

LIBRARY
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

BX 953 .B68 1845 v.2
Bower, Archibald, 1686-1766
The History of the Popes

The John M. Krebs Donation.

THE

HISTORY OF THE POPES.

THE
HISTORY OF THE POPES.

FROM THE

FOUNDATION OF THE SEE OF ROME TO A. D. 1758;

BY

ARCHIBALD BOWER, ESQ.

FORMERLY PUBLIC PROFESSOR OF RHETORIC, HISTORY, AND PHILOSOPHY, IN THE UNIVERSITIES
OF ROME, FERMO, AND MACERATA, AND IN THE LATTER PLACE
COUNSELLOR OF THE INQUISITION.

WITH

AN INTRODUCTION,

AND

A CONTINUATION TO THE PRESENT TIME:

BY

REV. SAMUEL HANSON COX, D. D.,

PROFESSOR EXTRAORDINARY OF BIBLICAL AND CHRISTIAN HISTORY IN THE UNION
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOL. II.

PHILADELPHIA:
GRIFFITH & SIMON, 188 NORTH THIRD STREET.

STEREOTYPED BY J. C. D. CHRISTMAN & CO.

1845.

AN
ALPHABETICAL CATALOGUE

OF
THE POPE S,
FROM A. D. 702 TO A. D. 1264.

VOLUME II.

	Election.	Death.	Page.		Election.	Death.	Page.
Anastasius III.	A.D. 911	A.D. 913	307	Hadrian IV.	A.D. 1154	A.D. 1159	487
Agapetus II.	946	956	314	Honorius III.	1216	1227	550
Alexander II.	1061	1073	370	Innocent II.	1130	1143	464
Anastasius IV.	1153	1154	485	Innocent III.	1198	1216	535
Alexander III.	1159	1181	502	Innocent IV.	1243	1254	560
Alexander IV.	1254	1261	567	John VI.	701	705	8
Benedict III.	855	858	227	John VII.	705	707	12
Boniface VI.	896	896	299	Joan			221
Benedict IV.	900	903	304	John VIII.	872	882	283
Benedict V.	964	965	320	John IX.	898	900	302
Benedict VI.	972	974	324	John X.	914	928	308
Benedict VII.	975	984	324	John XI.	931	936	311
Benedict VIII.	1012	1024	335	John XII.	956	963	315
Benedict IX.	1033	1045	340	John XIII.	965	972	321
Benedict X.	1058	Deposed.	365	John XIV.	984	985	325
Constantine	708	715	14	John XV. or XVI.	985	996	326
Christopher	903	903	306	John XVII.	1003	1003	333
Clement II.	1046	1047	342	John XVIII.	1003	1009	334
Calixtus II.	1119	1124	456	John XIX.	1024	1033	337
Celestine II.	1143	1144	475	Leo III.	795	816	173
Clement III.	1187	1191	529	Leo IV.	847	855	217
Celestine III.	1191	1198	531	Leo V.	903	903	306
Celestine IV.	1241	1241	559	Lando	913	914	308
Donus II.	975	975	324	Leo VI.	928	929	311
Damasus II.	1048	1048	343	Leo VII.	936	939	312
Eugenius II.	824	827	202	Leo VIII.	963	965	319
Eugenius III.	1144	1153	477	Leo IX.	1048	1054	343
Formosus	891	896	297	Lucius II.	1144	1144	476
Gregory II.	715	732	20	Lucius III.	1181	1184	524
Gregory III.	732	741	69	Marinus I.	882	884	292
Gregory IV.	827	844	209	Marinus II., or } Martinus III. }	942	946	314
Gregory V.	996	999	329	Nicholas I.	858	867	229
Gregory VI.	1046	Deposed 1046	341	Nicholas II.	1058	1061	366
Gregory VII.	1073	1085	377	Paul I.	757	767	109
Gelasius II.	1118	1119	453	Paschal I.	817	824	193
Gregory VIII.	1187	1187	528	Paschal II.	1099	1118	427
Gregory IX.	1227	1241	552	Romanus	897	898	301
Hadrian I.	772	795	126	Sisinnius	708	708	14
Hadrian II.	867	872	267	Stephen II.	752	757	90
Hadrian III.	884	885	293	Stephen III.	769	772	114
Honorius II.	1124	1130	461				

AN ALPHABETICAL CATALOGUE OF THE POPES.

