencal sectarian poems and romances. One day, while we were enjoying a reading—‘*lettura*’—the text of which was taken from the Albigensian romance of Lancillotto, and which narrated how that knight of the Holy Grail embraced the religion of love—‘*come amor lo strinse*’—we thought that no profane eyes were watching us—‘*soli eravamo e senza sospetto.*’—Frequently, this teaching—‘*quella lettura*’—(in French freemasonry *instruction*) enthralled us—‘*gli occhi ci sospinse*’—and at the same time, frightened us—‘*scolorocci ’l viso;*’ but one passage of that book triumphed over our hesitation—‘*un punto fu quel che ci vinse.*’ ”

When we read how the lover of the faith gave her the kiss of fraternity, and in exchange received from her the “ consolation ” (*consolamentum*)—“ *il disiato riso esser bacciata da*

cotanto amante” (1).—“Then this people of Rimini—‘*cotanto, amante*’—kissed me on the lips, adored me, and received from me the ‘consolation,’ although trembling for fear of Rome—‘*la bocca mi bacciò tutto tremante.*”

Let the reader compare this paraphrase with the original. Undoubtedly he will proclaim it ingenious, but just as surely will he deem it far-fetched and unwarranted. The strain to which the inventor subjected himself is evident in his work as a whole, and in every detail; its utter gratuitousness, its natural belonging to its native region of the “perhaps,” is shown by an absolute and ever persistent absence of anything approximating to proof. Rossetti exercises his imaginative faculties over a larger field than that of Aroux; he devotes five volumes to convince us that the mediæval Italian poets were not at all erotic; that they were constantly engaged in manifestations of supernal truths—that their Beatrices, Lauras, etc., were not flesh and blood women, but symbols of a free and pure Church, unencumbered by the errors of Rome. But, says Cantù, “without descending to particulars, the slightest notion of æsthetics would cause

(1) Speaking of the Waldensian Cathari, Aroux says that, in times of persecution this ceremony of consolation, “the most imposing in their ritual, was performed at night, and with great mystery. Numerous lighted torches symbolized the baptism of fire. The assembly was arranged in a circle (the perfect figure), and around a table covered with a white cloth, and serving as an altar (VAISETTE: *Proofs*, III., 224, 387). *The brethren assemble around the altar, and form a circle, leaving a space for the most excellent master (Light on Masonry*, 116). The minister, placed in the centre, gave to the neophyte the doctrinal instruction, blessing him thrice (as did St. Peter to Dante—*tre volte ciuse*), and receiving from the new brother a promise of fidelity to the rules of the Cathari—an engagement similar to that of the Masons. Among other obligations, he bound himself never to sleep ‘without shirt and drawers’—*sine camicia et braciis*, as did the Templars, and to be ever accompanied by his companion—*socius* (MARTENE, *New Anecd.*, F., 1776; *Arch. Inq. Carcass.*, 1243, Dt. 22, f. 110 a). The minister then gave the brother the Gospels to kiss, and invoked upon him the Paraclete. Then all the brethren recited the Lord’s Prayer, and the service ended with the reading of the first seventeen verses of the Gospel of St John,—a reading reproduced in certain degrees of Masonry. In token of his initiation, the brother received a linen or woollen cloth for a garment, ‘to be worn over the shirt’ (*Lib. Sent. Inq. Tolos.*, 247). Women wore a cord under the breasts (*Arch. Inq. Tolos.*, 1273, Dt. 25, f. 60 a). It is remarkable that, in our day, the Masonic apprentice is introduced into the lodge of reception with one foot bare and the other sandaled, with a cord around the neck (*Light on Masonry* 8), and the Mark Master wears the cord in four coils around his body (*Ibid.*, 96). The new Perfect received on his lips the ‘kiss of fraternity,’ and it was then passed around. The perfect ones, men and women, called each other brothers and sisters; Dante uses these terms, and with *frate* and *suora* instead of *fratello* and *sorella* (and so could any Italian, without incurring the suspicion of Catharism). All these ritualistic usages are perpetuated in Masonry, and are found in the *Comedy* with the most minute details.”—*Proofs of the Heresy of Dante drawn from the fusion, about 1311, between Albigensian Masonry, the Templars, and the Ghibellines.* Paris, 1857.

one to reject a system which would make of poetry an allusion, not an inspiration; which would celebrate persons and charms which had no reality. And to what purpose? The multitude, for whom poetry is written, would not understand it; only the initiated would appreciate such allegories, and they are supposed to have already received a revelation of the mystery. And if they so carefully disguised their hatred of Rome, why did they afterwards burst into open invectives? It is very well to say that Dante calls upon sound intellects to admire the doctrines hidden under the veil of his verses, but why proclaim the illusions if they were to remain a secret? And if he dared not declare the truth, how could he boast of a voice which "reached the highest summits," and vaunt himself as "no timid friend of truth," how could he hope, thereby, to be famous in the minds of those who would look upon his times as ancient? Would he not merit rather a place among the "ill spirits both to God displeasing and to His foes," or among the hypocrites who are "in the Church with saints, with gluttons at the tavern's mess"(1)?

(1) In the *Revue des Deux-Mondes*, 1836, p. 400, vol. vii., series 4, Schlegel remarks: "The Middle Age had a great taste for allegory. It was manifested in painting, and dramatic poetry commenced with allegory. The personification of a general or abstract idea has nothing equivocal; but in poetry, despite its clearness, it is always somewhat cold. In order that an ideal being may appear real, it must assume individual traits. . . . Dante, in his personification, so combined the ideal and individual character that they cannot be separated. It is the natural man who travels through the three regions where souls dwell; but it is also the poet Dante Alighieri, with all his biographical peculiarities. Virgil represents reason, unenlightened by revelation, but yet he is the Latin poet whom the Middle Age revered as a great sage. Beatrice represents the science of divinity, but she is the same Beatrice Portinari whose chaste beauty made so profound an impression on Dante's youthful heart. Is there anything unlikely in this combination? The beautiful is a reflection of the divine perfections in the visible world, and, according to Platonic fiction, a pure admiration moves the wings of the soul towards the heavenly regions." Probably no modern author was better constituted, both by nature and by study, to appreciate Dante than Silvio Pellico. In one of his unedited poems, cited by Pianciani (*Ragionamenti*, 1840), and called *La Morte di Dante*, he says: "I have never been able to understand why Dante, simply because a few of his magnificent verses are animated by an angry spirit, appears to anti-Catholics to be one of their coryphees; that is, to be an enraged philosopher, not believing in Roman Christianity, or, at least, professing another faith. If the poem of the Florentine is read in good faith, and without party spirit, it will show that he was a thinker who was an enemy to schism and heresy, and submissive to all Catholic teachings."

CHAPTER XXXIX.

THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM. *

On the death of Pope Gregory XI., March 17, 1378, the Sacred College was composed of the following: *Italians*: Peter Corsini, bishop of Porto, generally styled the cardinal of Florence; Francis Thebaldeschi, archpriest of St. Peter's; Simon di Brossano, archbishop of Milan; James Orsini; *Frenchmen*: Anglie Grimoard, bishop of Albano; Giles Ayselín de Montaigu, bishop of Tusculum; John de Blauzac, bishop of Sabina; Peter de Monteruc, vice-chancellor; William de Chanac; Hugh de Saint-Martial; John de Lagrange, bishop of Amiens; John de Cros, bishop of Palestrina, styled the cardinal of Limoges, grand-penitentiary; William d'Aigrefeuille; Bertrand de Lagery, bishop of Glandève; Hugh de Montrelaix, bishop of Saint-Brieuc, styled the cardinal of Brittany; Guy de Malésec, bishop of Poitiers; William Noellet; Peter de Verruche; Peter Flandrin; Gerard du Puy, abbot of Montmajeur; Robert of Geneva; Peter

* CONTESTANTS DURING THE SCHISM.

URBAN VI. (Barthol. Prignano, Neapolitan) April 9, 1378. Chosen by sixteen cardinals, fifteen of whom afterwards elect.....		CLEMENT VII. (Robert of Geneva) Sept. 21, 1378.
BONIFACE IX. (Peter Tomacelli, Neapolitan) Nov. 2, 1389.		BENEDICT XIII. (Peter de Luna, Aragon) Sept. 28, 1394.
INNOCENT VII. (Cosmo Meliorati, of Sulmona) Oct. 17, 1404.		Deposed by Council of Pisa on June 5, 1409, and by Council of Constance on July 26, 1417.
GREGORY XII. (Angelo Corrarío, Venetian) Nov. 30, 1406. Deposed at Pisa, June 5, 1409; abdicated, July 4, 1415.	ALEXANDER V. (Peter Filargo, Candiote) June 26, 1409.	CLEMENT VIII. (Giles de Munoz, Aragon) chosen by two cardinals June, 1424. Abdicated, July 26, 1429.
MARTIN V. (Otho Colonna, Roman) Nov. 11, 1417.	JOHN XXIII. (Balthazar Cossa, Neapolitan) May 17, 1410. Deposed by Council of Constance May 29, 1415. Abdicated, May 13, 1419.	

de Sortenac, bishop of Viviers; *Spaniard*: Peter de Luna. The first six Frenchmen were at Avignon; the cardinal LAGRANGE was in Tuscany; sixteen therefore entered the Conclave. From the very commencement of the deliberations, the Romans could be heard outside, shouting: "We want a Roman, or at least an Italian"; the thirteen bannerets, or chiefs of the *rioni* (wards) had already declared, before the Conclave, their wishes in the matter (1). After some hesitation, and after a stormy colloquy with the prefect of the *rioni*, their Eminences decided upon choosing an Italian; and the cardinal of Limoges, seeing that Thebaldeschi's age and infirmities rendered him unavailable, turned to the other Italians, and said: "Cardinal of Florence, you cannot receive the tiara, for your city is now hostile to the Holy See. Cardinal of Milan, neither can you, for you are a subject of Bernabo Visconti, who combats the rights of the Church. Neither can you, Cardinal Orsini, for you are too young to be Pope, and again, you are a Roman, and therefore partial. Consequently, I give my vote for Bartholomew Prignano, archbishop of Bari." The other cardinals, Orsini alone excepted—he announcing his intention to cast no vote, were convinced by the arguments of de Cros (which we shall notice hereafter), and they declared for Prignano. But they hesitated to publish the result, lest the Romans might not be satisfied. However, the people soon learned that a Pontiff had been chosen, and they clamored for the announcement of the personality of their Pope-King. In order to prevent the crowd from forcing the doors of the Conclave, the bishop of Marseilles devised the expedient of telling

(1) The words of the deputation, which was headed by the Senator of Rome, are given in the *Relation* of James de Seva, and in the *Conatus* of Papebroch. As they serve to illustrate the natural indignation of the Romans because of the late "Captivity of Babylon", we subjoin a brief synopsis. The deputation wished, said the Senator, to represent to their Eminences how much Rome had suffered, both spiritually and temporally, by the transfer of the Papal residence to France. The Eternal City had experienced greater woes from the absence of the Sovereign Pontiffs, than it had ever endured from the Barbarians. The Papal States had been victims of war and sedition; the provinces had been nearly all usurped by tyrants; the neighboring republics still retained part of the Roman territory; fire and sword had been brought to the very gates of Rome. This capital of Christendom had no longer even a semblance of that Holy City, once revered by the whole world; it was now a desert. The Romans were therefore persuaded that it was absolutely necessary that the Supreme Pontificate should not be confided to men from beyond the Alps, to men who had kept the Holy See away from Rome for so long a time. It was necessary, in fine, that a Roman, or at least an Italian, should be raised to the Chair of St. Peter.

them to "go into St. Peter's where they would learn who was Pontiff." His language was misunderstood, and gave the impression that Cardinal Thebaldeschi, styled the cardinal of St. Peter's (he being archpriest of that basilica) was elected. The mistake was confirmed by Montelaix, who replied to the cry of "The Pope, the Pope!" by asking: "Have you not the cardinal of St. Peter's?" Accordingly, in spite of himself, Thebaldeschi was vested in the Pontifical robes, and the overjoyed Romans began to pay him homage. Finally, the infirm old man succeeded in making the people understand that it was the archbishop Prignano who had been elected, and they rushed off in search of the real Pope. Nearly all the cardinals had profited by this mistake, or trick, to escape from the Vatican; only Corsini, Brossano, de Luna, and du Puy had the courage to remain. When the Romans had found the archbishop of Bari, they hastened to render him homage, but he checked them, saying that his election had not yet been published, and it was necessary to know whether the canonical forms had been respected. During the night that ensued, Prignano remained in the palace, and uncertainty reigned in every mind. On the following morning, eight cardinals who had fled to Castel Sant' Angelo came to the Vatican, and joined the four who had remained; all twelve then proceeded to the chapel of the Conclave, and declaring that the archbishop of Bari had been canonically elected, besought him to accept the burden. Prignano assented, and assumed the name of Urban VI.

During the eight days that preceded the coronation, the new Pontiff was assisted in the ceremonies of the Holy Week by all the cardinals of the late Conclave, for the four fugitives from the city (1) had returned, and had paid homage to him. All were present at the coronation when Orsini placed the tiara upon the head of Urban VI., and all joined in the solemn cavalcade from St. Peter's to the Lateran basilica. During three months all treated Urban as a legitimate Pope, naming him in the public prayers, and receiving benefices and favors from him. But in the month of June, all the

(1) Robert of Geneva had fled to the Colonna stronghold of Zagarolo; Noellet to the castle of Ardea; Orsini and Flandrin to the Orsini fortress of Vicovaro.

French cardinals were in open revolt, and three out of the four Italians were of dubious fidelity. From the moment of his election, Urban seems to have displayed, as a general rule, the more repulsive side of his character. His measures, however, were calculated to produce good effects, and had the French cardinals not been disposed to seek any excuse for undoing the work of the late Conclave, they would have patiently borne with the Pontiff's haughty manners (1). On the day following his coronation, Urban turned abruptly to certain foreign prelates who had come to assist at Vespers, and said: "You are perjurers; you have deserted your churches, in order to reside at the court of Rome" (2). Two weeks afterward, he pronounced, in full Consistory, a discourse against the luxury of the curials, and very soon he ordered the cardinals to diminish their retinues, and to be content with one course for their dinners (3). These sumptuary regulations greatly displeased the Frenchmen, most of whom were men of high lineage, and used to external magnificence. However, such restrictions might have been tolerated, but the Frenchmen were cut to the quick when they perceived that the Pontiff was about to put an end to the dictatorship of France in the counsels of the Church. One day the bannerets of Rome waited upon Urban, and asked him to signalize his elevation by a number of promotions to the cardinalate. The Pope replied that he intended to give the hat to a certain number of Romans, or at least Italians. Anger was visible at once on the countenances of the Frenchmen; the face of Robert of Geneva grew white; all immediately left the room (4). A crisis was reached when the Pontiff received the Cardinal Lagrange, who had been deputed by Gregory XI. to assist at the Congress of Sarzana. In full Consistory the Pontiff styled Lagrange a traitor to the interests of the Church; whereupon the cardinal retorted, with a menacing gesture: "Archbishop of Bari, you lie," and immediately left the hall (5). Toward

(1) THEODORIC OF NIEM, *Schism*, b. 1, c. 1.

(2) *Idem*, b. 1, c. 4.

(3) PAPEBROCH; *Conatus*—THOMAS DE ACERNO, *Creation of Urban VI.*, in Muratori's *Italian Writers*, vol. iii., pt. 2—ILLSECAS, p. 42.

(4) DE ACERNO, *loc. cit.*

(5) WALSINGHAM, *Richard II.*

the end of June, the French cardinals asked and obtained permission to spend the hot season at Anagni, and here they met Onorato Gaetani, count of Fondi, a bitter enemy of the Pontiff. They immediately leagued with this noble and with the prefect of Viterbo, Francis de Vico. They also assured themselves of the friendship of Rostaing, the French commander of Castel Sant' Angelo (1). Fully determined on revolution, the Frenchmen now took into their service twelve hundred Bretons, the remnant of the Breton free-lances whom Gregory XI. had employed in his war against Florence. Pope Urban tried to conciliate the disaffected Frenchmen, and sent the Italian cardinals Orsini, Corsini, and Brossano, with offers of accommodation. Then he transferred his court to Tivoli, that he might the more easily observe the enemy's movements. Orsini and his companions could effect no change in the state of affairs, and Urban soon realized the need of preparing for open war. He received from the cardinals at Anagni a manifesto which declared that the late Pontifical election was null; that the archbishop of Bari was an apostate, an Antichrist, and excommunicated (2). On August 9, their Eminences of Anagni issued a circular to all the faithful, in which they insisted that the Holy See was vacant (3). The university of Paris and the different sovereigns all received special letters, in which the disaffected admitted, strange to say, that they had really elected the archbishop of Bari, but insisting that they had so done, because they believed that he himself would regard the election as illusory (4). The cardinals Orsini, Corsini, and Brossano, now retired to Vicovaro, where they continued, for a time, in a kind of neutrality (5). Thebaldeschi remained outspokenly faithful to Urban VI.

(1) One of the first cares of Urban VI. had been to demand of Rostaing the surrender of the castle; but the Frenchman said that he had sworn to Gregory XI. never to do so, unless so commanded by the cardinals whom that Pontiff had left behind him at Avignon. Very soon these cardinals ordered Rostaing to yield his charge to Urban, but their Eminences of Anagni prevailed on him to retain possession. See *Relation* of James de Seva.

(2) DU BOULAI, *University of Paris*, vol. iv., p. 467. See also a MS. of Liege, in MARTENE and DURAND, *Act. Vet. Coll.*, vol. vii.

(3) DU BOULAI, *loc. cit.*, p. 468.

(4) *Ibi*, p. 476 & 479.

(5) It is likely that Urban wished this, for the sake of communication with the cardinals of Anagni.

until death called on him in 1380. But though Orsini, Corsini, and Brossano remained at Vicovaro, refusing to follow the Frenchmen when they removed to Fondi, they now ceased to communicate with Pope Urban (1). Their retirement from the Papal court was the signal for a general desertion; nearly all the French curials, and some of the Romans, joined the cardinals at Fondi. The Hungarian, English, and German prelates remained. On Sept. 18, the Pontiff created twenty-nine new cardinals. The revolted cardinals had already resolved to give a rival to Urban, but they hesitated to do so without the concurrence of their Italian brethren. Thebaldeschi was unapproachable, but the three others might be influenced. For some time Orsini, Corsini, and Brossano resisted the allurements of ambition, but they were conquered by Nicholas Spinelli, the chancellor of Queen Jane of Naples, and a personal enemy of Pope Urban. This diplomat waited upon each of the three, assuring each one that the Frenchmen were resolved to raise him to the Pontificate, if he would definitively abandon Urban. The ruse succeeded, and all three joined the pretended Conclave at Fondi on Sept. 20. Great was the astonishment of the Italians when, on the very first ballot, Robert of Geneva was announced as elected, but they acknowledged him as Pontiff; separating, however, from him at once, and retiring to the castle of Tagliacozzi. Orsini soon afterward died, refusing to recognize Clement VII., but remaining outside the obedience of Urban VI. Brossano lived some time, and died at Nice, while on his way to Avignon. Corsini died at Avignon, protesting that Clement VII. was the true Pope.

Robert of Geneva came of a very old family which was allied with many of the royal houses of Europe. His own talents and personal courage were undeniable; but his

(1) At this period occurred the visit of St. Catharine of Siena to Urban. He had already received many letters from her, containing the wisest advice and much consolation. Urban had made the acquaintance of Catharine at Avignon, and had learned to esteem her. When she returned to her cell, after the reconciliation of Florence with the Holy See, he called her to Rome, and before his entire court he asked her to express her views on the imminent schism. When she had complied, the Pontiff said: "How reprehensible must we be before God, if we are timid! This little woman shames us." The saint spent her few remaining days in Rome, encouraging Pope Urban, but her grief carried her to heaven on April 29, 1380. See *Life of Urban VI.* in Baluze.

habits were thoroughly secular, and he was ostentatious, prodigal, frivolous, and indolent. The Italians quite naturally detested him, for it was he who, in the war with Florence, had led the free-lances of Brittany to the sacking of Cesena. When he first claimed the Popedom, Clement VII. had around his person nearly all the members of the old Roman court; but, while Urban VI. was nearly universally recognized as Pontiff, his adversary was acknowledged only by Naples, Savoy, and Provence. It became, therefore, a matter of essential importance to Clement to extend his obedience (1), and for this purpose he sent the cardinal de Cros, styled the cardinal of Limoges, to France; Aigrefeuille to Germany and Bohemia; Malésec to England and the duchies of Hainaut, Flanders, Brabant, and Gueldres; de Luna to the Iberian peninsula. Aigrefeuille persuaded the dukes of Austria, Lorraine, and Bar to acknowledge Clement VII., but he failed in Bohemia and Germany. Malésec exerted himself vainly in England; and the lord of Flanders, remembering that, immediately after the election of Urban VI., he had received from this same Malésec a letter declaring its canonicity, menaced the prelate with imprisonment if he did not leave his dominions. But in France, the cardinal of Limoges succeeded in procuring the patronage of King Charles V. and of the university of Paris. At first, indeed, the English and Picard "nations" of the university declared for neutrality, while the Faculties of theology, canon law, and medicine, and the French and Norman "nations" pronounced for Clement; but on May 26, 1379, the university officially entered the obedience of Clement. Charles V. at once sent embassies to all his allies, urging them to recognize Clement, but Scotland alone responded. In Spain, the genius of the cardinal de Luna finally triumphed over all obstacles; when John I. ascended the Castilian throne, in 1379, a conference of prelates and doctors was ordered to consider the great question at Medina del Campo. The discussion lasted from Nov., 1380, until the following May, and it resulted in the recognition of Clement. Six

(1) The states which recognized a certain claimant to the Popedom, during this unfortunate period, were said to be in his "obedience."

years afterward Aragon and Navarre came to the same decision. But de Luna had no success in Portugal, owing to the influence which England then exercised in that kingdom. Christendom was now divided into two obediences. Urban VI. was recognized by all northern and nearly all central Italy; by the emperor Wenceslaus; by Hungary, Poland, England, Brittany, Flanders, Denmark, and Sweden. Clement was obeyed by the kingdoms of France, Castile, Aragon, Naples, Cyprus, and Scotland; by Genoa, Savoy, Geneva, Lorraine, Bar, and Rhodes. During the forty years that the schism lasted, there were some variations in these obediences, some of the powers declaring for neutrality until a General Council could settle the lamentable controversy.

We do not propose to follow this schism through all its details; whatever of controversy arises from it can be settled solely by a study of its origin. If the election of Pope Urban VI. was canonical, it follows that his successors, Boniface IX., Innocent VII., and Gregory XII., were legitimate Pontiffs; that the so-called Clement VII., Benedict XIII., and Clement VIII., in spite of the sensitiveness of certain French writers as to the use of this term in the present connection, were Anti-Popes. With regard to Alexander V., elected after the Council of Pisa pretended to depose Gregory XII., and with regard to his successor, John XXIII., it would seem, if we note the usage of the Holy See, that they should be classed as dubious; for while certain undoubted Pontiffs, coming after the termination of the schism, have taken the names by which Robert of Geneva, Peter de Luna, and Giles Munoz, were known, and thus have manifested the mind of the Holy See as to the proper qualification of Clement VII. and his line, the undoubted Pontiff, Alexander (Roderick Borgia), called himself the Sixth of that name.

Before we enter upon a discussion as to the validity of the election of Pope Urban VI., a few reflections are to be made on the nature of the Great Western Schism. It has been well remarked that this most afflicting of all the dissensions which have ever troubled the Church was **unique**, inasmuch as it was a schism without schismatics.

We shall show that the election of Urban VI. was canonical, and that therefore they who rebelled against his authority were guilty of schism; but it is certain that, owing to the artifices of the original culprits, the masses of Christendom were led to doubt as to who was, or was not, the legitimate Pontiff; that, therefore, in following the obedience which seemed to them proper, they were not schismatics, properly speaking, even when they acknowledged as Pope one who was not such. The Catholic doctrine of there being one supreme head of the Church on earth was never denied by our ancestors of the fourteenth century during these days of trial; nay, it was because of their attachment to this article of faith, that they would not hear of a compromise. There was no question of dogma, but one of persons; hence it is that certain grave theologians have held that the division ought not to be styled a schism. "Although it is necessary," says St. Antonine of Florence, "to believe that there is but one supreme head of the Church, nevertheless, if it happens that two Popes are created at the same time, it is not necessary for the people to believe that this one or that one is the legitimate Pontiff; they must believe that he alone is true Pope who has been regularly elected, and they are not bound to discern who that one is; as to that point, they may be guided by the conduct and opinion of their particular pastor" (1). During the entire tempest of the Great Western Schism, the dogma of Catholic unity, under one earthly shepherd, shone vividly above the darkness of lies and treasons; and we may say with M. de Maistre that this very schism served to prove that the throne of Peter is indestructible. Mosheim thinks that this schism gave a mortal blow to the Papal power (2), and he lays particular stress upon the immoralities and irregularities of the time, as depicted by contemporary authors, especially by Nicholas de Clemangis. Five hundred years have passed since this "mortal blow" was inflicted upon the Papacy, and many more such, in the minds of its adversaries, have been dealt it since that time. As for the irregularities prevalent

(1) *Chronicle*, pt. iii., tit. 22, c. 11.

(2) *History*, Cent. xiv., pt. 2, ch. 2, § 15.

during the schism, Protestants exaggerate them, and thus attack their own system, for such a state of affairs only goes to prove the necessity of a wise and virtuous head in the Church.

But what must we think of that picture drawn by Clemangis of the Church of his day? He tells us that "it is useless to speak of literature and learning, since we know that nearly all priests can scarcely stammer through what they are obliged to read, and they have no conception of the meaning of the words. . . . Nowadays, any lazy man who hates labor, but who wishes to luxuriate in idleness, rushes into the priesthood." Nicholas de Clemangis, rector of the great university of Paris, and private secretary of Peter de Luna (Benedict XIII.), is certainly a grave authority. "He formed," says Scharpff, "with Peter d'Ailly, his master, and Gerson, the triumvirate of Catholic reformers of discipline and of theological science, toward whom the Sorbonne, all France, aye, the entire Church, turned their attention with confidence at the end of the fourteenth, and at the commencement of the fifteenth century." But are not the quoted sentiments of Clemangis a mere oratorical declamation? Could the mass of the clergy have been thus ignorant and debauched at a time when flourished, not only this triumvirate, but that crowd of doctors in theology and in law, that great number of learned and zealous bishops, who composed the Councils of Pisa and Constance? However, Clemangis himself shows us that, in the above passage, he abuses an orator's privileges. Bonnechose, and others of that ilk, carefully refrain from observing that a little further on in his text, Clemangis apologizes for his exaggerations, saying: "Notwithstanding what I have said above concerning ecclesiastics, I would wish no one to think that I include all clerics in my censures. I am not ignorant that in each and every country, some, and perhaps the majority (*aliquos, et forte plurimos*), are good, innocent, just, and not affected by the aforesaid evils." The fact is that Clemangis wrote this book on *The Corrupt Condition of the Church* at a time when his heart was surcharged with bitterness, and his brain afire with indignation. He had been intensely loyal to the

cause of Peter de Luna, and had remained faithful to it, even after the court of France had (although only for a time) abandoned it (1398). During the next few years Clemangis labored for a return of France to the obedience of de Luna, and when it had been effected (1403), he was one of those who believed that de Luna was sincere when he proposed to resign his claims. When, finally, Charles VII. declared that if the schism did not end in 1408, he would recognize neither Gregory XII. nor Benedict XIII., the latter issued a Bull of excommunication against Charles, and that monarch definitively abandoned his cause. Clemangis was now believed to have been the author of the Bull of excommunication, and to avoid trouble, he retired to a Carthusian convent. With his eyes opened to the deceptions practised by de Luna, and not perceiving any hope for immediate peace in the Church, he composed his celebrated book, and in a vein of hypercriticism and quasi despair.

We now come to a discussion of the principal question excited by the Great Western Schism. Was the election of Prignano valid? The sole argument originally adduced against its validity was based on the supposition that it had not been free. Therefore, if it can be shown that the election was not effected by intimidation, it is evident that Urban VI. was a legitimate Pontiff, and hence Robert of Geneva was an Anti-Pope. We shall merely allude to the eloquent fact that during three months the cardinals, separately and collectively, privately and officially, recognized Urban VI. as Supreme Pontiff; that they discovered his oppressiveness only when they had become dissatisfied with his reformatory measures, and especially when they had found that he was about to weaken the hold of France upon the Holy See. But proceeding to an examination of the election of his Grace of Bari, we must first indicate the principal treatises, composed during the schism, to illustrate the question from the canonical point of view. I. We have the narrative of James de Seva, edited by Cæsar du Bouloi in vol. IV. of his *History of the University of Paris*. II. An anonymous relation published by Papebroch in his *Conatus Historicus*. III. An account of the *Election of Urban VI.* by Thomas de

Acerno, bishop of Nocera (1). IV. The famous *Four Books on the Schism* by Theodoric of Niem, who died in 1416. V. Thirty manuscript volumes in the Vatican Library, plentifully quoted by Raynald in his *Annals*. VI. Two *Lives of Gregory XI.* annotated by Baluze. VII. The *Declaration of the Cardinals against Bartholomew, Archbishop of Bari*, the authors of which were the French Cardinals Malésec, Sortenac, Flandrin, and Noellet. VIII. The treatises, favorable to Urban VI., of John Lignano, of the university of Bologna; of Ubaldi of the university of Perugia. Both of these are given by Raynald. XI. The treatises, favorable to Clement VII., by Cardinal de Barriere, bishop of Autun; by the prior of Chartres, in answer to Lignano. These are edited by du Boulai in his work on the university of Paris, in the fourth volume. X. Much information can be gathered from the *Epistles* of Coluccio Piero Salutato, secretary of Urban V. and Gregory XI. (2), and from Gerson's treatises on the *Unity of the Church*, and on the *Removability of the Pontiff by the Church* (3).

Now for the election of Urban VI. In the first place, the name of the archbishop of Bari was not sprung suddenly, and as a last resource, upon the Sacred College. It had been seriously considered before the electors entered into the Conclave. The reader must know that after the death of Gregory XI. great discord prevailed among the French cardinals. The Limousins (4), who numbered seven, wishing to make of the tiara an attribute of their own country,

(1) In MURATORI, in his *Collection of Writers on Italian Matters*, vol. 3.

(2) Florence, 1742.

(3) At first, Gerson suggested the voluntary abdication of Peter de Luna; then he was willing to recognize him, with certain restrictions favorable to the Gallican church; finally, he advocated force as the only means of ending the schism. Both claimants, said he, seem to have equal rights; therefore let us depose both, and elect a third. He contended that whenever a schism occurs, the Church should reform herself "in the head and members;" that as every free nation can depose an incorrigible prince, so can the Church; that when the head of the Church obstinately refuses to call a Council, she can do so. A General Council, according to Gerson, was "an assembly of the whole Catholic Church, comprising every order of the hierarchy, and without excluding any of the faithful, who might wish to be heard." We shall have occasion hereafter to speak more fully of the great chancellor, and of his many curious and untenable theories.

(4) The Limousin (now forming parts of the departments of Haute-Vienne, Correze, Creuze, and Dordogne), with Limoges for its capital, although under the suzerainty of the French king, had been ceded to the English by the treaty of Bretigny in 1360, and was not definitively restored to France until 1451.

first put forth the cardinal Malésec as their candidate ; and when he declined, they rallied around Peter de Sortenac. The four cardinals who were subjects of the French crown had resolved, of course, to elect a Gallic Pontiff, but they thought, to use the words of Cardinal Flandrin, that "the world was tired of Limousin Popes" (1). During the nine days' funeral services for Gregory XI., the Italians and the properly so-called Frenchmen perceived that they might indeed succeed in preventing the election of a Limousin, but that their own real and ultimate object, the triumph of their own special candidate, was yet to be fought out among themselves. At this period of doubt, Marino, archbishop of Brindisi, asked his intimate friend, the cardinal Robert of Geneva, if he thought that the Limousin influence would eventually triumph ; and in his book on the schism, Marino says that Robert replied : "More votes will agree with mine than with those of the Limousins," and, adds Marino, "taking his Breviary in his hands he swore : 'By these holy Gospels of God, we shall have no one for Pope but the archbishop of Bari, or another whom, at present, I wish not to name to thee ;' and many times during the *novendiales* of the aforesaid lord Gregory of blessed memory, when he would ride to visit the said cardinals, he reiterated the same." This fact is confirmed by Robert Straton, an auditor of the Apostolic palace, who says that : "Since the cardinals who were present in the city could not determine upon one of themselves before they entered the Conclave, it is said that two-thirds of them resolved to elect the most reverend father, the archbishop of Bari ; and some of them privately intimated this to him, whereupon, as I have heard, he grieved much." This previous consideration of Prignano is confirmed by the death-bed testimony of Cardinal Thebaldeschi, declaring that before the opening of the Conclave, the French cardinals had greatly extolled to him the merits of the archbishop of Bari, and had urged him to vote for that prelate (2). It appears evident, therefore, that when as yet the cardinals were subject to no pressure from the Romans, they had nearly, if not quite, determined to elect Prignano.

(1) Clement VI. and Innocent VI. were both Limousins.

(2) RAYNALD, year 1378. No. 2 and 3.