	Election.	Death.	Page.		Election.	Death.	Page.
Stephen IV.	A.D. 816	A.D. 817 . . .	192	Theodore II.	A.D. 898	A.D. 898 . . .	302
Sergius II.	844	847	215	Urban II.	1088	1099	413
Stephen V.	885	891	294	Urban III.	1184	1187	527
Stephen VI.	896	897	300	Urban IV.	1261	1264	571
Sergius III.	904	911	306	Valentine	827	827	208
Stephen VII.	929	931	311	Victor II.	1055	1057	361
Stephen VIII.	939	942	313	Victor III.	1086	1087	410
Sylvester II.	999	1003	331	Zachary	741	752	76
Sergius IV.	1009	1012	334				
Stephen IX.	1057	1058	363				

THE
HISTORY
OF THE
POPES, OR BISHOPS OF ROME.

JOHN VI., EIGHTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[TIBERIUS APSSIMARUS.—CUNIPERT, ARIBERT, *kings of the Lombards.*]

John VI. chosen. The emperor orders him to be driven from his see; but the soldiery defend him;—[Year of Christ, 702.] His generosity in the redemption of captives. Wilfrid driven again from his see and sent into exile;—[Year of Christ, 703.]

[Year of Christ, 701.] In the room of Sergius was chosen and ordained, after a vacancy of fifty days, and consequently on the 28th of October of the present year, John, a native of Greece, and the sixth of that name.¹ His ordination was scarce known at Constantinople, when Tiberius Apsimar, at this time emperor, ordered, we know not upon what provocation, the patrician Theophylactus, his great chamberlain, and exarch of Italy, to repair from Sicily, where he then was, to Rome, and drive the new pope from his see; but the exarch no sooner arrived at Rome, than the soldiery, whom the popes, on all occasions, took care to oblige, suspecting his design, and looking, in a manner, on the pope as their sovereign, hastened from all parts to defend him; insomuch that had not the pope interposed, and, causing the gates to be shut, sent out some of his clergy, to moderate their zeal for his safety, the exarch would have scarce escaped with his life.²

The same year Gisulphus, duke of Benevento, having taken a great number of captives, in an irruption which he made into the territories of the empire in Italy, the pope, with great generosity, redeemed them all, and even persuaded Gisulphus to withdraw his troops, and suffer the subjects of the empire to live unmolested.³

The ensuing year, 703, a council was assembled at Rome on the following occasion. Theodore of Canterbury had, upon his being reconciled with Wilfrid, warmly recommended him to Alfrid King of Northumberland; and Alfrid had, in virtue of that recommendation, restored him to the see of

York, from which he had been driven by his predecessor king Ecgfrid ten years before, and banished the kingdom of Northumberland.¹ But Wilfrid was a man of a most haughty, restless, and imperious temper; and he was scarce settled in his see, when, unmindful of his obligations to the king, he began to quarrel with him, and disturb the peace both of the court and kingdom: For, not satisfied with his bishoprick, he claimed the revenues of the rich abbey of Rippon, as having been granted to him by pope Agatho; and besides would not submit to the regulations of Theodore, though approved and confirmed by all the bishops of England as well as the kings, pretending those regulations to be contrary to the decrees of the popes, and consequently null. As he had the pope on his side, his behavior was, in that dispute, so overbearing and arbitrary, that he met with opposition from all quarters, insomuch that the king was, in the end, obliged, for the sake of peace, to drive him from his see, and banish him the kingdom.² He had now no other resource, but to recur to Rome; and he wrote accordingly to Sergius, who then governed that church, to acquaint him with what had passed, and implore his protection. The pope, prejudiced in his favor for the eminent services he had, at different times, rendered to his see, had no sooner read his letter, than he declared him, upon his own testimony, unjustly deposed; and at the same time decreed, without waiting to hear what the king had to lay to his charge, that he should be forthwith restored to his see, and to all the possessions which he had

¹ Anast. Platin. &c. in Joan VI. ² Anast. ibid.

³ Idem ibid. et Paul. Diac. l. 6. c. 27.

¹ See vol. I. p. 473.

² Bed. l. 5. c. 23. Eddius in vit. Wilfrid. c. 42, 43.