A most conclusive argument for our thesis was advanced by the bishop of Faenza, representative of Pope Urban VI. in the assembly of the Castilian clergy, at Medina del Campo, in Nov., 1380. Had the cardinals chosen the archbishop of Bari because they feared the ire of the Romans, would they have abstained from immediately publishing the election? The following are the bishop's words: "The said election having been made, the said lords deliberated as to whether it would be expedient to proclaim their choice, and they concluded not to do it. The opposing advocate may reply that they dared not proclaim the election, because of the furious people. Wonderful indeed it would have been, if they did not dare to publish the election of the archbishop of Bari, after having chosen him, as our adversaries say, because of the demand of the people, and to avert the danger of death. Who has ever heard of one who wished to avert death concealing what would, if manifested, free him at once from anxiety? But the real reason for not publishing the election was that the cardinals believed that they had not satisfied the people. Therefore, they had not been influenced in the election by the fear now pretended, nor had any such fear destroyed their liberty of action." We may here draw an argument from this fear of the cardinals that they had not satisfied the people (an allusion to the fact that the Romans had demanded a Roman for Pope, and had received a Neapolitan). The action of the cardinals in allowing Thebaldeschi, the archpriest of St. Peter's, to be dressed in pontificals, and exhibited as Pope, shows that they dreaded the effect of their election of Prignano; therefore, again, their choice of this prelate had been voluntary, and not caused by fear of the Romans. But it is from this very fact that the choice of the Sacred College was a Neapolitan, not a Roman, that is derived one of the most convincing proofs that the election of Pope Urban VI. was free, as we now proceed to demonstrate.

In an epistle written to the king of Aragon by the abbot of Sistri, we read that the prefect of the *rioni* of Rome entered the Conclave, and thus addressed the cardinals: "You are aware, my lords, that at the commencement of the Con-

clave, many insisted that you should give them a Roman, or at least an Italian. Now, however, I am sent to your Paternities by the whole people, and on their behalf I make known to you that they will not be satisfied with an Italian, but ask that a Roman be given to them. They fear lest some agreement may be secretly made between you and any Italian who is not a Roman, to transfer, after the election, the Papal court to Avignon." Notwithstanding this categorical demand of the Romans, the cardinals elected, not a Roman, but a Neapolitan; therefore they were not desirous of pleasing the Romans to the point of sacrificing every wish of their own. Nor can it be said, observes Palma, that the electors chose Prignano only because there was but one Roman, Orsini, in the Sacred College; for they went outside of their own number for a Pontiff, and they could have found many worthy subjects among the Roman clergy. But the reply of the cardinals to the prefect of the Roman *rioni* plainly shows that they were determined not to elect a Roman, simply because they wished to avoid all danger of being charged with having yielded to coercion. The abbot of Sistri tells us: "The following was the reply of the cardinals to the prefect of the *rioni*, as given, in the name of all, by the most reverend father, the cardinal of Glandève (de Lagery): 'My lords and I do much wonder that you so trouble us, for the replies already given, concerning this business, ought to satisfy you and the Roman people. Depart therefore, for we now say as we have ever said, and you will receive no other answer;' that is, that they would conduct the election for the honor of God, the salvation of the Christian peoples, and the good of the Catholic Church. But the prefect replied: 'God grant that you give us a Roman, or certainly you will experience something besides words.'" Again, that the cardinals were resolved not to yield to the Romans is shown by the following remarks of Cardinal de Cros in the Conclave, after the prefect had withdrawn. They are thus given by the abbot: "You perceive, my lords, that these Romans first asked us for one who would be acceptable to God and the world, and they made no exception of country or of persons; afterward, at the beginning of the Conclave, they restricted this gener-

al proposition to one nationality, the Italian ; now, however, they are not content with even that restriction, but confine us to the Romans. I do not see how we can elect a Roman, for such a choice would be judged by God and the world to be the result of intimidation." According to de Cros, therefore, the election of a Neapolitan was not the result of intimidation, but the effect of a free and untrammelled choice.

After the cardinal de Cros had insisted that the selection of a Roman was altogether out of question, if the Sacred College desired to escape the charge of having yielded to force, he proceeded, in a most tranquil manner, to detail the reasons which militated for the election of Prignano. These were six ; namely, maturity of age, probity of life, great learning, experience in the business of the Roman court, courtesy toward his colleagues, and (strange admission for a French cardinal of the Avignonese school), Prignano was "an Italian, and through an Italian the patrimony of the Church might be recovered, whereas no foreigner could effect that recovery." Such, according to de Cros, and not any intimidation by the Romans, were the reasons for choosing Prignano as Pontiff. "These six qualifications," said he, "are found, my lords, as far as I can see, in no other one person than the archbishop of Bari. He is more than fifty years old, and is so virtuous, that for more than fourteen years, during which he has been attached to the Roman court, nothing has ever been heard against him, either as to word or deed. His learning is indubitable ; he is a great teacher in the Canon law, as is shown by his Collections . . . Besides, we all know him well, for he is our creation, a creation especially by us Limousins, since he was made archbishop of Bari by the lord Gregory of blessed memory. Finally, he is an Italian ; and being a Neapolitan, is a subject of a French house (Anjou), and hence ought to be acceptable to the king of France and his brothers." Here is another proof that in voting for Archbishop Prignano, the cardinals were actuated by other reasons than a desire to avoid offending the Romans. We may also note that, according to Marino, the election of Prignano was effected before the tumultuous conduct of the Roman people. "This election was

concordantly made immediately after the departure of the prefect of the *rioni*, without any lapse of time, unless that in which the cardinal of Limoges was making the above remarks ; indeed, the election took place before Vespers, six hours before any tumult of the people."

We shall strengthen our defence of the validity of the election of Pope Urban VI. with an extract from the *Relation* of James de Seva. This author admits that the Romans surrounded the Papal palace, both before and during the Conclave, and that they continually shouted, "We want a Roman Pope ;" but his picture of the proceedings after the deliberations had begun shows that the cardinals, to the very end, were determined not to yield to dictation. After informing us that the Conclave had been "everywhere well closed and locked," de Seva says that the cardinals Aigrefeuille, Malésec, and de Cros sounded Thebaldeschi as to his views concerning Prignano, and that this cardinal assented to Prignano's election, "just as he had previously assented ;" that Aigrefeuille and Malésec then went among the others with the same object. He then represents Aigrefeuille as complacently addressing his brethren: "My lords, let us sit down at once, for I firmly believe that we shall choose a Pope without delay." Then the cardinal Orsini, who was intriguing for his own election, tried to defer the imminent ballot, saying: "My lords, if it pleases you, let us postpone our choice, and play a trick on those Romans who are crying for a Roman Pope. Let us take some Franciscan friar, vest him with a cope and a Papal mitre, tell the people that he has been elected, and then let us leave this place, and somewhere else elect another person." Now if the cardinals had been made of the material which many French authors supposed them to have been made of ; if they were led to violate their consciences in the election, and into three months of hypocrisy after it, and all this through fear ; they would have eagerly entertained this or some similar project. But mark how Orsini's idea was received, and then believe, if you can, that these cardinals were about to elect a man whom they believed to be, as Maimbourg asserts, willing to acknowledge the invalidity of their proceedings. "The cardinal of Limoges

and his followers answered the said Orsini in these or equivalent words : ‘ My lord of Orsini, we shall certainly not do as you advise, for we do not wish to deceive the people, nor to damn our own souls ; indeed, *we intend now to elect a true Pope, and we care not for the words or clamors of the people.*’ Then, the Conclave being well closed and locked on all sides, the said cardinals sat down to the election. The cardinal of Florence (Corsini) wished to prevent the elevation of the archbishop of Bari and named the cardinal of St. Peter’s (Thebaldeschi), urging the others to vote for him. But the cardinal of Limoges said that although the cardinal of St. Peter’s was a holy man, there were two things against him : firstly, he was a Roman, and *the Romans demanded a Roman, and therefore should not have a Roman* ; secondly, he was weak and infirm, and could not sustain the burden.” Then de Seva narrates how the cardinal of Limoges “ named the most holy lord Urban, who was then archbishop of Bari, in these words : ‘ *I freely vote for, and receive as Pope, with a mind and will that he be true Pope, the lord Bartholomew, archbishop of Bari.*’ ” The chronicler then speaks of the voting, and of the resolve to withhold the announcement of the election, and continues : “ The archbishop of Bari and certain other prelates having been called to the palace, and the Conclave being still well closed and locked, and all being quiet, the cardinals again met in the chapel ; and for the better expression of their free will and consent, and by way of greater precaution, they again freely, simply, concordantly, and unanimously, consented to the aforesaid, then archbishop of Bari, and again elected him Pope, saying expressly that they chose him freely, and with the mind that he should be true Pope.” Then de Seva narrates the violent scenes that followed, and which caused the flight of most of the cardinals, and finally he describes the coronation of Urban VI.

The arguments already presented seem to us to fully justify the saying of Pope Benedict XIV. that “ to-day it is evident that Urban VI. and his successors were legitimate Pontiffs ;” but we would draw the reader’s attention to certain other proofs, which are furnished by letters written by the very cardinals who revolted against the authority of the

Pontiff whom they elected First in importance is a private letter of Robert of Geneva, written a few days after the election of Urban, to the emperor Charles IV., and which John Dominick Mansi transcribed from a Vatican manuscript, and first published in his *Notes* to the *History* of Alexandre(1). If the future rival of Pope Urban was aware of any flaw in that Pontiff's election, surely here was an excellent and a most natural opportunity for publishing it to the world. "Most Serene prince, and most dear relative: After the death of our lord, Pope Gregory XI., of blessed memory, which event I tearfully announced to your Serenity in a previous letter, my lords the other cardinals here present, and I myself, being shut up in Conclave, ten days after the death, according to the regulations of the Canon law, unanimously gave our votes to the archbishop of Bari, now Supreme Pontiff, a Neapolitan by nationality, and deputy in the curia for my lord, the cardinal of Pampeluna, Apostolic vice-chancellor; and we elected him to the Apostolate on the eighth day of this month, after a Conclave which lasted only one night, because the Romans would not consent to its being any longer protracted. He is now styled Urban VI. While he was yet in Minor Orders, he was my friend and very familiar with me; now he is raised from the lowest to the highest grade, and his coronation has been ordered for the feast of the Resurrection of our Lord, now at hand. He hopes for much from your Serenity, and as you were a son to his predecessors, and a particular arm of strength to them, so your Serenity ought to persevere in his regard. And as he is now occupied in affairs which concern your Serenity and your most Serene son, things about which I have often conversed with him in private, I have found him very well disposed; so much so, that if his deeds correspond to his words, as I trust they will, the affair of your most Serene son will be happily expedited(2). I shall not cease to use all my energies in urging him to settle that business; and master Conrad, secretary of your Serenity, is working commendably, with all zeal, for

(1) Cent. xiv., c. 2, art. 9.

(2) This affair was the projected coronation, as future emperor, of the young prince Wenceslaus, who, with the consent of the late Pope Gregory XI., had been declared king of the Romans in 1377.

the same end. I ever commend myself to your Serenity, whom may the Omnipotent happily preserve. Written at Rome, the fourteenth day of April, (1378). Your cardinal of Geneva." This letter needs no comment. The next epistle which we would ask the reader to examine, is that of the cardinal-electors, written on April 30 to their six brethren of the Sacred College residing at Avignon: "*We freely and unanimously gave our votes to the person of the reverend lord Bartholomew, archbishop of Bari, a man conspicuous by the light of his great merits, and illustrated by his manifold virtues; concordantly raising him to the height of Apostolic power and announcing this our election to the multitudes of Christendom. On the ninth day of this month the same lord, the elect, before an immense assembly of the faithful, and elevated on the throne of Apostolic dignity, took to himself the name of Urban; and on the day when the Supreme Pontiff Jesus Christ restored our life by His resurrection, he was magnificently and solemnly crowned in the Basilica of the Prince of the Apostles, as is the custom of the Roman Church, amid the joyful manifestations of an innumerable congregation of the Christian people. . . . In Him whose place the same our lord holds on earth, we have a firm hope and confidence that the Roman State and the Universal Church will flourish, and that the orthodox faith will reach its desired happy development.*"

Having presented the arguments which militate for the legitimacy of the line of Pope Urban VI. during the Great Western Schism, historical justice requires us to pay attention to the reasons advanced by the defenders of Clement VII. No writer has more energetically, or more bitterly, presented the claims of Robert of Geneva, than Maimbourg; so thoroughly partisan is the spirit with which he illustrates the Avignon side of the question, that his *History* of the schism might have been more reasonably styled a *Defence of the Avignon Idea*. He protests that he does not imitate the Urban historians "who rely only upon testimonies drawn from the *Informations* laid by Urban" before the sovereigns of the day; but during the entire course of his narrative of the origin of the schism, he studiously avoids the slightest

evidence in favor of any possibility of right on the part of Urban VI. To Maimbourg, the recognition of Urban VI. by the clergy and people of Rome, whom history shows to have been always averse to Anti-Popes, means nothing. He can perceive no argument for Urban's legitimacy in the recognition extended by the cardinals to that Pontiff during a period of nearly three months, that is, until they discovered that the Avignon idea was in a fair way of being exploded forever by a creation of several Roman cardinals, who certainly would not tamely acquiesce in a resubjugation of the tiara to France. This recognition, he says, was forced; so soon as the cardinals could withdraw themselves from the surveillance of Urban, they endeavored to undo the work to which they had perforce lent themselves. And he insists that before the cardinals went into Conclave, some of them had put on record their protests against the validity of the election, if an Italian were chosen. Even the Italian cardinals, according to Maimbourg, had already declared that if one of themselves was elected, they would regard the act as null, owing to the violence of which the Conclave was a victim. And when the Sacred College finally leaned toward Prignano, persists Maimbourg, it did so because he "being a doctor in Canon Law, knew well that such an election could not be upheld; and because, as he had the reputation of being a man of conscience and of probity, the cardinals had reason to believe that if he accepted the dignity in order to deliver them from the danger of being massacred, he would not hesitate to renounce it, when once they had been located in security, and could hold a free election." As for the letters written by the cardinals, testifying to the validity of the late election, Maimbourg would deny them any value, because some of their Eminences "found means to write to King Charles V., that he should believe nothing that they might write in favor of Urban, so long as they were in Rome, because they were obliged to do all that this elect and the Roman magistrates demanded of them, for if they refused, they ran the risk of their lives." Now all of these assertions of Maimbourg, namely, that the three months' recognition of Urban was forced upon the cardinals; that their

Eminences had protested, before the Conclave, against the validity of the election of any Italian ; that they voted for Prignano, only because they thought that he would not deem his election canonical ; and that the durance vile in which Urban held the cardinals, after the election, took all value from the letters in which their Eminences spoke of that Pope as legitimate ; are easily refuted, and by their refutation the only resources of the defenders of Robert of Geneva are destroyed.

Maimbourg asserts that the cardinals were forced to recognize Urban VI. as Pontiff, although “ they prayed him to leave Rome, in order that they might freely ratify his election,” and that “ he employed the authority of the magistrates and bannerets to compel their immediate return to the palace, and those who were in the city did return. And although those who had shut themselves in Castel Sant’ Angelo sent to him their written procuration, that their names might be used at his enthronization, he wished, nevertheless, that they should attend in person, and should, conjointly with those who had left Rome, seat him on the Pontifical throne.” Now this “ authority of the magistrates and bannerets ” might have availed to compel the attendance of the cardinals who were living in the city, although we very much doubt whether the Roman officials, who had just been disappointed in their fond hope of having a Roman for their Pope-King, would have shown much zeal in forcing the opponents of the Neapolitan Prignano, unless they had been well satisfied that their own turbulence had not affected the validity of the election ; that, therefore, the unwelcome Neapolitan was to be obeyed. But no physical power, then at Pope Urban’s disposal, could have compelled an unwilling return, either of those cardinals who had left Rome, or of those who had taken refuge in Castel Sant’ Angelo. Robert of Geneva was secure in the stronghold of Zagarolo, under the protection of the proud and perennially rebellious Colonna ; Noellet was in the fortress of Ardea, which belonged to the Frangipani ; Orsini and Flandrin were in the castle of Vicovaro, a possession of the former’s house ; eight others were in Sant’ Angelo, the commander of which for-

tress, Rostaing, was a Frenchman sworn to preserve his post in the interest of the cardinals at Avignon, and the event proved that he was a foe to Urban. The military operations which afterward ensued showed that our Pontiff could not have undertaken offensive measures against Zagarolo, Ardea, and Vicovaro; and even if he could have done so, but a short march away were the savage free-lances of Brittany, ready to make common cause with their rebellious fellow Gauls, as they soon proved, even before Robert of Geneva had donned his mock tiara. Secure, therefore, as the absent cardinals were from the physically weak arm of Pope Urban, what could have induced them to return to Rome? Perhaps they were as yet devoted sons of the Papacy; perhaps their projects had not yet assumed any definite shape, and they deemed it advisable to bide their time. Excogitate, however, what reason you will, it is absurd to imagine that their return was compelled by Pope Urban. When they rejoined the Pontiff, it was of their own free will, if not from a sense of duty, and their ensuing homage to Urban VI. was as thorough a ratification of the late election as it would have been, if conducted amid all the solemnities of a new Conclave.

Maimbourg asserts, secondly, that some of the cardinals had protested, before the Conclave, against the validity of an election of any Italian; that such protests had been drawn up before a notary. He also asserts that when the cardinals heard the Romans hammering on the doors of the Conclave, "nearly all, and especially the transalpine cardinals, protested that the election of an Italian, which they were about to effect, would receive their assent merely because they wished to escape death." As for any protests before the Conclave, we do read of one by the cardinal of Glandève. A document was drawn up on Dec. 10, "in the first year of our lord Pope Clement VII." in which this cardinal (de Lagery), then bearing, by Clement's appointment, the title of bishop of Ostia, declares that on the previous 6th of April he had sworn, before one Stephen Bernard, a notary public, and five witnesses, that if, in the election about to take place, he, de Lagery, "were to elect or name as Pope any Italian from outside the College of the lords cardinals, it would be be-

cause of fear of death, and entirely contrary to his mind, intent, and will." The original protest, continued de Lagery, had been lost, and the notary had died in the previous November; de Lagery therefore had requested that the testimony of the aforesaid five witnesses should be taken as to the fact of the said protest. The document then gives the attestation of the five. Now, granting the veracity of de Lagery in this matter, what does the above protest prove? Simply that, before the election, his mind was intensely averse to the selection of an Italian; so averse, in fact, that he thought that nothing short of fear of death could extort his consent to the elevation of one. But he did consent, and in spite of his protest he signed the decree of election, as did the cardinal of Limoges before him: "I freely name and elect as Pope the lord archbishop of Bari." Passing this fact, however, the eloquent one remains that, after all tumult had subsided, de Lagery left his place of refuge and did homage to Pope Urban VI. As for the protests made, according to Maimbourg, when the cardinals heard the Romans hammering on the door of the Conclave, neither hammering nor protests are mentioned as occurring at the time of the nomination of Prignano, save by the interested cardinals in their great protest of Aug. 2, "against Bartholomew, archbishop of Bari." But granting that all was as their Eminences declare, the stubborn fact remains that for three months they did homage to Urban VI.

Maimbourg asserts, thirdly, that the cardinals voted for Prignano only because "he, being a doctor in Canon law, knew well that such an election could not be upheld; and because, as he had the reputation of being a man of conscience and of probity, the cardinals had reason to believe that if he accepted the dignity, in order to deliver them from the danger of being massacred, he would not hesitate to renounce it. . . . Indeed, Simon de Cramaud, patriarch of Alexandria, who lived at that time, assures us, in his little book on the schism, that Pontius Veraldi swore to him that being, together with the archbishop of Bari, in St. Peter's, while the cardinals were entering the Conclave, that prelate, of whom Veraldi was a great friend, told him, when he saw the hor-

rible violence of the people, that he who would be chosen in such a tumult would not be truly Pope, and that he would never acknowledge such a one." But in the protest of Aug. 2, upon which Maimbourg implicitly relies, the cardinals say nothing of the above supposed understanding. They do say, however, that some of their number declared that "they elected him (Prignano) *with the mind and intent that he should be a true Pope.*" They might have said that not "some of their number," but more than two-thirds of them, used this phrase, for they are very precise in mentioning the four who did not, and in giving their alleged reasons for dropping it. And further on the cardinals say that "some of them said to each other that it was their intention to do what, as history informs us, has been done heretofore, that is, to retire, when convenient, to a safe place, and there elect him (Prignano) again." There is no mention of any wish or thought of electing anyone else than Prignano; they speak of electing him (*eum*) again (*de novo*). This would certainly indicate that, even though there had been no "hammering at the door of the Conclave, etc.," the archbishop was, for other reasons, and though his election was contrary to their Gallic prejudices, the acceptable candidate of the cardinals. This new election was not held, but the posterior conduct of the electors must certainly be regarded as a voluntary ratification of their action in the Conclave. The sole escape from this conclusion is by supposing that when the cardinals paid homage, during nearly three months, to Urban VI., they were living under a reign of terror, and Maimbourg readily grasps the idea. We shall soon prove that such a supposition is purely gratuitous. As for the testimony of Cramaud, to the effect that Prignano expressed to Veraldi his conviction that a Pontiff chosen in circumstances of violence would not be legitimate, that does not prove that the election in question really took place amid such circumstances.

Maimbourg asserts, fourthly, that no value attaches to the letters written by the cardinals in attestation of the legitimate election of Urban VI. Some of their Eminences, he says, had written to the French king that he should give no credit to anything they might say while they were under the influ-

ence of Prignano. But if these cardinals could "find means" to thus communicate with King Charles, why did they not, then and there, reveal to him the inner history of the late Conclave? In the absence of these letters to Charles, we know nothing as to the nature of the warning said to have been given, but since their Eminences did not avail themselves of their opportunity, we are justified in supposing that there was no inner history to relate; at least, nothing that would invalidate the late election. And where does Maimbourg learn that the cardinals were kept in such duress, or under such surveillance, that they could not communicate, for three months, the truth to the outside world? Only in the protest of Aug. 2d, in which the rebels say that after the election, "the lords cardinals, at least those who were from beyond the Alps, never deemed themselves secure; yea, they regard it as probable, and it is commonly believed, that if they had called his promotion into doubt, or had criticised it, they would all have been killed, since the violence still lasted. While they were in Rome, they never dared to converse on this subject, even among themselves; and he, although often requested, would never leave the city with the lords cardinals, nor would he locate them in a secure place. After the transalpine cardinals, with the utmost caution and a few at a time, had come to Anagni, wishing to deliberate on the above matters, and to avoid the dangers which threatened them while they lived among the Romans, etc." But if we consult Niem, de Seva, and other writers of the time, even those not partial to Pope Urban VI., we find that the cardinals were not forced to withdraw to Anagni, "with the utmost caution" and "a few at a time," in order to avoid detention. They received full permission from the Pontiff to retire to Anagni, because they complained of the heat in Rome. Had Urban been so distrustful of their fidelity, as Maimbourg would have us believe, is it likely that he would have allowed them all to withdraw themselves out of his power? As to the closeness of the Pontiff's surveillance of the cardinals, and their trembling in his presence, several events that happened at this time show that the cardinals enjoyed not a little freedom of action. For instance, when

Cardinal Lagrange gave the lie to the Pontiff in full Consistory, he was allowed to leave the palace and the city. Would a Pope who permitted such insolence to go unpunished, be likely to exercise such surveillance, and to inspire such terror, as the rebellious cardinals declare that they experienced at his hands ?

Having demonstrated, as we believe, the legitimacy of the election of Pope Urban VI., we now give a brief account of the happy termination of the schism, referring the reader to the pages of history, if he desires to follow it in its many and terrible phases. In 1408, Charles VI., king of France, wishing, as he said, to hasten the inauguration of a unanimous and perpetual obedience to one only vicar of Jesus Christ, resolved to obey neither Gregory XII., the third successor of Urban VI., nor Peter de Luna, who, with the name and style of Benedict XIII., had succeeded to the pretensions of Clement VII. Following the example of France, several other countries observed neutrality. In spite of the two competitors, a Council assembled at Pisa in 1409 for the purpose of extinguishing the schism. Under the presidency of the cardinal de Malésec, then bishop of Palestrina, there assembled twenty-three cardinals of both obediences, ninety-two bishops, eighty-seven abbots, many superiors of religious Orders, the deputies of the great universities, representatives of more than a hundred cathedral chapters, and about three hundred doctors in theology and in Canon law. There also attended the ambassadors of England, France, Sicily, Poland, Bohemia, and Portugal. Both Gregory XII. and Peter de Luna refused to attend, and each created new cardinals to replace those who had abandoned him ; and each convened another Council, the former at Friuli, and the latter at Perpignan. Each contestant objected against the authority of the Council of Pisa, that it was irregular, not having been convened by the Apostolic See. To this the prelates replied that such was the situation of the Church, that ordinary rules had to be laid aside ; that the Apostolic See itself was involved in clouds of obscurity which were to be dissipated, that a Council could depose a dubious Pope ; especially when, as in the present case, both claimants, at the time of their elec-

tion, had promised to resign, if the cardinals should deem it proper. We shall treat of this Council, as well as of that of Constance, in another place ; here it is sufficient to say that the prelates of Pisa having found that neither Gregory XII. nor Peter de Luna would abdicate, issued a decree of deposition against both, and then the cardinals elected as Pontiff the cardinal Peter Filargo, a Candiote, and archbishop of Milan, who took the name of Alexander V. But, as St. Antonine of Florence says : “ a great many good people, fearers of God, and enlightened men, continued to regard Gregory XII. as the true Pope.” Bavaria, Naples, and many cities of Italy continued in his obedience, while Castile, Aragon, and Scotland remained attached to de Luna. The Church now found that the Pisan measures had only increased the difficulties of the schism ; there were now three claimants to the tiara (1). On Nov. 16, 1414, was held the first session of the celebrated Council of Constance. John XXIII., the successor of Alexander V., presided over the first two sessions, and then left the city, after having signed a promise to abdicate ; taking refuge in Schaffhausen, he issued a vindication of his flight, and complained bitterly of his treatment by the Council. The prelates, however, continued their sessions ; Peter d’Ailly, Cardinal of Cambrai, presiding over the third, Cardinal Giordano Orsini over the fourth, etc. The emperor Sigismund wrote to King Charles VI. of France, requesting him to do his utmost for the success of a Council “ assembled to determine which one of the three claimants ought to be recognized as legitimate Pontiff.” John XXIII. and his friends declared that an injury was thus done to the Council of Pisa, for it was insinuated that the said assembly was neither legitimate in itself, nor prudent in its choice of a new Pope. To this Peter d’Ailly replied that the Council of Pisa and the election of Alexander V. were canonical, and therefore the election of John XXIII. was legitimate ; but the followers of the rival claimants had probable reasons for their opposition, and there was, consequently, as much embarrassment among Catholics as there had been before the Pisan

(1) But if the monster of the Great Schism, says Bossuet, was not entirely destroyed at Pisa, it at least received a blow which was the prelude of its total extinction by the Council of Constance, held five years afterward.

Council. And d'Ailly went on to say that a triple abdication was now necessary ; to which conclusion the entire Council of Constance soon arrived. After many efforts and many failures, all three of the obediences were brought to adopt the plan ; and at length John XXIII. approved and ratified the sentence of deposition pronounced by the Council against himself. In the fourteenth session Gregory XII., through his ambassador, Charles Malatesta, lord of Rimini, voluntarily abdicated. De Luna remained obstinate to the last, and there was given to him a phantom of a successor, in the person of one Giles Munoz (Clement VIII.); but this last relic of the Great Schism finally abdicated on July 26, 1429. On Nov. 11, 1417, the election of Cardinal Otho Colonna, who assumed the name of Martin V., was followed by a solemn *Te Deum*, sung by the representatives of the three former obediences, and the Papacy emerged triumphant from a combat which, had it not been the work of God, must have inevitably destroyed it.

CHAPTER XL.

RIENZI.

Pope Benedict XII., third of the seven Pontiffs who resided at Avignon, having died on April 23, 1342, the cardinal Peter Roger, a Benedictine monk and archbishop of Rouen, was elevated to the Chair of Peter on May 6, and took the name of Clement VI. At this period the royal authority of the Pontiff in the Roman States was purely nominal ; the pontifical vicar, usually the bishop of Orvieto, saw his power confined almost entirely to spirituals. Outside the city, the country was at the mercy of petty barons, where it was not ravaged by the mercenaries of Charles of Luxemburg or of the Visconti. The people of the capital had divided it into thirteen wards—*rioni*,—each under its own banneret ; but in reality the Romans were the victims of brute force, now uppermost in the persons of the Colonna, and then dominant under the sway of the Orsini. There was no guarantee for property, no security for life ; iniquity

sat in the tribunals, immorality was rife in the sanctuary, and misery weighed down every family (1). Petrarch eloquently describes the misfortunes entailed upon the queen of the world by the unfortunate mistake of Clement V.; and shows us the utopian schemes for her restoration which were cherished by many of his enthusiastic contemporaries, who hoped to see Rome again the head of universal empire under the rule of concordant Pope and emperor. A beautiful dream indeed, remarks one of the most intelligent of modern polemics (2); but which, if realized, would have reduced the Popedom to as servile a condition as that of the Constantinopolitan patriarchs of the Lower Empire. One of these dreamers was Nicholas Gabrini, known to history as Cola di Renzo, or simply Rienzi (3). His mother was a laundress and water-carrier; his father a tavern-keeper, although Cola himself boasted of being an illegitimate son of the emperor, Henry VII. Like most young Romans even in our day, Rienzi was made familiar with the olden heroes of Rome, but his enthusiasm was more than ordinary; and, after a youth passed in assimilating the aspirations of the classic writers of his country, his early manhood found him living almost exclusively among the monuments of an irrevocable past, murmuring to himself, "Shall I ever see such men in Rome?" All his studies impelled him to an attempt which must ever be impossible even to the greatest genius (4)—namely, the withdrawal of a people from its tomb. He possessed qualities apt to make him a successful revolutionist. His figure was beautiful yet majestic; his features were exceedingly mobile and his smile magical; his voice sweet but sonorous; his conversation passionate and entrancing; his style of writing highly colored, though elegant. But he was inconstant, vain, and weak in judgment; and often his romanticism

(1) *Fragm. Hist. Rom.*, in Muratori's *Antiq. Ital.*, vol. iii., b. 2, c. 5.—ZEFERINO RE, *Life of Cola di Renzo*, Forli, 1828. This *Life* is based on the famous one by Fortiflocca, Bracciano, 1624.—The chronicle published by Bzovius, in his *Annals*, vol. xiv., and entitled *Diarium ex MS. Vaticano*, is only an abridgment, and an inaccurate one, of the *Life* by Fortiflocca.

(2) CHRISTOPHE, *The Papacy in the Fourteenth Century*, Paris, 1853.

(3) His father's name being Laurence (Lorenzo), he was styled Nicholas, son of Laurence, Cola di Renzo.

(4) "*Nihil actum fore putavi. si quæ legendo didiceram non aggrederer exercendo.*"
—*Epist.*

prompted him, even at the most serious crises of his enterprise and of his life, to play the mountebank.

Rienzi made his entrance into public life in 1344, having been chosen by the Romans to urge again upon Clement VI. the propriety, nay necessity, of his coming to his See. At Avignon he made a great impression on Petrarch; and his friendship with that poet, then at the height of his fame, influenced the Pontiff to accord him so much favor that a daily audience was granted him during several weeks. With the exception of a short interval of coolness, brought about by Cardinal John Colonna because of Rienzi's eloquent denunciation of the Roman nobility, this favor was continued to him until his dismissal, when he was rewarded with the then lucrative office of notary of the Apostolic Chamber. History is silent as to the date of his return to Rome, but we find him in 1347 arisen to such a height in popular estimation that he dared to publicly upbraid the nobles as "drinkers of the blood of the people," and to call upon the "good estate" to provide for its own safety against the "dogs of the Capitol." On this occasion a Colonna struck him in the face, but generally the patricians simply ridiculed his demonstrations; even when, one day, while dining with Gianni Colonna, he declared that he would yet be emperor, and would send the barons to the scaffold, the guests were convulsed with laughter. His exhibition of pictures on the walls of Sant' Angelo and before the Capitol, showing the woes of Rome and the imminent justice of God; his own appearance in St. John Lateran's, vested as a stage monarch, and weeping because of Rome's having lost "her two eyes: the Pope and the emperor,"—such, and other demagogic tricks excited smiles even in many who desired the accomplishment of his promises. But the multitude was profoundly impressed.

And meanwhile Rienzi added the part of conspirator to that of demagogue. Among the middle classes he soon counted a large number who swore to co-operate with him in raising up the "good estate," and who awaited only his signal to act. Chance afforded an opportunity on the first of May,—Stephen, head of the house of Colonna, and most of the barons, having left the city in quest of grain, there

being scarcity of food within the walls. Rienzi sent trumpeters to every quarter, proclaiming that at nine on the next morning, all the citizens, without arms, would meet at the Capitol to debate on the amelioration of the "good estate." From midnight until the appointed hour Rienzi prayed in the church of San Agnolo in Peschiera, where he had caused thirty Masses to be offered in honor of the Holy Ghost. As the clocks struck nine, a curious procession left the temple. First came Rienzi, bareheaded, but otherwise in full armor, accompanied, strange to say, by the papal vicar, Raymond, bishop of Orvieto, whose ostensible duty would have been to repress such demonstrations, but whose weak nature had yielded to the ascendancy of superior genius. Next marched four standard-bearers,—three displaying the emblems of liberty, justice, and peace, and the fourth carrying the time-worn remnants of the flag of St. George. Then came a hundred men-at-arms, and nearly all Rome fell into line as the procession joyfully wended its way to the Capitoline. From this historic hill the "liberator" made one of his fervent addresses, and then deliberately read his new constitution. The citizens were to be guaranteed from all oppression by the barons; a citizen militia was to be enrolled, and a navy was to protect the coasts; the nobles were to keep the roads safe, but no patrician could have a fortress or stockade within the walls; justice was to be prompt: no trial was to be prolonged beyond a fortnight; the government would establish granaries for the benefit of the poor; widows and orphans, especially, if made such by war, were to be at the charge of the state; each commune was to send two representatives to a general congress in Rome, and an Italian confederation was to be promoted; above all, the Pope-King was to return to his See and capital. The people gladly acclaimed these provisions; the two senators, Sciarra Colonna and John Orsini, were chased from the Capitol; and Rienzi, joined ostensibly in authority with the papal vicar, at once assumed a dictatorship. Quick work was made with the barons. When Stephen Colonna, then at Corneto, heard of the revolution operated by a person whom he had regarded as merely a buffoon, he

rushed back to Rome, only to receive an order to withdraw at once. He tore the missive to shreds, exclaiming, "If this fool makes me mad, he shall be pitched from the windows of the Capitol!" But Rienzi caused the great bell to be rung: the people rushed to arms, and Stephen was lucky in saving his life by a precipitate flight to his fortress of Palestrina, accompanied by only one retainer. The dictator immediately ordered all the barons to retire to their castles in the country,—a command which was gladly obeyed, after the discomfited nobles had sworn not to disturb the roads, not to harbor malefactors, and not to do any injury to the "good estate."