No regard paid in England to the decree of the pope in favor of Wilfrid. He is tried by a council in England and deposed. He appeals to the pope; which serves only to aggravate his guilt and complete his ruin. He goes to Rome.

ever enjoyed. But no greater regard was paid by Alfrid to the decree of Sergius, than had been paid, some years before, by Ecgrif, to the decree of Agatho and his council;¹ and Wilfrid was obliged, notwithstanding the determination of Rome in his favor, to take shelter in the kingdom of Mercia. As Theodore had recommended him, upon their reconciliation, to Ethelred king of the Mercians, he was not only received by that prince with all possible marks of respect and esteem, but preferred, soon after his arrival, to the see of Leicester, in the room of Sexulphus, who died about this time.²

In this station Wilfrid continued from the year 692, in which he was driven from the see of York, to the year 702, when, I know not upon what new misdemeanor, a council was assembled to examine into his life and conduct. The council met at Onestrefield, a place five miles north of Rippon; and were present at it king Alfred in person, Berctuald archbishop of Canterbury, and almost all the bishops, says Eddius, of the isle of Britain, meaning, no doubt, the English bishops; for the Scots, the Picts, and the Britons, still declined all communion or intercourse with the English, on account of their different rites and ceremonies. The council being met, Wilfrid was summoned to appear before them; and, upon his appearing, several crimes were laid to his charge, which the author of his life has not thought fit to specify. But the council, after hearing both him and his accusers, pronounced him guilty with one voice, and as such divested him of his episcopal dignity, and, at the same time, of all the possessions which he held either in the kingdom of Mercia, or in that of Northumberland. Such were the determination and judgment of the council. But the bishops, who composed it, and the king himself, touched with compassion, and inclined to favor Wilfrid so far as they thought it consistent with the peace of the church and the kingdom, that he might not be left quite destitute in his old age, offered to restore to him the abbey of Rippon, with all its wealth and its revenues, but upon the following conditions; I. That he should renounce all claim to the see of York. II. That he should thenceforth forbear all the functions of the episcopal office. III. That he should retire to his abbey, and never stir beyond the bounds of his monastery without leave from the king. And lastly, that he should declare, in the presence of the council, both by word of mouth, and in writing, his consent and agreement to these terms, without any limitation or restriction whatever. Wilfrid was not more provoked, says the author of his life, at the sentence of the

council, than at what they called a mitigation of the sentence. He put them in mind of the great services he had done to the English church, especially in bringing the Northumbrians, though converted by the Scots, to conform to the rites and usages of Rome; urged the decrees of three popes, namely, of Agatho, Benedict, and Sergius, declaring him innocent, and restoring him to his see; and challenging those, who had condemned him, to justify their conduct at the tribunal of the pope, he appealed from their judgment to his. But his appeal stood him in no stead; nay it only served to aggravate his guilt, and complete his ruin: for the king and the archbishop, thinking his thus appealing from their judgment to that of the pope and his council, as great a crime as any, that had been yet laid to his charge, declared, that were he guilty of no other, he well deserved, and ought to be condemned for that alone.¹ The king added with great indignation, that, if the council approved of it, he would find means to make the refractory priest retract his appeal, and acquiesce in the judgment of the council. But the council had promised, that no violence should be offered to his person; and therefore would not consent that any should be used. However, to assert their authority, and give to the world the most remarkable instance they could of their acknowledging no power superior to their own, they solemnly, and with one consent, excommunicated Wilfrid, and with him all his friends and adherents; nay, and declared, that if an abbot or priest of his party should bless the meat of any Christian people, it should be looked upon as meat offered to idols; and that the sacred vessels themselves, used by them, should be deemed defiled, and by no others used till they were again blessed and purified.²

Wilfrid, thus deposed and excommunicated by the council, returned, as soon as it broke up, to the kingdom of Mercia, and being there received with great kindness by Ethelred, who still continued his friend, and assured, that the sentence of the council should not take place in his dominions, unless the pope, to whom he had appealed, confirmed it, he set out soon after, though then seventy years old, on his journey to Rome. On his arrival in that city he was immediately introduced to the pope, and prostrating himself at his feet, "being persecuted at home," said he, "I have fled for protection to the apostolic see, as to the bosom of a tender mother. I am not come to accuse others, but to defend myself; and

¹ See vol. 1. p. 473.

² Edd. Vit. Wilfrid. c. 41. et 43. Bed. 1. 4. c. 23.

¹ "Hæc audientes, Archiepiscopus et Rex, dixerunt, Modo utique culpabilis factus a nobis notatus damnetur, quod magis illorum quam nostrum legitur iudicium. (Edd. in Vit. Wilfrid. c. 44.)

² Edd. Vit. Wilfrid. c. 44, 45, 46.

Wilfrid is absolved at Rome by the pope and his council. Returns to England. Well received by Berctuald of Canterbury;—[Year of Christ, 705.] Recommended by the king of Mercia to the king of Northumberland; who is reconciled to him when at the point of death. A great council convened.

who are beg your holiness will take upon yourself the examining of my cause: for to your judgment I have appealed, and in your judgment alone I am resolved to acquiesce." The pope received him, as all were received, who appealed to Rome, with the greatest marks of friendship and kindness. He had been but a few days in Rome, when deputies arrived there, sent by Berctuald of Canterbury to justify, against his misrepresentations, the proceedings of the council of Onestrefeld, and the judgment they had given. Upon their arrival the pope assembled the bishops, who were then in Rome, and in the neighborhood of Rome, to examine the cause together with him, and hear both parties, what the deputies had to lay to the charge of Wilfrid, what Wilfrid had to offer in defence of his innocence. This examination lasted four whole months, and the bishops are said to have met no fewer than seventy times. In the end Wilfrid, tried, says the author of his life, as gold in the furnace or crucible, was declared innocent of the crimes laid to his charge, and absolved by the pope in the name of St. Peter, to whom power was granted of loosening and binding.¹

Wilfrid being thus absolved, the pope wrote to the kings of Mercia and Northumberland to acquaint them therewith; and at the same time to desire, that they would order Berctuald to convene a council of the English bishops, at which should be present Wilfrid, and the two bishops who had been appointed in his room, namely, Bosa of York, and John of Hagulstad; that they should endeavor to adjust matters among themselves; but if they could not agree, that the parties concerned should repair to Rome, where he would take care to call together a greater number of bishops than were present at this time, and with their advice finally determine the whole affair. With these letters Wilfrid returned, much against his will, to England,² and repairing, as soon as he landed, to Canterbury, ac-

¹ Edd. Vit. Wilfrid. c. 50.

² He remembered the treatment which he had formerly met with in England, notwithstanding the judgment given by the pope in his favor;—(see vol. I. p. 473.) and not caring, as he was now far advanced in years, to expose himself to the like treatment, he would have willingly spent the short remains of his life in peace at Rome. But the pope found him the most proper tool he could employ, to maintain and promote his authority in England; and therefore, without any regard to his age, his inclination, or the just apprehension he was under of the reception he might meet with at home, he ordered him to return without delay, and acquaint the king of Northumberland and the archbishop, be the consequence what it would, with the decree of the apostolic see in his favor. Wilfrid indeed was satisfied, says the author of his life, with the absolution of the pope and his council; but having promised all duty and obedience to the apostolic see, he readily obeyed the order he received, how contrary soever to his inclination, and cheerfully set out, carrying a cargo of relics with him, on his return to England.—(Eddius in Vit. Wilfrid. c. 53.)

quainted Berctuald with the judgment given by the pope in his favor. Berctuald was, it seems, unwilling to quarrel with the pope; and therefore, finding that Wilfrid had been absolved at Rome, he was not only reconciled with him, but promised to mitigate the severity of the sentence which the English council had passed upon him. From Kent Wilfrid hastened to the court of the king of the Mercians. But his friend Ethelred had quitted his kingdom the year before, and led, at this time, a monastic life in the monastery of Bardeney, in Lincolnshire. However, out of the great friendship he had for Wilfrid, he warmly recommended him to Kenrid, to whom he had resigned the crown. Kenrid, in virtue of his recommendation, dispatched two ambassadors to the court of Northumberland, to let the king know, that Wilfrid had brought a letter to him from the pope, and beg he would grant him leave to come to his court, and acquaint him with the judgment and writings of the apostolic see concerning his cause. Alfrid received the ambassadors with the greatest politeness, and returned, after having advised with his council, the following answer: that he had the greatest regard for their persons; and therefore would have greedily embraced the opportunity of gratify them, had they asked any thing for themselves; but, as for Wilfrid, he begged they would not concern themselves with his affairs, or with him: "for what my royal predecessors," said he, "and the archbishop, did formerly decree, what I myself with an archbishop approved by Rome, and almost all the bishops of Britain, have again decreed, I never will alter or repeal for what you call the writings of the apostolic see."¹ But he did not continue long in that mind: for, being soon after taken dangerously ill, and apprehending, when his understanding was impaired, that his illness was a judgment from heaven for not submitting to the authority of the pope, he solemnly promised to submit to it, if he recovered, and restore Wilfrid to his see and all his possessions. The king did not recover,² but charged, when at the point of death, Berectfrid, guardian to his infant son Osred, to see that his promise was punctually performed, and as soon as it possibly could.

The king being dead, a council was, by means of Berectfrid, convened as soon as it conveniently could, the most numerous coun-

¹ Edd. Vit. Wilfrid. c. 55.

² Alfrid died this year, a few days before he had completed the 20th year of his reign.—(Bed. in Epit. Wigorn. ad ann. 705. Malmesb. de reg. Angl. l. i. p. 21.) He is commended by William of Malmesbury as a prince, in whom envy itself could discover nothing worthy of blame, besides his persecuting the great Wilfrid; (Malmesb. *ibid.*) and Eddius himself, however partial to that prelate, speaks of Alfrid as a prince of great wisdom. (Edd. in Vit. Wilfrid. c. 56.)