Rienzi at once notified the Pontiff, the emperor, the king of France, and the Italian powers, of his accession to the tribunate. The two rivals, Louis of Bavaria and Charles of Luxemburg, and Queen Jane of Naples, received his ambassadors with honor; Florence, Siena, and Perugia sent him troops; the cities of Umbria sent deputies for his congress; Gaeta gave him 10,000 golden florins—a very large sum at that time—and the sovereignty of the city; Venice and Luchino Visconti declared themselves his allies; but the Pepoli of Bologna, the Esti of Modena, the Scala of Verona, the Gonzaga of Mantua, the Malatesta of Rimini, and other sovereign princes, at first regarded him as a lunatic. Philip VI., of France, wrote to him as if writing to a trader, and sent the letter by a common soldier. The court of Avignon was somewhat disturbed when it received the couriers of "Nicholas the severe and clement, the illustrious liberator of the Holy Roman Republic, the tribune of liberty, peace and justice," swearing fidelity to the Holy See, and begging for pontifical recognition; but prudence bade Clement VI. to send letters to Bishop Raymond and to the Roman people, accepting the new constitution, although condemning its irregular and revolutionary origin, and reserving to himself future liberty of action.

News came to Avignon of the comparatively contented state of Rome; justice reigned, for crime was punished without exception of persons. The tribune had created a "chamber of justice and peace" for the enforcement of the ancient

and now revived law of retaliation—*lex talionis*,—and its judges were chosen from among the most irreproachable of the plebeians. This method of satisfying for injuries was so enthusiastically accepted by the Romans that, according to the *Life* by Fortificocca, its exercise became a fanaticism (1). Once more, however, the peasant cultivated his fields in security; again the pilgrim made his unmolested journey to the tomb of the Apostles. The hitherto truculent barons could rage only in secret. One alone, John de Vico, lord of Viterbo, dared to resist Rienzi; but his towns were taken, his property confiscated; he was forced to swear, on the Body of Christ, submission to the Roman people, and only then was he allowed to resume his lordship under the tribunitial suzerainty. Facts such as these made a good impression at Avignon, and Petrarch took up his pen to felicitate Rienzi.

Some critics have denied that the poet had the tribune in his mind when he wrote that most beautiful of his works, *Spirito Gentile*; but, be that as it may—and the affirmative arguments are by far the stronger,—the letters of Petrarch to Rienzi show that he regarded the tribune's enterprise as restorative of that Roman grandeur which was the unique object of his own aspirations: "Your letters are read by every prelate of the court; every one copies them. One would think that they had come from heaven, or at least from the antipodes; for when the courier arrives there is a struggle to obtain his missives, and the oracles of Apollo were never so variously interpreted. Your enterprise is wonderful, and you are free from all blame; for you have shown at once your own great courage and the majesty of the Roman people, without any want of respect to the Supreme Pontiff. It is incumbent on a prudent man like yourself to reconcile these things, which apparently are contradictory. . . You have shown no craven fear, still less any mad presumption

(1) When the adversaries were brought to this "chamber of peace," each swore to leave it reconciled. Then the offended party rendered injury for injury to the offender,—literally, "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth." An embrace followed, and enmity was at an end. Once a man, who had just gouged out another's eye, ran to the tribunal voluntarily; and when his victim appeared he fell on his knees, turning up his face for the retaliatory treatment. The injured man refused the proffered satisfaction; then ensued a struggle between "justice" and charity; and finally the culprit left with both eyes, a fast friend of the other.

... We know not which to admire the more, your deeds or your style of speech. Men say that you act like Brutus and talk like Cicero... Do not abandon your magnanimous undertaking... You have laid solid foundations—truth, peace, justice, and liberty... It is well known that I warmly defend the justice of your tribunate and the sincerity of your intentions... Romulus founded Rome, Brutus gave her liberty, Camillus raised her from her ruins; you, illustrious man, have done more than all this! Romulus surrounded Rome with weak walls, but you give her inexpugnable ramparts. Brutus delivered her from one tyrant; you have freed her from innumerable oppressors. Camillus raised her from smoking ashes; you have raised her from ruins under which even hope had perished. Hail, then, our Romulus, our Brutus, our Camillus! Hail, restorer of our freedom, peace, and concord!”

Wiser men than Petrarch had observed that Rienzi was merely a child of capricious fortune and not her master; that “his enterprise was fantastic, and could not last (1)”; and that his own affectations were fast alienating from him his only sure trust, the love of the Roman people. This plebeian, who had discoursed eloquently on the simplicity of the ancient Quirites, on the sublime devotion of the Conscript Fathers, manifested more selfishness than any baron of them all, and displayed a luxury more fastidious than that of any contemporary monarch; even his wife never showed herself unattended by ladies of honor, whose chief duty was to fan the flies from her face. To the title of “severe and clement tribune” he soon joined, even in his correspondence with the Pontiff, those of “august,” “knight of the Holy Ghost,” and “*zelator Italiae* (2).” He even usurped the prerogative of a supreme ruler by coining money with the stamp of his own effigy. His ambition was overweening, but his common-sense soon became infinitesimal. There was no absurdity, perhaps, in his notifying the independent cities of Italy that he had conferred Roman citizen-

(1) JOHN VILLANI, *History of his Own Times*.

(2) Under date of August 5 1347, he signs himself, *Candidatus, Spiritus Sancti miles, Nicolaus severus et clemens, liberator Urbis, zelator Italiae, amator Orbis, et tribunus augustus, se ad pedum oscula beatorum*.

ship on all their inhabitants, and that on the feast of the Assumption they would be called on to exercise their right of suffrage in the election of an emperor. Such a studied ignoring of the pontifical authority—the only reason for the existence of the Holy Roman Empire—might not have been, to some minds, insanely extravagant; but when he doffed the mask, and showed that the end of all his patriotism was the imperial crown for himself, he should have demeaned himself with becoming dignity.

Tricks of the theatre may not be necessarily displeasing in a leader of men, but they must not be their own end. The great Napoleon relied much on this species of adventitious impressiveness—witness his smashing the vase at the feet of the dismayed Austrian agent; and his exhibition before Pius VII., moving the gentle Pontiff to comment, “How well he acts!” But Napoleon had an ever-present ulterior object, which his histrionic efforts were calculated and intended to unfold; the exhibitions of Rienzi were simply destructive of his most intimate hopes, and in their manifestations he received the same kind of applause that cheers the mountebank or the clown. Commodus performing in the ring was no more of an anomaly than Rienzi was in his reception of knighthood or in his citation of Louis of Bavaria. On the eve of the former ceremony, celebrated with unprecedented pomp in the Lateran Basilica, he bathed in the famous porphyry vase in which Constantine was said to have bathed after his cure from leprosy by Pope St. Sylvester I. Of a piece with this extravagance for its mock solemnity was his citation of the rivals, Louis of Bavaria and Charles of Luxemburg. While Mass was being celebrated in the chapel of Pope Boniface, he advanced toward the people and cried in a loud voice: “Know ye that we hereby summon before ourselves Louis of Bavaria and Charles, king of Bohemia, who style themselves emperors; as well as all the electors of the empire; in order that the former may allege the foundations of their claim, and that the latter may prove that right of nomination to the empire which has always belonged to the Roman people alone.” A notary immediately drew up the citations in

form, and they were sent to the princes concerned. Then Rienzi drew his sword, and, striking the air thrice toward various parts of the earth, exclaimed: "This is mine, this is mine, this is mine!" In the MS. *Life* published by Bzovius it is asserted—and most historians repeat the assertion—that the tribune summoned also the Pope and the Sacred College; but the original act contains no such citation; and, what is more convincing, among the charges at the trial of Rienzi such folly is not mentioned. When the dazed Raymond had recovered his senses, he endeavored to undo the work of his "colleague" by a notarial protest; but the infatuated tribune ordered the trumpets to blare, and soon afterward told the weak prelate that his occupation was gone. It is perhaps needless to state that neither the imperial rivals nor any of the electors noticed this ebullition.

The tribunitial *regime* had been in force only a few weeks when the diminished enthusiasm of the people prompted Rienzi to inaugurate a reign of terror. Such a course could be more safely pursued with the barons as victims, and their wealth was necessary to so luxurious a system as he followed. Accordingly, on September 14, he invited Stephen Colonna to dine with him at the Capitol; and having, on various pretexts, induced many of the principal nobles to meet the old baron, he seized their persons and thrust them into separate dungeons, charging them with conspiracy against the "good estate." A friar was sent to each with the intimation that death would be his portion the next morning, and all prepared for the solemn change, excepting old Stephen, who said that he was not ready to die. But influential persons represented to Rienzi the foolishness of his conduct, and he fancied that he might retract and yet profit by the situation. When, therefore, an immense multitude had assembled to witness the execution, they were treated instead to another of the tribune's theatrical pettinesses. He ascended the red-covered platform, preached a sermon on the text, "forgive us our trespasses," and declared that he not only forgave the culprits, but intended to bind them by ties of gratitude to the "good estate," making this one duke of the Campagna, that one duke of Tuscany, another consul, and so on. The

proceedings terminated with a splendid banquet. But the barons were not deceived by this affectation of clemency. The Colonna hastened to Marino, then a powerful fortress, and were soon joined by their ancient foes, the Orsini. Rinaldo Orsini took Nepi by assault, and his brother Giordano ravaged the Campagna even to the walls of Rome. Rienzi was no soldier, but the murmurs of the people led him to make a pretence of taking the field. He confined his operations to a parade around the walls of Marino, a devastation of its outlying territory, and a return to the capital to receive the honors of a "triumph." On November 20, Stephen Colonna suffered a defeat at Porta San Lorenzo; but, instead of following up his advantage, the tribune took another "triumph," exhibiting himself at the Capitol with crown on head and sceptre in hand; and having drawn his bloodless sword, he wiped it on his skirt and exclaimed: "I have cut the ears from heads which neither Pope nor emperor has dared to touch!" And the next morning he visited the scene of the late engagement, and observing a pool of water yet tinted by the blood of Stephen Colonna, who had there perished, together with his son Gianni, he beckoned his own son Lorenzo to his side, and made him the centre of another theatrical tableau. Telling his officers to strike the young man on the shoulder with the flats of their swords, he dipped his own hand in the bloody pool, and, sprinkling Lorenzo, thus knighted him: "Be thou hereafter the knight of victory!" To the credit of the knights in his retinue, be it remembered that nearly all of them immediately left his service.

While Rienzi was thus trifling with his fate, the Holy See had been content with giving him full liberty, subject to the surveillance of Cardinal Bertrand de Deux, the legate at Naples. But the good impression he had made on the pontifical court was short-lived, despite his reformatory pretences and his protestations of fealty to the Pope-King. Even Petrarch, who had so extravagantly deployed his pompous phrases in eulogizing his *protege*, was compelled to admit, in a letter written to his friend Lœlius on November 22: "I have read a copy of the tribune's letter, and I am dismayed

at his conduct (1). Patience having ceased to be a virtue in the premises, Pope Clement VI. wrote to the legate, instructing him to order Rienzi to withdraw his absurd citation of the imperial rivals, to dissolve his league with the king of Hungary against Queen Jane of Naples, to cease in his disrespect to the papal vicar, and to protect the barons as well as the people in their rights. If he obeyed, he was to continue in the tribunate, but conjointly with the vicar Raymond, or some other to be chosen according to circumstances ; if he resisted, he was to be deposed from office and excommunicated ; and if the people persisted in his support, the city was to be interdicted.

Bertrand proceeded to Rome and interviewed Rienzi, but received only insolent replies ; whereupon he retired to Montefiascone and launched the decree of excommunication, publishing at the same time an address from the Pontiff to the Romans, exhorting them to throw off the yoke of an extravagant adventurer and a rebel. Then Rienzi yielded, abandoning his pretensions concerning the empire, renouncing all sovereignty over the Romans, and resigning all his grandiloquent titles (2). The legate reinstated Rienzi and the bishop of Orvieto in the tribunate ; but the enthusiasm of the people was a thing of the past, and the barons had planned a counter-revolution. On the night of December 16, there resounded throughout the city cries of " Live the Colonna ! Death to the tribune ! " Rienzi caused the great bell of the Capitol to be rung ; but, although it rang all night, the people remained unmoved. A few of his devoted retainers attacked Minorbino, palatine of Altamura in Naples, who had placed himself at the head of the baronial forces ; but they were defeated. Then Rienzi lost all heart, save for impressive appearances—which spirit, indeed, was to actuate him to his dying hour,—and he went through the farce of resigning his office. Addressing the few who were with him as well as his tears would permit, he said : " I have governed justly, and it is only envy that blames me. Resume the sovereign power which you gave me seven months ago."

(1) *Rer. Fam.*, epist. vii.

(2) JOHN VILLANI, b. xii., c. 104.—RAYNALD, *ibi*, nos. 18, et seqq.—PAPENCORDT, *loc. cit.*

Then he mounted his horse, and, followed by his body-guard, with flying banners and playing musicians, he rode to Castel San Angelo. After trying in vain to revive the faith of the Romans in his destiny (1), he fled to Naples, where his ally, the king of Hungary, had just defeated Queen Jane, and who was the more willing to protect him, since the Pontiff had honorably welcomed the vanquished princess.

But the plague forced the Hungarian to retreat to his own country, and the ex-tribune returned to Rome toward the end of 1348. He was not disturbed; but he soon sought an asylum among a community of Franciscans "of the strict observance," at Monte Majella in the Apennines. This community was a remnant of that rebellious portion of the Franciscan family which had separated from the Order to follow their whims concerning religious poverty, and which had been anathematized by Pope John XXII., both for this reason and for their profession of the errors of Oliva. Here he was visited by a certain friar Angelo, a personage whom the "Spirituals" held in great esteem for sanctity, and who, although Rienzi had communicated his name to none of the community, at once pronounced it, and told him that God had resolved to regenerate the world through the work of the emperor Charles IV. and his own; that therefore he should at once consult the emperor. Rienzi resolved, as he told Charles in a letter written in July, 1350, to obey the divine commands. But before manifesting this intention, the ex-tribune tried his independent fortune by two attempts in Rome during the first part of that year. The immense multitudes thronging to the Eternal City for the Jubilee (2) seemed to promise many favorable occasions for a resurrection of the tribunate; but Rienzi's two *coups de main*—an attack on the palace of the legate, Cardinal Ceccano, and another against that prelate's person—ended only in his excommunication and flight. Then he set out in disguise

(1) He exhibited on the wall of the Church of the Magdalen a picture representing an angel with the arms of Rome, treading on a lion, a dragon, and a basilisk. But the populace covered it with mud.

(2) Matthew Villani (b. i., c. 56) says that during the Paschalseason there were at one time over 1,200,000 pilgrims, and at Pentecost 800,000; on no day during the year were there less than 200,000 foreigners. These pilgrims nearly all camped in the streets, and with perfect order.

for Prague, where the emperor Charles was residing. Having obtained an audience, he unfolded the prophecies of Friar Angelo, to the effect that a great persecution against the clergy was imminent; that the next Pope, chosen from among the poor, would erect at Rome a temple to the Holy Ghost, more beautiful than that of Solomon; that after fifteen years the entire world would profess one faith under one pastor; that the Pope, the emperor, and Rienzi formed an image of the Trinity on earth, and therefore the emperor should rule in the West and Rienzi in the East. Then Rienzi offered to return to Rome, to open the way for Charles. The monarch penetrated his visitor's incognito, and Rienzi, having admitted his identity, was ordered to reduce his views to writing. When this was done, the prelates and many theologians, who examined the document, declared that it at least smacked of heresy, whereupon Charles consigned Rienzi to the custody of the archbishop of Prague until the pontifical pleasure should be signified. According to the will of Clement VI., the ex-tribune was sent to Avignon in July, 1351. "This once redoubted tribune," writes Petrarch to the prior of the church of the Holy Apostles in Florence, "now the most unfortunate of men, has been brought here as a captive. He who from a distance once caused the wicked to tremble, who filled the good with hope, has entered the Roman court humiliated and despised; he to whom the greatest lords of Italy paid honor walked between two jailers."