Wilfrid appointed bishop of Hagulstad. The supremacy of the pope not yet owned in England. The pope dies. John VII. chosen. The canons of the Quinisext counsel sent by the emperor to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 706.]

cil, and in every respect the most considerable, that had yet met in England: for it consisted of all the bishops of the Heptarchy; and the young king was present in person, attended by Berectfrid regent of the kingdom, by Ælfrida, the late king's sister, and abbess of Streneshall or Whitby, and by all the abbots and nobility of the kingdom of Northumberland. They met at a place near the river Nidd; and Berctuald, who presided, after exhorting his brethren to peace and concord, produced the letters from the pope to the kings of Mercia and Northumberland, acquainted the council with the judgment given at Rome in favor of Wilfrid, and at the same time declared, that as for himself, he was for complying with that judgment. He was therein warmly opposed by several bishops, especially by John of Beverly, bishop of Hagulstad, urging against the decrees of the pope the decrees of Theodore confirmed by king Ecgrid, and those of Berctuald himself lately confirmed by king Alfred, and all the bishops of England: these decrees, they said, no man had a power to revoke or annul. This gave occasion to long and warm disputes in the council. But the abbess Ælfrida, who was, on account of her eminent sanctity, held by all in the greatest veneration, interposing in favor of Wilfrid, and Berectfrid declaring, at the same time, that the late king had, on his death-bed, vowed Iris restoration, and charged him with the performance of his vow, the party that had hitherto opposed Wilfrid began to yield, and the matter was in the end thus compromised; namely, that John, bishop of Hagulstad, should be translated to the see of York, vacant by the death of Bosa, which happened very luckily at this time; and that Wilfrid should be appointed bishop of Hagulstad in his room, and enjoy with that bishopric his abbey of Rippon¹. And thus was the affair of Wilfrid determined at length, after it had lasted with some intermission near forty years. He was obliged to be satisfied with the bishopric of Hagulstad, and died four years

after, that is, 709, bishop of that city. From the foregoing account (and the account is delivered by an unexceptionable writer, by a writer who lived at this very time, and was an eye-witness of what he relates) it is evident, as every reader must have observed beyond all contradiction, that the English church or bishops knew not yet, so late as the eighth century, of any power besides that of the king superior to their own; that they looked upon the judgment given by them, and confirmed by the king, as decisive and final, and were so far from believing that the pope could reverse or repeal the sentence which they had pronounced, that on the contrary they thought it a crime worthy of degradation to appeal from their judgment to his. And it is to be observed, that those who opposed the restoration of Wilfrid the most, notwithstanding the decrees of four popes in his favor, who condemned him as guilty, though declared innocent at Rome, and from all guilt, who even deposed him for appealing from their judgment to that of the pope, were all men of distinguished characters: nay, and some of them, if the authority of Bede, who was personally acquainted with them, may be relied on, famous for the sanctity of their lives, and even for the miracles which they were said to have wrought. I have dwelt on these transactions longer than I should have otherwise done, to show the sense of the English church at this time with respect to the power and authority of the pope, the power especially of receiving appeals, which the popish writers most impudently pretend to have been ever acknowledged in this kingdom.

The affair of Wilfrid was not yet quite determined when the pope died. If he held the see, as we read in Anastasius, and in almost all the pontificals, three years, two months, and twelve days, his death must have happened on the ninth of January of the present year; for he was ordained on the 28th of October, 702. He was buried, with the other popes, in the church of St. Peter.¹

JOHN VII., EIGHTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[TIBERIUS, JUSTINIAN.—ARIBERT, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 705.] John the Sixth was succeeded by John the Seventh of that name, ordained the first of March of the present year, after a vacancy of one month and nineteen or twenty days. He too was a native of Greece, and the son of one

Plato.² His promotion was no sooner known at Constantinople, than Justinian, who was restored to the empire in the latter end of this year,³ dispatched two metropolitans to

¹ Anast. in Joan. VI. ² Anast. in Joan. VII.

³ Leoncius, who had driven Justinian from the throne, and, having caused his nose to be cut off, banished him to Chersona, as has been related above, (see vol. I. p. 495, note *) was himself, after a reign of three

¹ Edd. Vit. Wilfrid. c. 56, 57. Bed. 1. 5. c. 3. et. 20. Malmesb. de Pont. Angl. 1. 3. p. 269.

The pope sends the canons back without either approving or disapproving them. He dies. The patrimony in the Alpes Cottia restored to the Roman church.

Rome, with a copy of the canons of the late council in Trullo; and a letter to the new pope, requiring him to examine those canons with his council, and point out, in the copy he had sent him, which he rejected, and which he received. The metropolitans met with a reception at Rome suitable to their rank and their character; but the pusillanimous pope, as Anastasius styles him, unwilling, on the one hand, to approve of all the canons of that council, as some of them condemned the received practices of his church, and apprehending on the other that he might disoblige the emperor, and be driven from his see, if he excepted against any, dextrously declined concerning himself with them at all, and sent back the copy by the same metropolitans who brought it, without declaring his approbation of any, or his disapprobation.¹ And this is all we read of John VII. worthy of notice, from the time of his election to the time of his death. He presided in the Roman church, according to the bibliothecarian, two years, seven months, and seventeen days; and con-

years treated in the like manner by Apsimarus, called also Tiberius, one of his own generals, who, being proclaimed emperor by the troops under his command, seized on Leontius, caused his nose to be cut off, and confined him to a monastery in Dalmatia. In the mean time Justinian, having privately, by some trusty friends, engaged Trebeles, king of the Bulgarians, to espouse his cause, fled undiscovered from the place of his exile to the court of that prince, who not only received him with the greatest demonstrations of kindness, but marched with him, at the head of a powerful army, to Constantinople, and laid siege to that metropolis. The inhabitants, dreading the cruel temper of Justinian, seemed determined to hold out to the last. But the third day of the siege some Romans, who served in the army of Trebeles, having got into the city through an aqueduct, and opened the gates to the rest, their courage failed them; and, throwing down their arms, they submitted anew to Justinian, conducted him to the imperial palace, and replaced him on the throne.—(Theoph. Cedren. ad Ann. Tib. Aps. 7.) Thus was Justinian restored to the empire, nine years after he had been driven from it. Both usurpers fell into his hands, and both were beheaded. As for the patriarch Callinicus, he ordered his eyes to be put out, and then banished him to Rome.

¹ Anast. in Joan. VII.
The pusillanimity and timorousness of this pope, quite unworthy of an apostolical man, gave occasion, says Papebroke, to the satirical Romans to call him, by way of derision, a woman, and branding him with the name of pope Joan; and hence the famous fable of a she pope took its rise.—(Papeb. in Conatu Chronic. Historic.) But that conjecture is in this, as he is in most of his other conjectures, for they deserve no other name, grossly mistaken; the fable of a she pope, if it is a fable, being of a later date, by several centuries, than the pontificate of John VII., as shall be shown in a more proper place.

sequently must have died on the 17th of October, 707. He was buried in the church of St. Peter, before the altar of an oratory, built by himself in honor of the Virgin Mary. Of him it is observed, that he adorned several churches in Rome with the pictures of the fathers, and likewise with his own.¹ In the time of this pope, or, as some will have it, in the time of his predecessor pope John VI., Aribert, king of the Lombards, is said by Paulus Diaconus to have restored to the apostolic see, and yielded forever, by an instrument written with letters of gold, which he sent to pope John and St. Peter, the patrimony of the Roman church in the Alpes Cottia,² which had been seized and long possessed by the Lombards.³ Some have understood Paulus Diaconus here, as if he meant, that the king of the Lombards restored to the apostolic see the whole province of the Alpes Cottia, the ninth province of Italy, comprising a large tract of country, and several great cities; namely, Susa, Tortona, Savona, Genoa, &c., and thence conclude that whole province to belong of right to the pope. But from history it does not appear, that the popes were ever possessed of the whole province; nor can they tell us, setting aside the famous donation of Constantine, when, by whom, or on what occasion it was yielded to them; and what they never possessed, can, in no sense, be said to have been restored to them. Paulus Diaconus, it is true, calls what they possessed in that province, the patrimony of the Alpes Cottia; but the popes themselves constantly style it in their letters the patrimony of St. Peter, in the Alpes Cottia; an expression that plainly shows the patrimony did not comprehend the whole province.

¹ Anast. in Joan. VII.

² The Cottian Alps were so called from Cottius, king of that country, who lived, not in the time of Nero, as Paulus Diaconus supposes, (Paul. Diac. l. 2. c. 16.) but in the time of Augustus, as we read in Ammianus Marcellinus, (Ammian. l. 15. c. 20.) and defended his kingdom with great bravery against the Romans, till Augustus received him into his friendship. He was the first, says Ammianus, who rendered the Alps passable with safety; and the road which he made across those mountains, was ever afterwards used by the Roman armies, that marched into Gaul.—(Idem *ibid.*) His kingdom was, upon his death, reduced to a Roman province, and reckoned the ninth province of Italy.—(Eutrop. l. 7. c. 9.)