During the consideration of his case, Cola di Rienzi was confined in a cell in the upper part of the tower of Trouillas. His food was the same as that of the Pope, and books were furnished him in abundance (1). It would appear that Charles IV. communicated none of Rienzi's plans or *fraticelli* doctrines to the Pontiff; and, says Christophe, "we must not confound the real errors of these friars (which Rienzi's letter to Friar Angelo shows him to have certainly embraced) with the one charged to him toward the end of his tribunate, and which Clement VI., in his address to the Romans, reduced to this proposition: 'The city of Rome and the Universal Church are one and the same thing.' But a matter of so

(1) *Fragments*, b. II., c. xiii.

little importance would not have been seriously regarded as a heresy." Petrarch informs us that the judges examined only two charges—that of having tried to withdraw the Roman States from the papal domination, and of having sustained that the Holy Roman Empire, as well as the election thereto of its emperor and its suzerainty, belonged to the Roman people. Only the clemency of the Pontiff saved Rienzi from a traitor's death. Petrarch says that the culprit's escape was due to the discovery that he was a great poet, and the judges could not bring themselves to condemn a poet. This singular discovery might deceive the populace; but no sensible person, not even Petrarch himself, would credit it. Rienzi never composed a single verse. We can only suppose, therefore, that his acquittal was due to the Pope's kindness. He was restored to freedom, but was forbidden to leave Avignon.

Meanwhile the Eternal City had again become the scene of factions. The government instituted by the legate, Bertrand de Deux, very soon vanished, and once more brigandage was the order of the day. On December 26, 1350, the disgusted people, guided by a few wise men, assembled in the basilica of St. Mary Major, and determined to vest authority in an absolute hand. Having selected one John Cerroni, a man of integrity, they rushed to the Capitol, expelled the senator, Luca Savelli, and forced all the nobles to recognize their choice; while he, in turn, swore fidelity to the Holy See before the papal vicar. But Cerroni held office only twenty months; he felt his own weakness, he could not bear the derision of the nobility, and hence resigned. The factions now resumed their sway. On September 14, 1351, the people again seized the Capitol, and, seduced by the eloquence of Francis Baroncelli—called *lo schiavo*, or "the slave," a senatorial scrivener,—restored the tribunate in the person of this demagogue. For a time there was order, but the new master soon played the tyrant; riots followed, and in one of them he perished. But while yet in power, Baroncelli was the unconscious cause of Rienzi's restoration to the tribunate.

Pope Clement VI. was called to his reward on the 5th of December, 1352; he was succeeded by Stephen Aubert,

bishop of Ostia and Velletri, and grand penitentiary of the Roman Church, who took the name of Innocent VI. At that moment the temporal authority of the pope-kings in the Roman States had become, thanks to the blunder of Clement V., almost a thing of the past (1). To remedy this state of affairs, the new Pontiff dispatched the celebrated cardinal Albornoz into Italy with extraordinary powers: he was to repress heresy, restore the honor of the priesthood, elevate the dignity of worship, banish political and social disorder, succor the poor, force a restitution of all territory stolen from the Holy See, and restore its sovereign and suzerain authority. How well he succeeded, after a struggle of fifteen years, is detailed by secular historians; we wish only to allude to his connection with Rienzi (2).

While Albornoz was resting at Montefiascone, and superintending the fortification of that place—which he intended to make a base of operations for an aggressive campaign against the usurpers of the Papal States,—a deputation of Romans waited upon him, begging his immediate aid in preventing some other Baroncelli from again seizing on the Capitol. At this juncture the legate was informed that Rienzi was entering the camp, bearing letters from the Pontiff. Having learned of the usurpation of Baroncelli, Innocent VI. had resolved to oppose the old tribune to the new one; he thought, said he to the vice-legate Harpajon, that Rienzi, taught by adversity, would abandon the romantic for the practical, and would sincerely direct his talents for the good of the Roman Church and the Roman people. Albornoz had now no need of Rienzi, Baroncelli having fallen; and, besides, he had little confidence either in the ex-tribune's talent or his sincerity. Hence he did not send him to Rome, but to Perugia; taking care also, while assigning him a comfortable revenue, that it should be one which would furnish small resources to ambition. However, accident aided Rienzi. For several years one of the most famous *condottieri* in Europe, Fra Moreale, a Knight Hospitaller of St. John—leading, however, a life in no way

(1) The only cities where it was fully recognized were Montefiascone, in the Patrimony, and Montefalcone, in the Duchy of Spoleto. See Baluze, *Vitæ Papearum*. vol. i., p. 323.

(2) See Note in our vol. i., p. 517.

conforming to his religious profession,—had been amassing an enormous fortune by pillaging throughout Italy (1). Just about this time he had deposited his capital in the banks of Perugia, and his two brothers, Arimbaldo and Brettone, were engaged in its investment. Rienzi formed their acquaintance, and, taking advantage of a romantic disposition on the part of Arimbaldo, he seduced his imagination with the prospect of immortal glory, to be attained by a revival of the majesty of ancient Rome. Rienzi would at once make him a Roman citizen, and appoint him grand captain of the Roman forces. Arimbaldo therefore, loaned the adventurer 3,000 florins, and prevailed on Moreale to advance 4,000. Then Rienzi donned an ermine robe, knightly spurs, etc., and, accompanied by the two brothers, waited on Albornoz again at Montefiascone, and demanded the senatorship of Rome. In the legate's camp there were a great many Romans, who now seemed to remember only the favorable side of Rienzi's former administration; again, the cardinal had experienced the inability of Guido d'Isola, the senator whom he had appointed (2). Rienzi was therefore made senator; and, followed by about five hundred soldiers, whom Malatesta of Rimini had just dismissed, he set out for Rome.

Had Rienzi been another Scipio Africanus, he could not have been received by the Romans with more idolatrous enthusiasm. Nearly all the inhabitants went out as far as Monte Mario to meet him. Olive-branches, sign of victory and peace, were in every hand. The entire route to the Capitol was decorated with triumphal arches; and, as time had not permitted that degree of ornamentation which their hearts would have furnished, the women covered these arches with their daintiest robes. The soil trodden by the procession could not be seen, so thickly was it strewn with flowers; and hundreds of choirs sang the glories of the "liberator." Arrived at the Capitol, Rienzi pronounced one

(1) His first reputation was gained in the service of King Louis of Hungary in Naples. Forced to surrender Aversa, where he was royal vicar, in 1352, he served a while under the papal standard against John of Vico, and then became a freebooter.

(2) Epistle of Albornoz to Innocent VI., in the archives of the Albornoz College at Bologna, cited by Christophe.

of his grandiloquent harangues, named Arimbaldo and Brettone leaders and standard-bearers of the Roman armies, and dispatched news of his accession to all the cities and feudatories of the papal dominions. Never had ruler a more promising prospect than that now open before Rienzi; but a few days showed that experience had taught him nothing. Armed guards constantly accompanied him; his profuse expenditures exhausted the treasury, and he levied new and exorbitant taxes; he became a glutton and a drunkard, and ere long his inflamed visage and ungainly frame excited disgust. Not only did he neglect to pay Moreale the money advanced, but he extorted further sums, and reduced Arimbaldo and Brettone to penury. When Moreale himself came to Rome to insist on his dues, he was arrested, tried, and decapitated, under pretext of his many depredations. The undoubted guilt of the ex-Hospitaller might have neutralized the indignation felt by the Romans because of Rienzi's ingratitude; but while the scaffold yet reeked with the blood of the brigand, it received another victim in the person of Pandolfuccio di Guido, a citizen universally esteemed for probity and wisdom, whose only crime was his popularity.

The once loved Rienzi now inspired only hate and fear. But his vanity led him to regard the sombre silence around him as indicative of unlimited submission, and not as the token of popular anger. Every day saw some new victim dragged off to the Capitol there to lose life or fortune; and scarcely two months from the day of his restoration, horror lost its stupefying influence on the people, and they arose in their might to administer punishment. On the morning of October 8, 1354, says Matthew Villani (1), the tribune, yet in his bed, was washing his face with Greek wine, when he heard shouts of "Live the people!" Soon great numbers of armed men invested the Capitol, and the cry went up, "Death to the traitor Rienzi!" At first the tribune scorned to notice the rioters; he would not order the great bell to be rung, to summon such of his partisans as remained faith-

(1) Fortiflocca ascribes the awakening of the people to even an earlier date—September 8,—but the best critics follow Villani in this matter.

ful (1). When he realized his danger, he found that of all his council and even of his body servants three alone remained with him. It may have been true courage, or his ever dominant love of the theatrical, or even a mixture of both, which now inspired Rienzi ; but he put on his armor, and, taking the standard of the people in his hand, he went out onto the main balcony of the palace. Raising his hand to command silence, he once more essayed the magic of his eloquence ; but a shower of missiles fell around him, his right arm was wounded, and the redoubled yells of the furious multitude rendered his voice powerless. Returning to his room, Rienzi excogitated and abandoned many plans to retain his position, or at least secure his safety ; and the palace was already in flames, and the outer doors forced, when he threw off his armor and all the insignia of his dignity, cut off his beard, stained his countenance, put on the dress of a peasant, and, throwing a mattress on his shoulders as though he were one of the pillagers now at work in the palace, he mixed in the crowd, and was already out on the square, when his golden bracelets, forgotten in the excitement, attracted attention. Being questioned as to his identity, he admitted that he was the tribune. Rough hands dragged him to the Steps of the Lion, where he had pronounced so many sentences of death ; but during an entire hour, while he was exposed to the scoffs of the mob, no violence was offered him. At length one Francis del Vecchio plunged his sword to the hilt into the abdomen of the unfortunate man ; a notary named Trejo cut off his head ; the crowd fell on, cut the body to pieces, and finally cast them into the flames.

Thus perished Cola di Rienzi,—a warning to all who would fain resuscitate ideas which are repugnant to those of their age, or unadapted to the spirit of the society in which they move. It were unjust to Rienzi to compare him to the Red Shirt of modern Italian demagogism ; although, like that filibuster, he could excite a revolution, while unable to

(1) The Insurgents were principally from the quarters of Castel Sant' Angelo, Ripa, and Colonna, where the Savelli and Colonna families had great influence. In the other *rioni*, Rienzi's friends were more numerous.

direct it. He was a learned man, but was wanting in policy. Character he had, and yet he was a braggart. However, his figure will always be prominent in history; for in his enterprise there was a grandeur which must ever distinguish it from the common run of revolutions.

CHAPTER XLI.

WYCLIFFE.

In the year 1365 a priest named John Wycliffe obtained from Archbishop Islip the wardenship of Canterbury Hall, lately founded at Oxford by that prelate; and he excluded from the establishment the monk Wodehall, who had enjoyed the position since 1363. Islip died a few months afterward, and the new primate, Simon Langham, ordered Wycliffe to make way for Wodehall, contending that the appointment of a secular priest was contrary to the original charter of the Hall. Wycliffe vainly appealed to Rome; and to this defeat his contemporaries attribute his bitterness toward the Roman court and the monastic Orders. He soon received the living of Lutterworth, but continued to lecture at Oxford. His first onslaught on the friars was to the effect that a mendicant life was contrary to the Gospel; and when the religious replied that Christ was supported by alms, he answered that our Lord received, but did not ask. Soon he declared that the entire clergy "were choked with the tallow of worldly goods, and therefore were hypocrites and Antichrists" (1). The priests being sinners, it was the duty of the laity to seize their possessions. To propagate these and other errors, which we shall soon describe, Wycliffe organized a band of fanatics whom he styled "poor priests," men with bare feet, coarsely clad, whom he sent over the land as preachers. In 1377 Pope Gregory XI. ordered Sudbury, archbishop of Canterbury, to summon Wycliffe before his tribunal, and when the mandate was issued, the agitator presented himself, accompanied by the royal duke of Lancaster, and Percy, the lord-marshal. That Lan-

(1) RYMER, vii., 41.

caster's object was the intimidation of the bishops, was at once manifested by his ordering them to allow Wycliffe to sit down (1). Courtenay, bishop of London, had sufficient spirit to refuse the demand, and Lancaster became insolent; whereupon the spectators rushed to the defence of their pastor, and only Courtenay's interposition saved the life of the duke. But the court evinced very little zeal and courage; it simply reprimanded Wycliffe, and ordered him to be silent thereafter on such matters as had caused trouble.

This impunity encouraged the innovator to broach new errors. He attacked the ceremonies of worship, the monastic vows, the devotion to saints, the free will of man, the authority of Councils, etc. Nineteen propositions, taken from his teachings, having been submitted to the Holy See in 1377, they were condemned. A court met on Dec. 28, under the presidency of the primate, and Wycliffe read his defence, first signifying his readiness to submit to the decisions of the Church. He then took up the propositions condemned at Rome, explaining and qualifying them with quibbles. Thus, whereas he had taught that "charters of perpetual inheritance were impossible; that even God could not give to man civil possessions forever," he declared that by "forever" he meant "after the day of judgment." Again, having contended that "if there is a God, temporal lords may lawfully and meritoriously take the possessions of a sinful Church," he explained that in such a case the secular lords would not act of their own authority; they would act by command of God (2). The innovator was again dismissed, with an injunction to abstain from ambiguous language; and quite naturally he regarded this farce as a triumph, and even presumed to forward the propositions censured by Gregory XI. to that Pontiff's successor, offering to sustain their orthodoxy. In the meantime the Great Western Schism caused the Wycliffe affair to be dropped for some

(1) Lancaster's object in espousing the cause of Wycliffe was to so embarrass the bishops as to prevent them from insisting that justice should be done to the bishop of Winchester, whom Judge Shipworth, a creature of the duke, had deprived of his temporalities. For some time, owing to the age of Edward III. and the illness of the prince of Wales, Lancaster had held the reins of power, and had given signs of that policy which, in the following reign, was to cause the "Wars of the Roses."

(2) WALSINGHAM, 206.

years, and gave the agitator opportunity to increase the number of his followers. The famous insurrection of the Commons occurred in 1381, and the "poor priests" of Wycliffe were not backward in fomenting the discontent. The peasants were naturally pleased with the doctrine that all right to property is founded in grace alone; and that no sinful man can claim the services of another. In June nearly all the men of Essex arose in revolt under the leadership of an itinerant priest who called himself Jack Straw; the men of Kent followed, under the command of Wat Tyler and a preacher named John Ball (1). The insurgents, a hundred thousand strong, listened eagerly to the instructions of the Wycliffite chaplain, which were to rid themselves of all office-holders, from the archbishop and all nobles, down to the last of the magistrates. Promising to make Ball primate and chancellor of the state, the mob set about their work of destruction. Every judge, lawyer, etc., whom they captured was decapitated; so was Archbishop Sudbury, and his head fixed on London Bridge. When finally the insurrection was crushed, men began to realize the necessity of repressing the doctrines which had been mainly responsible for its excesses.

One of the the first measures of Courtenay, the new primate, was the convocation of a synod to take action in regard to the new heresy. Twenty-four of the Wycliffite propositions were condemned, and Wycliffe himself was deprived by the king of all right to teach. An appeal of the agitator to parliament only alienated many of his partisans; even Lancaster urged him to submit to the synodical decision. He yielded and retired to his rectory of Lutterworth. Here, on Dec. 29, 1384, while assisting at Mass, he was stricken with apoplexy, and died two days afterward. Lingard says of the character and sentiments of Wycliffe: "Exemplary in his morals, he declaimed against vice with the freedom and severity of an apostle; but, whether it were policy or prejudice, he directed his bitterest invectives almost exclusively

(1) Knyghton styles Ball the precursor of Wycliffe, for he had become an itinerant some years before the latter began his innovations. He had been excommunicated by archbishops Islip, Langham, and Sudbury, and when Wycliffe started on his heretical career, Ball adopted most of his ideas. WILKINS, *Councils*, iii., 64. 152. WALSHINGHAM, 275.

against the clergy. His itinerant priests formed, indeed, an honorable exception; they were true evangelical preachers; but the rest, the Pope, bishops, dignitaries, and the whole body of the 'clerks pensioners,' were no better than liars and fiends, hypocrites and traitors, heretics and Antichrists. . . . He contended that they were bound to lead a life of poverty, like their Master (1) It will not excite surprise if doctrines so prejudicial to their interests, alarmed and irritated the clergy. They appealed for protection to the king and the Pontiff; but though their reputations and fortunes were at stake, they sought not to revenge themselves on their adversary, but were content with an order for his removal from the university to reside on his own living. If the reader allot to him the praise of courage, he cannot refuse to them the praise of moderation."