³ Paul. Diac. l. 6. c. 28.

Sisinnius chosen. Dies soon after. Constantine chosen. Felix of Ravenna asserts the independency of his see ;—[Yeas of Christ, 709.] Justinian causes him to be sent prisoner to Constantinople, and his eyes to be put out. The see of Ravenna entirely subjected to that of Rome.

SISINNIUS, EIGHTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTINIAN.—ARIBERT, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 708.] In the room of John VII. was ordained, on the 18th of January, when the see had been vacant three months, Sisinnius, by birth a Syrian, and the son of one John. He was so lame with the gout, that he could not even feed himself; and he died suddenly, twenty days after his ordination;¹ so that his death must have happened on the 6th of February, 708. As the popes, trusting to the affection of the people, and the soldiery, which they made it their study

to earn and to cultivate, looked now upon Rome, in a manner, as their own; Sisinnius undertook to rebuild the walls of that city, at the expense of his see; and had already prepared, though he lived so short a time, some of the necessary materials for so great an undertaking.¹ He is commended by Anastasius, the only ancient writer who mentions him, as a man of great firmness and constancy.²

CONSTANTINE, EIGHTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JUSTINIAN.—ARIBERT, ASPRAND, LUITPRAND, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 708.] Sisinnius being dead, Constantine, another Syrian, and he too the son of one John, was chosen to succeed him, and ordained, after a vacancy of one month and nineteen days, and, by consequence, on the 25th of March.²

In the first year of Constantine, came to Rome, Felix, archbishop elect of Ravenna, to receive his ordination at the hands of the pope; and he was accordingly ordained by Constantine, having first promised, says Anastasius, as his predecessors had done,³ subjection and obedience to the apostolic see. But he soon forgot, adds the same writer, the promise he had made; or rather, repented his having thus betrayed the liberties and just rights of the church committed to his care; and being, on his return to Ravenna, encouraged by the people, who had chosen him, to shake off the yoke, he retracted his promise, withdrew himself from all subjection to Rome, and openly asserted the independency of his see. Of this the pope was no sooner informed, than, transported with rage, he complained of it to the emperor; painting Felix and his people as rebels to St. Peter, and exhorting him to espouse the cause of the prince of the apos-

ties, and wreak on his enemies the vengeance which their rebellion deserved. As Justinian was extremely desirous of having the canons of his council in trullo approved by the pope, he laid hold of this opportunity to oblige him; and, hearkening to his complaints, he sent immediately an order to the patrician Theodorus, general of the army in the island of Sicily, requiring him to sail forthwith to Ravenna, to seize there the archbishop, with the other rebels (for so he styled them,) and send them all in chains to Constantinople. The order was executed with the utmost rigor; and the unhappy prisoners were, soon after their arrival at Constantinople, all put to death, except the archbishop; and his life the emperor spared out of his great mercy, but caused his eyes to be put out, and banished him to Pontus. And thus by a just judgment of God, and by the sentence of St. Peter, all were in the end deservedly cut off, who refused to pay the obedience that was due to the apostolic see.³ With these words the bibliothecarian closes this account, impiously ascribing to God, and St. Peter, the antichristian cruelties of the pope, and the emperor. Thus, in the end, was the see of Ravenna entirely subjected to the see of Rome; and we read of no farther attempts made by the bishops of that city, towards the recovery of their liberty, from this time till the beginning of the eleventh century, when we shall see them striving again, but striving in vain, to shake off the yoke. As for the unhappy Felix, he continued in Pontus, the place of

¹ Anast. in Sisinn.

² Anast. in Constantin.

³ "As some of his predecessors had done," he ought to have said. The three immediate predecessors of Felix, Reparatus, Theodorus, and Damianus, had indeed acknowledged the authority of the pope, and for the sake of peace, promised subjection and obedience to the apostolic see. But Maurus, the immediate predecessor of Reparatus, not only maintained the independency of his see, in defiance of the pope and all his anathemas, so long as he lived, but charged his clergy, when at the point of death, to tread in his footsteps, and withstand to the last, the unjust claims and pretensions of Rome. (See vol. 1. p. 463-6.)

¹ Anast. in Sisinn.

² Idem ibid.

³ Anast in Constantin.