The following are the twenty-four Wycliffian propositions condemned by the synod of London in 1382. The qualification of heretical was affixed to: I. The substance of the bread and wine remains after the consecration in the Sacrament of the Altar. II. After the consecration, in the same Sacrament, the accidents do not remain without a subject. III. Christ is not identically, truly, and really present in body in the same Sacrament. IV. Bishops or priests who are in mortal sin do not confer Sacraments. V. If a person be properly contrite, auricular confession is superfluous. VI. There is no Scriptural proof that Christ instituted the Mass. VII. God must obey the devil. VIII. If the Pope is a prestidigitator and a bad man, and hence a limb of Satan, he has no power over the faithful, unless perchance that given him by Cæsar. IX. After Urban VI. no one is to be recognized as Pope; like the Greek schismatics, we are to live under our own laws. X. Temporal possessions are forbidden to ecclesiastics by Scripture. The following propositions were censured as erroneous: I. No prelate should excommunicate a person unless he knows that God has so done. II. He who does this becomes a heretic. III. A prelate who excommunicates a cleric who appeals to the king or the royal council, is, by the very

(1) In his *Triologue*, iv., 15, Wycliffe says that the man who first taught it to be lawful to endow churchmen was the worst of heretics and Antichrists.

fact, a traitor to God, the king, and the nation. IV. They who, because of excommunication by men, cease preaching or hearing the word of God, are themselves excommunicated. V. Any priest or deacon may preach without permission of Pope or bishop. VI. No person is a lord in civil matters, or a bishop or prelate, while he is in mortal sin. VII. Temporal lords may take away, as they will, the goods of delinquent ecclesiastics; and the people may correct, as they will, their delinquent superiors. VIII. Tithes are merely alms, and parishioners may withhold them from sinful pastors. IX. Special prayers applied by prelates or religious to one person are of no more avail than general prayers, other things being equal. X. By the very fact of entering into a religious Order, a person becomes more incapable of obeying the commandments of God. XI. Those who founded religious Orders, whether mendicant or not, committed sin in so doing. XII. The members of religious Orders do not belong to the Christian religion. XIII. A friar should obtain his living by the labor of his hands. XIV. He who gives alms to a friar is excommunicated, as well as the recipient.

The following errors should also be noted. Every creature is God (1). God can produce nothing besides what He does produce (2). God cannot amplify or diminish the universe, nor can He create souls beyond a certain number (3). God cannot reduce any creature to nothing (4). The term *a quo* of creation is not mere nothing, but the most perfect *esse* of the thing created, that is, its ideal *esse*; for the power of God does not extend itself to nothing (5). God gives only to the just (6). All things happen from absolute necessity, and God necessitates every creature to its every action (7). The human nature of Christ, independent of the Word, is to be adored with *latria*; even if the Word were to relinquish it, it should be so adored (8). Peter and the Roman Pontiffs, of whom some were probably the devil, are not at the head of the Church (9). The election of the Pope by the

(1) *Jews*, c. iii.—THOMAS WALDEN, v. I., b. I., c. i.

(3) WALDEN, c. xiii.

(5) *Trial.*, c. xi.—WALDEN, c. xx.

(7) *Trial.*, c. xiii.—Council Const.

(9) Conc. Const.

(2) *Triologue*, b. I., c. ii.

(4) *Idem*, c. xvii—*Universals*, c. xiii.

(6) *Idem*, b. ii., Art. 3, c. lxxxii.

(8) WALDEN, v. I., b. I., Art. 3, c. xxxix.

cardinals is an invention of the devil (1). The power exercised by the Pope is derived from Cæsar, and has no foundation in Scripture (2). An excommunication by the Pope or any prelate is not to be feared, for it is a censure by Antichrist (3). The Pope has no right to issue decrees (4). When human laws are not founded on the Bible, subjects are not bound to obey (5). The Church is the entirety of the predestined (6). The Chapter of Antichrist consists of the Pope, the cardinals, bishops, officials, canons, monks, and mendicant friars (7). The sacramental "character" is found neither in Scripture nor in reason (8). Baptism is not necessary (9). The Holy Ghost is not given in Confirmation (10). The Body of Christ in the Eucharist is a thing inferior to a flea, because it is bread (11). Confession was invented by Antichrist or his limb, in order to penetrate into secrets, and lay hold of the goods of seculars (12). The sins of the predestined to glory are only venial; the sins of others are mortal (13). Extreme Unction is a sacrament only when the virtue of the administrator merits that it shall be such (14). In the matrimonial contract the consent of the parties, without any visible sign, is sufficient (15). The impediments enforced by the Church are to be disregarded; there is no reason why we should not follow the system which obtained in the first days of the human race (16).

John Luke, an Oxford theologian, collected 266 errors from the works of Wycliffe; Thomas Walden 800; but the Council of Constance reduced them to 45 heads. It must be observed, however, that it is not always easy to discern Wycliffe's real sentiments. "In common with other religious innovators", says Lingard, "he claimed the twofold privilege of changing his opinions at will, and of being infallible in every change; and when he found it expedient to

(1) *Truth and Falsehood*, c. x.

(3) Conc. Const.

(5) WALSINGHAM, p. 283.

(7) *Members of the Church*, ch. xvi.(9) *Ibi*, ch. xii.(11) *Apostacy*, ch. xviii.

(13) WALDEN, vol. II., ch. clv.

(15) *Ibi*, ch. xxii.(2) *Christ and Antichrist*, ch. vii.

(4) KNYGHTON, b. V.

(6) *Antichrist*, ch. i.—*Dowry of the Church*, ch. ii.(8) *Trial*, IV., ch. xv.(10) *Ibi*, ch. xiv.(12) *Trial*, IV., ch. xxiv.(14) *Trial*, IV., ch. xv.(16) *Ibi*, ch. xx.

dissemble, could so qualify his doctrines with conditions, or explain them away by distinctions, as to give an appearance of innocence to tenets of the most mischievous tendency." It is remarkable that Wycliffe, in spite of his invectives against the Pope and prelates, affirmed that "prelates and priests ordeyned of God comen in the stade of apostles and disciples, and that the Pope is the highest vicar that Crist has on erth" (1). Another inconsistency of this innovator was his condemnation of the voluntary poverty of the friars, in spite of his reduction of even the secular clergy to absolute indigence; for himself, however, he took good care to retain his living of Lutterworth, and died in its enjoyment. With regard to his doctrine on the Eucharist, although his language sometimes sounds orthodox, it is certain that his teaching was similar to that of impanation, afterward introduced by Luther: "It is verray Goddus Body in fourme of brede. . . . It is verray Goddus Body and verray brede" (2). And he contends that "the right faith of Christen men is this, that this worshipful Sacrament is brede and Christ's body" (3). He holds that "the sacrifice of the kirk is maad in two thingis togidre; that is, the visible spicis of elements and invisible flesch and blood of our Lord Jhu Crist, Sacrament and thing of the Sacrament. . . . this thing that is seen is brede; but this that the faith askyth to be enformed, the brede is the Body of Crist" (4). As to matrimony, Wycliffe held that the usual form, "I take thee to wife," contains a falsehood; the learned Oxford doctor descended to the following petty quibble. No woman becomes a wife until her consent is given; but in the marriage ceremony the man says: "I take thee to wife," before the woman gives that consent; therefore he says what is false, and hence the marriage is void (5). However, he held that interior consent was sufficient. He also taught that a woman who had passed the time of child-bearing could not lawfully be married. Wycliffe believed in purgatory and in the efficacy of the Mass, although he taught that there is no Scriptural proof that Christ instituted the latter. He says that "the seying

(1) *MS. of Prelates*, in Lewis, p. 129, cited by Lingard.

(2) KNYGHTON, 2649.

(3) *MS. in Lewis*, 78—*Trial*. IV., 27.(4) *Apology*, p. 49.(5) *Trial*. IV., 20, 22.

of Mass with clenness of holy life and brenning devotion full much, and neet hondes, most pleaseth God almighty, and profiteth to Cristen souls in purgatory" (1). Few of Wycliffe's outbursts are more eloquent of disgust than his declamations against some singing in the churches: "When there ben forty or fifty in a queer, three or four proud and lecherous lorels shullen knack the most devout service, that no man shall hear the sentence, and all other shullen be dumb, and looken on them as fools. And then strumpets and thieves praisen sire Jack, or Hobb, and William the proud clerk, how smallen they knacken their notes, and seyn that they serven well God and holy Church, when they despisen God in His face, and letten other men of their devotion and compunction, and stirren them to worldly vanity" (2).

The errors of Wycliffe, in regard to the power of God and the free will of man, are thus summed up by Bossuet: "Everything happens through necessity; all the sins committed in the world are necessary and inevitable. God could not prevent the sin of the first man, nor could He pardon him without the satisfaction by Jesus Christ; God, of course, could have done so, had He wished, but He could not wish things otherwise. Nothing is possible to God, save that which actually occurs; God can produce nothing, either within or outside Himself, which He does not produce necessarily; His power is infinite, only because there is no power greater than His own. Just as He cannot refuse being to anything that can have it, so He cannot annihilate anything. But although God acts necessarily, He is always free. What is called 'liberty of contradiction' is an invention of the schools, and our idea that we are free is a constant illusion. God has predetermined everything; hence it is that there are predestined and reprobate souls. God necessitates those of both classes to all that they do, and He cannot save others than those who are actually saved." Basnage, naturally an admirer of Wycliffe, seems to feel that this doctrine of absolute fatality is destructive of all religion, morality, and virtue; and he avows that the desire to reconcile the presence and concurrence of God with the lib-

(1) *MS. in Lewis*, 131.(2) *Ibi*, 134.

erty of man, greatly embarrassed the English speculator. But then, says Basnage, many others have been lost in the depth and obscurity of this question. If he realized its obscurity, asks Bergier, why did he attempt to decide it by the absurd supposition that what is done necessarily is done freely ; that necessity and liberty are the same thing?

It is generally, if not universally, believed that Wycliffe was the author of the first translation of the Bible into the English language. Not only Protestant, but Catholic writers of reputation, are responsible for this opinion ; but in our day the learned Benedictine, F. A. Gasquet, has conclusively shown that the opinion is without foundation (1). However, be this as it may, we must remember that before the time of Wycliffe, and for many years after it, there was no need of an English version of the Scriptures. Latin and French were familiar to all Englishmen who could read at all ; the English language was not that of the court or of the educated classes. Then the rolls of parliament, and all legal documents which were not written in Latin, were couched in the French tongue. Even pleadings in the courts were made in French exclusively until 1362 ; and then, although they could be made in English, the records of the same pleadings were preserved in Latin. Not until 1363 was parliament ever opened with a speech in English. When such was the condition of linguistic matters, it is evident that an English version of the Bible was a superfluity (2). Nevertheless, that such versions existed before the days of Wycliffe, is admitted by that famous Protestant authority, the "martyrologist" Foxe. Dedicating to Archbishop Parker his edition of the Saxon Gospels, he writes :

"If histories be well examined, we shall find both before the Conquest and after, as well before John Wycliffe was

(1) *The Pre-Reformation English Bible* ; in the Dublin Review, July, 1894.

(2) "It has been shown beyond the possibility of doubt that in Germany there existed in the Middle Ages some seventy-two partial versions of the vernacular Scriptures and fifty complete translations, all emanating from Catholic sources. The same numerous translations existed also in France, with this difference, that, whilst most of the French manuscripts are *livres de luxe*, in Germany they appear to be small volumes, which point to their use as aids to personal piety rather than as books for mere library use."—GASQUET : *loc. cit.*,—Pope Innocent III. (1198), writing to the bishop of Metz, speaks of many French versions of the Bible as then current. But the most famous early French version, that of Guyards des Moulins, appeared in 1294.

borne as since, the whole body of the Scriptures was by sundry men translated into our country tongue." And listen to Cranmer, in his prologue to the second edition of the great Bible :

"If the matter shoulde be tried by custome, wee might also alleidge custome for the reading of the scripture in the vulgar tongue, and prescribe the more ancient custome. For it is not much above one hundred yeare ago, since scripture hath not been accustomed to be read in the vulgar tongue within this realme, and many hundred yeares before that, it was translated and read in the Saxon's tongue, whiche at that tyme was our mother tongue ** and when this language waxed olde and out of common usage, bycause folke should not lacke the fruit of reading, it was again translated into the newer language, whereof yet also many copies remayne and be dayly founde" (1). Blessed Thomas More says : "The whole byble was long before his (*i. e.*, Wycliffe's) days by vertuous and well learned men, translated into the English tongue and by good and godly people with devotion, and soberness, wel and reverently red."

We refer the reader to the cited article by Gasquet for convincing proofs that Wycliffe was not the author of that famous volume which is preserved in the King's Library at the British Museum as "The English Bible, Wycliffe's Translation;" and that the Sacred Scriptures, commonly known as Wycliffite, are really Catholic versions by our pre-Reformation forefathers.

Since Wycliffe is regarded by Protestant writers as one of the precursors of the Reformation, it may be interesting to notice how far, and in what important matters, this heresiarch differed from the Reformers, whether of the Lutheran, Anglican, or Calvinist schools. All the children of the Reformation, who admit any Sacraments whatever, regard only Baptism and the Eucharist as such; Wycliffe admitted seven. Commenting on *Mark XV.*, he compares the Sacraments to so many fortifications, and having described the seven, he says that "this entire series of fortifications was founded by Christ, giving to His vicars power to everywhere

(1) *Dialogues*, edit. 1530, p. 138. Strype's *Cranmer*, App., 212.

erect them" (1). He also says that our Lord "instituted all the Sacraments; some, indeed, which are the more difficult to believe, and the more necessary for salvation, He himself promulgated, as Baptism, the Eucharist, Orders, and Penance; others again through the Apostles, as Confirmation and Extreme Unction" (2). Protestants reject auricular confession; but although, in his fourth *Triologue*, Wycliffe calls the practice an invention of Antichrist, yet when commenting on *James V.* he says: "It is necessary to receive the Sacrament of Penance for the washing away of mortal sins: confiding them not only to God, but to man. And since they are specially to be confessed to a vicar of Christ, who mediates between God and man, the after-comers ordered auricular confession" (3). The last assertion of Wycliffe is false, but the context shows that he admitted the necessity of confession. As to his inconsistency, that is a vice of all innovators. Protestants regard Extreme Unction as a useless rite, but Wycliffe, commenting on 1 Cor., c. i., says: "Extreme Unction is a medicine to cure sin, and that it has a place in the New Law, appears from *James V.*; for Extreme Unction is an efficacious, final, and universal sign of the remission of sins." Protestants have no Mass, but Wycliffe calls it "excellent, and excellently declared," and tells us that all its ceremonies are praiseworthy, as they "excite a greater love for Christ" (4). Nearly all Protestant sects reject the rites and fasts of the Church, but Wycliffe writes: "They say that we do not read that the Apostles shaved their beards and heads, as we do. Nor did they recite the Office, as we do; nor did they fast, and use vestments and rites, while celebrating, as we do. Therefore all these are illicit. What fool does not see that this does not follow?.... If it was a principle with Paul that everything should be orderly done, then these rites, as they were ordered, are taught in that principle" (5). But they who look up to the pastor of Lutterworth as their father in the Lord should hearken to his sentiments on prayer to the Mother of God: "It seems to me impossible that we can be rewarded without the assist-

(1) *Postilla on the New Testament.*
 (4) *Apostacy*, c. 18.

(2) *Ibi.* (3) *Ibi.*
 (5) *Scholastic Gradations*, c. 3.

ance of Mary. Nevertheless there are degrees in her help; some, even of those whom God foresees will be damned, she helps to avoid sin, and consequently to receive a mitigation of their eternal punishment; some she helps to the accumulation of the goods of fortune, of nature, of grace, and consequently to an avoidance of temporal danger or loss; some she helps to merit salvation. And so no one is without her superabundant assistance, whether he serves her much or little; yea, those who have merited nothing feel her help, since because of her humility and prayers for the human race they will be more lightly punished. She was, in a manner, the cause of the Incarnation and Passion of Christ, and hence of the salvation of the world. We must believe that no one merits blessedness unless by the grace of God, and by his consequent finding of God. Mary always interposes before the merits of our sins, because she obtains for sinners that they repent. Hence there is no sex, age, state, or condition in the human race that needs not to implore the aid of the Virgin" (1).

Mosheim admits that the doctrine of Wycliffe was not free from error; but he deems the changes advocated by the innovator wise, salutary, and useful in many respects (2). Was it wise and salutary to attempt to despoil the clergy of their legitimate revenues? Neither before Mosheim's time nor since has any state spoliation of the Church benefited the people one iota. It has been tried in nearly every land, but the people have not found their taxes any lighter therefor; nay, as a rule, their burdens have become greater, for the works of mercy once performed by churchmen have fallen perforce to the duty of an unwilling and merciless state, which generally squanders more money than it gives to the needy. As an illustration of what Mosheim calls useful and salutary, we need not go out of England, where, before the state had played the game recommended by Wycliffe, the work-house was unknown.

Basnage and other Protestant polemics deplore the severe punishments inflicted upon the Wycliffites, or Lollards, as they came to be called, and hold them up to the contempla-

(1) *Sermon on the Assumption.*

(2) *History*, Cent. 14, pt. 2, c. 2, § 19.

tion of the credulous as a proof of the savage intolerance of the Church of Rome. But it is certain that no Wycliffite was severely punished; that very few were punished at all before the sanguinary outbreak of Straw, Ball, etc., in 1381. The history of this insurrection—one of the most repulsive records of rapine, sacrilege, and murder ever penned—shows that its instigators deserved death for their crimes. In fact, they were not punished for heresy, but as subverters of the state. Ball had preached his inflammatory doctrines throughout England during twenty years, with no other punishment than a few months' confinement; and the prime author of all the trouble—Wycliffe—was allowed to retain his curacy, and was not deprived of those revenues which he would have taken from his opponents. Well may Lingard, by no means an enthusiast, say that the English clergy of that period deserve the praise of moderation. And in after years, although the Wycliffites persevered in their incendiary course, the clergy were content with obtaining from Richard II. their expulsion from the faculty of Oxford. Not until the year 1401, in the reign of Henry IV., after thirty-six years of a toleration at which an Elizabeth would have laughed (1), did there occur a capital execution for heresy, and that was the first instance in English history (2), though the death penalty had been, for many centuries, adjudged to persistent heretics by the common law in every country of Europe. Until the year 1413., in the reign of Henry V., we meet with no further persecution of the Lollards; but then occurred the famous insurrection of Sir John Oldcastle. This reformer had been pre-eminent in vice among all the dissolute companions of Henry's youth; and out of the ashes of his memory Shakspeare is said to have formed his character of *Falstaff* (3).

(1) Sir Edward Coke, the bright particular star of the English bar during the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I., and, for that day, a determined foe of arbitrary power, taught that heresy should meet with condign punishment, because it was a crime, not against human, but against divine Majesty—an infectious leprosy of the soul. *Institutes*, III., 5.

(2) The victim was a priest named William Sawtre, chaplain of St. Osith's in London.

(3) Originally the character was presented by the old dramatists under the name of Oldcastle, "the rufflan knight, as all England knows" (PARSONS, *Three Conversions*). In the old play of *The Famous Victories*, Oldcastle occurs as a low rufflan. On this matter Knight remarks: "Whether or not Shakspeare's *Falstaff* was originally called Oldcastle, he was, after the character was fairly established as *Falstaff*, anxious to vindicate himself

Under the auspices of this apostle the children of Wycliffe undertook to "reform the priesthood and the knighthood;" and as the Commons stated in their address to Henry, "to destroy the Christian faith, the king, the spiritual and temporal estates, and all manner of policy and law." They designed, as Henry afterward stated in his proclamation, and as is proved by the judicial records and parliamentary documents, "to destroy him, his brothers, and several of the spiritual and temporal lords; to confiscate the possessions of the Church; to secularize the religious Orders; to divide the realm into confederate districts, and to appoint Sir John Oldcastle president of the commonwealth." On the failure of the rebellion, Oldcastle escaped, but thirty-five of his followers were executed. He was taken four years afterward, and also put to death.

from the charge that he had attempted to represent the Oldcastle of history. In the epilogue to the Second Part of *Henry IV.* we find this passage: 'For anything I know, *Falstaff* shall die of a sweat, unless already he be killed with your hard opinions; for Oldcastle died a martyr, and this is not the man.' This would show a consciousness of some necessity to apologize and atone for the past." However we may view the question of the identity of Oldcastle and *Falstaff*, the readiness of the playgoers to identify them shows a popular tradition that the Lancashire baronet was not a very apostolic man, whatever Mr. Foxe may say in his *Book of Martyrs*.

APPENDIX.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

Of the Roman Pontiffs, Rulers of Principal Nations, Principal Councils, Ecclesiastical Writers, and Heretics.

NINTH CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i> <i>Date of Election.</i>	<i>Western Emperors.</i> <i>Date of Death.</i>	<i>Eastern Emperors.</i> <i>Date of Death.</i>	<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>
Stephen V, 816	Charlemagne, 814	Irene, 802	St. Paulinus,
St. Paschal I, 817	Louis the Com- pliant, 817	Nicephorus, 811	Alcuin,
Eugene II, 824	Lothaire, 855	Michael Curopala- tes, 813	Theodulphus of Or- leans,
Valentine, 827	Louis II, 875	Leo the Armenian, 820	S. Theodore Studita,
Gregory IV, 844	Charles the Bald, 887	Michael the Stut- terer, 829	Agobard,
Sergius II, 847	Charles the Fat, 899	Theophilus, 842	Jonas of Orleans,
St. Leo IV, 855	Guido of Spoleto, 899	Michael III, 867	Amalarius,
Benedict III, 858	Lambert, 899	Basil the Macedon- ian, 886	Hilduin,
St. Nicholas I, 867	Arnald, 899		Walafrid Strabo,
John VIII, 872			Rabanus,
Marinus, 882	<i>Kings of France.</i>		Florus of Lyons,
Adrian III, 884	<i>Date of Death.</i>		Paschasius,
Stephen VI, 885	Charlemagne, 814		Lupus of Ferrières,
Formosus, 891	Louis the Com- pliant, 840		Usuard,
Stephen VII, 896	Charles the Bald, 877		Theodore of Abucara,
Romanus, 897	Louis the Stutter- er, 879		St. Ado of Vienne,
Theodore, 898	Louis III, 882		Anastasius the Libra- rian,
John IX, 898	Carloman, 884		Hincmar,
	Charles the Fat, dep. 887		Photius.
	Eudes, 898		

Councils.—About 200; Eighth General (4th of Constantinople).

Heretics.—Claude of Turin, Goteschalck, Photius, Scotus Erigena.

TENTH CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i> <i>Date of Election.</i>	<i>Western Emperors.</i> <i>Date of Death.</i>	<i>Eastern Emperors.</i> <i>Date of Death.</i>	<i>Kings of France.</i> <i>Date of Death.</i>
Benedict IV, 900	Vacancy during 60 years: then Pope John XII. transferred the empire from the Franks to the Ger- mans. in the person of Otho I, who died in 973	Leo the Philoso- pher, 911	Charles the Sim- ple, 929
Leo V, 903		Constantine Por- phyrogenitus, 659	Raoul, 936
Christopher, 903		Romanus, 963	Louis d'Outre-mer, 954
Sergius III, 904		Nicephorus Pho- cas, 969	Lothaire, 986
Anastasius III, Landon, 911		John Zimisceas, 976	Louis V, 987
John X, 913			Hugh Capet, 996
John XI, 914			
Leo VI, 928	Otho II, 983		<i>Kings of England.</i> <i>Date of Death.</i>
Stephen VIII, John XI, 929	Otho III, 1002		Alfred, 901
Leo VII, 931		<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>	Edward I, 925
Stephen IX, 939		St. Odo of Cluny,	Athelstan, 941
Marinus II, 943		Simeon Metaphrastes,	
Agapetus II, 946			

RULERS (CENT. X.)—*Continued.*

John XII,	956	Flodoard,	Edmund,	945
Benedict V,	964	Atto of Vercelli,	Edred,	955
John XIII,	965	Liutprand,	Edwy,	955
Benedict VI,	972	Ratherius of Verona,	Edgar,	975
Donus II,	973	Fulcuin,	Edward the Mar-	
Benedict VIII,	975	Rhegino,	tyr.	978
John XIV,	984	Auxilius,		
John XV,	985			
John XVI,	985			
Gregory V,	996			
Sylvester II,	999			

Heretics.
Anthropomorphites,
Walfred.

Councils.—More than 120.

ELEVENTH CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i>		<i>Western Emperors.</i>		<i>Eastern Emperors.</i>		<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>
<i>Date of Election.</i>		<i>Date of Death.</i>		<i>Date of Death.</i>		
John XVII,	1003	St. Henry II,	1024	Basil II,	1025	Heriger,
John XVIII,	1003	Conrad II,	1039	Constantine VIII,	1028	Guido of Arezzo,
Sergius IV,	1009	Henry III,	1056	Michael the Paph-		Burchard of Worms,
Benedict VIII,	1012			lygonian,	1041	Fulbert of Chartres,
John XIX,	1024			Michael Calæpha-		Glaber Rudolphus,
Benedict IX,	1033	<i>Kings of France.</i>		tus,	1042	Hermannus Contrac-
Gregory VI,	1044	<i>Date of Death.</i>		Zoe,	1042	tus,
Clement II,	1046	Robert,	1031	Constantine Mon-		St. Peter Damian,
Damasus II,	1048	Henry I,	1060	omachus,	1054	Theophylactus,
St. Leo IX,	1049			Michael Stratioti-		St. Anselm of Lucca,
Victor II,	1055			cus,	1057	Lanfranc,
Stephen X,	1057	<i>Kings of England.</i>		Isaac Comnenus,	1059	Guitmund,
Nicholas II,	1058	<i>Date of Death.</i>		Constantine Du-		Durand of Troars,
Alexander II,	1061	Ethelred,	1016	cas,	1067	Desiderius,
St. Gregory VII,	1073	Edmund II,	1016	Michael Para-		St. Bruno of Segni,
Victor III,	1086	Canute,	1035	pinax,	1068	Robert of Rheims,
Urban II,	1088	Harold I,	1040	Constantine Du-		Card. Humbert,
Paschal II,	1099	Hardecanute,	1042	cas,	1068	Berno,
		Edward the Con-		Romanus Diog-		Downizzo,
		fessor,	1065	enes,	1071	Laubert of Aschaf-
		Harold II,	1066	Michael Ducas,	1078	fenburg.
		William the Con-		Nicephorus Boton-		
		queror,	1087	iates,	1083	
		William II,	1100			

Councils.—More than 300.

Heretics.—New Manicheans, Berengarius, Michael Cerularius, Roscelin.

TWELFTH CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i>		<i>Western Emperors.</i>		<i>Eastern Emperors.</i>		<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>
<i>Date of Election.</i>		<i>Date of Death.</i>		<i>Date of Death.</i>		
Gelasius II,	1118	Henry IV,	1106	Alexis Comnen-		St. Anselm of Canter-
Calixtus II,	1119	Henry V,	1125	us,	1118	bury,
Honorius II,	1124	Lothair II,	1137	John Comnenus,	1149	Sigebert,
Innocent II,	1130	Conrad III,	1152	Manuel Comnen-		Ivo of Chartres,
Celestine II,	1143	Frederick I,	1190	us,	1180	Abelard,
Lucius II,	1144	Henry VI,	1197	Alexis Comnen-		Godfrey of Vendome,
Eugenius III,	1145			us II,	1183	Hugh of St. Victor,
Anastasius IV,	1153			Andronicus Com-		Suger.
Adrian IV,	1154	<i>Kings of France.</i>		nenus,	1185	St. Bernard,
Alexander III,	1159	<i>Date of Death.</i>		Isaac Angelus,	1195	Peter the Venerable,
Lucius III,	1181	Philp I,	1108			Otho of Frisingen,
Urban III,	1185	Louis VI,	1137	<i>Kings of England.</i>		Gratian.
Gregory VIII,	1187	Louis VII,	1180	<i>Date of Death.</i>		Peter Lombard,
Clement III,	1187			Henry I,	1135	Richard of St. Victor,
Celestine III,	1191			Stephen,	1154	Peter Comestor,
Innocent III,	1198			Henry II,	1189	John of Salisbury,
				Richard I,	1199	William of Tyre,
						Peter the Chanter,
						Peter of Blois.

Councils.—More than 300; 9th, 10th, and 11th General (1st, 2d, and 3d, of the Lateran).

Heretics.—Bogomiles, Peter of Bruis, Tanquelin, Arnald of Brescia, Albigenses, Waldenses.

THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i>		<i>Western Emperors.</i>	<i>Eastern Emperors.</i>	<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>		
<i>Date of Election.</i>		<i>Date of Death.</i>	<i>Date of Death.</i>			
Honorius III,	1216	Otho IV,	1218	Alexis Angelus,	1203	St. Anthony of Padua,
Gregory IX,	1227	Frederick II,	1250	Baldwin I,	1205	James of Vitry,
Celestine IV,	1241	William of Hol-		Henry I,	1216	Alexander of Hales,
Innocent IV,	1243	land,	1256	Peter de Cour-		Vincent of Beauvais,
Alexander IV,	1254	Rudolph of Haps-		tenay,	1218	Robert de Sorbonne,
Urban IV,	1261	burg,	1291	Robert de Cour-		William de Saint-
Clement IV,	1265	Adolphus of Nas-		tenay,	1228	Amour,
Gregory X,	1271	sau, dep. in	1298	John de Brienne,	1237	St. Thomas Aquinas,
Innocent V,	1276			Baldwin II, dep.		St. Bonaventura,
Adrian V,	1276	<i>Kings of France.</i>		in	1261	St. Raymond of Pen-
John XXI,	1276	<i>Date of Death.</i>		Michael Paleolo-		nalot,
Nicholas III,	1277			gus,	1282	Albert the Great,
Martin IV,	1281	Philip Augustus,	1233	<i>Kings of England.</i>		John Veccus,
Honorius IV,	1285	Louis VIII,	1226	<i>Date of Death.</i>		James de Voragine,
Nicholas IV,	1288	St. Louis IX,	1270			Roger Bacon.
St. Celestine V,	1294	Philip III,	1287	John,	1216	
Boniface VIII,	1294			Henry III,	1272	

Councils.—About 300; 12th, 13th, and 14th General (4th of the Lateran, 1st, and 2d of Lyons).

Heretics.—Abbot Joachim, Almaricus, Flagellants, Oliva, Fraticelli.

FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

<i>Popes.</i>		<i>Western Emperors.</i>	<i>Eastern Emperors.</i>	<i>Eccl. Writers.</i>		
<i>Date of Election.</i>		<i>Date of Death.</i>	<i>Date of Death.</i>			
Benedict XI,	1303	Albert I,	1303	Andronicus II,	1332	Raymond Lullo,
Clement V,	1305	Henry VII,	1313	Andronicus III,	1341	John Duns Scotus,
John XXII,	1316	Louis of Bavaria,	1347	John Paleologus,	1391	Durand de Saint-
Benedict XII,	1334	Charles IV,	1378			Pourgain.
Clement VI,	1342			<i>Kings of England.</i>		Augustine Triumphus
Innocent VI,	1352	<i>Kings of France.</i>		<i>Date of Death.</i>		William Ockam,
Urban V,	1362	<i>Date of Death.</i>		Edward II,	1327	Egidio Colonna,
Gregory XI,	1370	Philip IV,	1314	Edward III,	1377	Alvarez Pelayo,
Urban VI,	1378	Louis X,	1316	Richard II,	1399	St. Catharine of Si-
Boniface IX,	1389	John I,	1316			enna,
		Philip V,	1322			Nicholas Emeric,
		Charles IV,	1328			John of Paris,
		Philip VI,	1350			Guy of Perpignan,
		John II,	1364			Ptolemy of Lucca,
		Charles V,	1380			Adam Goddam,
						Henry Knygton,
						Gregory of Rimini,
						William of Coventry.

Councils.—About 200; Fifteenth General (of Vienne).

Heretics.—Dulcinus, Béguins, Beggaris, Lollards, Marsilio of Padua, Palamites or Quietists of Mt. Athos, Turlupins, Wyckliffe.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME II.

CENT. IX.—XIV.

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. The Middle Ages.....	1
II. The Revival of the Western Empire Under Charlemagne.....	23
III. The Fable of the Popess Joan.....	40
IV. The Greek Schism: Its First Stage Under Photius, and the Eighth General Council.....	55
V. The Addition of the Clause "And From the Son" to the Creed	81
VI. The False Decretals of Isidore Mercator.....	90
VII. The Eucharistic Doctrine in the Tenth Century.....	107
VIII. The Pretended Deposition of Pope John XII.....	114
IX. The Greek Schism: Its Revival by Michael Cerularius, and its Present Condition.....	123
X. St. Leo IX. and Pius IX.—Civitella and Castelfidardo.....	137
XI. The Pontificate of St. Gregory VII.....	144
XII. The Election of the Roman Pontiff, and Hildebrand's Defence of its Freedom.....	161
XIII. The Question of Investitures.....	170
XIV. Clerical Celibacy.....	189
XV. The Right of the Pope to Depose Sovereigns.....	202
XVI. The Heresy of Berengarius.....	220
XVII. Abelard.....	227
XVIII. The Crusades: Their Justice and Effects.....	246
XIX. The Truce of God.....	258
XX. The Ninth General Council: First of the Lateran.....	265
XXI. The Tenth General Council: Second of the Lateran.....	268
XXII. Pope Alexander III. and the Lombard League.....	274
XXIII. The Eleventh General Council: Third of the Lateran.....	284
XXIV. The Cause of St. Thomas à Becket.....	291

CHAPTER	PAGE
XXV. The Waldenses.....	308
XXVI. The Pontificate of Innocent III	320
XXVII. The Albigenses.	350
XXVIII. The Twelfth General Council: Fourth of the Lateran	360
XXIX. The Cause of Frederick II. and the Thirteenth General Council	370
XXX. The Fourteenth General Council: Second of Lyons.	379
XXXI. The Inquisition.....	387
XXXII. Pope Boniface VIII.....	411
XXXIII. The Alleged Bargain of Pope Clement V. with Philip the Fair	435
XXXIV. The Fifteenth General Council.—Sequel of the Contest with Philip the Fair.....	446
XXXV. The Suppression of the Templars.....	454
XXXVI. The Popes at Avignon.....	487
XXXVII. The Pontificate of John XXII.: The Question of the Beatific Vision, and the Schisms of the Franciscan "Spirituals," and of Louis of Bavaria.....	497
XXXVIII. The Charge of Heresy Against Dante.....	508
XXXIX. The Great Western Schism.....	522
XL. Rienzi.....	550
XLI. Wycliffe....	568
APPENDIX: Chronological Tables, showing the Roman Pontiffs, Principal Rulers, Councils, Ecclesiastical Writers, and Heresies, during Centuries IX.—XIV.....	583

s in Church history
I II # 308

THE INSTITUTE OF MEDIAEVAL STUDIES
10 ELMSLEY PLACE
TORONTO 5, CANADA.

308.