The king of the Mercians, and the son of the king of the East Saxons, embrace a monastic life at Rome. The emperor orders the pope to repair to Constantinople;—[Year of Christ, 710.] He is every where received with the greatest marks of distinction. How received by the emperor.

his exile, so long as Justinian lived, the pope, though the chief author of all his misfortunes, never once offering to interpose in his favor. However, upon the death of Justinian, he was recalled by Philippicus, and even restored, notwithstanding his blindness, to his dignity and see.¹ He is said by Anastasius to have, at last, submitted to the pope; and Rubeus tells us, in his account of the bishops of Ravenna, that after his death he was honored by that church as a saint.²

The same year Coenred, king of the Mercians, and Offa, the son of Segher, king of the East-Saxons, a youth, says Bede,³ of great comeliness and extraordinary endowments, came to Rome, to embrace a monastic life there, and receive the tonsure at the hands of the pope. Offa is supposed by William of Malmesbury,⁴ and after him by all our historians, to have been king of the East-Saxons: but Bede, who lived at this time, only calls him the son of Segher, king of the East-Saxons; and commends him for leaving his wife, his lands, his relations, his country, without mentioning, as he does in speaking of Coenred, his crown, or his kingdom. Both he and Coenred continued at Rome, and in the profession they had embraced, so long as they lived.⁵ Egwin, the third bishop of Worcester, is said by William of Malmesbury,⁶ and the anonymous writer of his life,⁷ to have attended the two princes to Rome, and to have obtained, on that occasion, of pope Constantine, a grant of several privileges, immunities, and exemptions, for the monastery of Evesham, which he had founded. But that grant, or charter, is now as universally looked upon as supposititious, as it was deemed, in the ignorant ages, authentic and genuine.⁸ And indeed, by no nation more fables, more incredible stories, have been invented concerning their rise and original, than have been invented by the monks, lying as it were in emulation of each other, concerning the original, foundation, and privileges, of their respective monasteries.

The following year Constantine received a letter from the emperor, commanding him, that is, says Baronius, begging and entreating him,⁹ to repair to Constantinople, as soon as he conveniently could. What gave occasion to that unexpected command history has not informed us; but as Justinian had long desired to have the canons of the coun-

cil in trullo approved by the pope, it is commonly thought, that he called him with that view, to the imperial city, knowing that his approbation might be there more easily obtained than at Rome. However that be, Constantine, in obedience to his command, embarked as soon as he received it, and sailed from Porto, on the 5th of October of the present year, attended by two bishops, three presbyters, and a great number of the inferior clergy. He passed the winter at Hydruntum, now Otranto, in Calabria; and, during his stay there, received an order signed by the emperor, and addressed to all the governors, judges, and magistrates, of the cities and places through which he should pass, requiring them to receive, honor, and entertain him, as they would the emperor, were he present in person. With this order Constantine sailed early in the spring from Otranto, and, pursuing his voyage, was received in all the places he touched at, in a kind of triumph; and had the same honors paid him, that would have been paid on the like occasion to the emperor himself. He landed before he reached Constantinople, and, approaching that city, was met, at seven miles' distance, by Tiberius, the emperor's son, Justinian himself being then at Nice, by the senate in a body, by the nobility, the chief citizens, and the patriarch Cyrus at the head of his clergy. With this grand attendance he entered the city, mounted, with the chief persons of his retinue, on the emperor's own horses most richly caparisoned; and, advancing through immense crowds of people, all congratulating him with repeated acclamations on his happy arrival, he dismounted at the palace of Placidia, which was assigned him for his habitation; and there, with great expressions of friendship and kindness, took leave of Tiberius, and the rest, who had attended him thither. In the mean time, the emperor, informed of his arrival, dispatched immediately a person of distinction, with a letter to thank him for his ready compliance with the order he had sent him, and require him to repair to the city of Nicomedia, where he should meet him. He met him there accordingly; and if the account, which Anastasius gives us of this interview, be true, the most Christian emperor (for so he styles, on this occasion, one of the most cruel and blood-thirsty tyrants that ever swayed a sceptre,) prostrating himself at their first meeting on the ground with the crown on his head, kissed the pope's feet; and then they mutually embraced each other, all, who were present, admiring and extolling the extraordinary condescension of the good prince. The following Sunday the emperor assisted at divine service, performed by the pope; received the sacrament at his hands; and, begging his holiness to inter-

¹ Anast. in Constantin.

² His tomb was discovered by that antiquarian with the following epitaph, or inscription: "Hic tumulus clausum servat corpus Domini felicitis sanctissimi acter Beatissimi Archiepiscopi," though a rebel to St. Peter.

³ Bed. in Epit. et in Hist. l. 5. c. 10.

⁴ Malmsb. de reg. Angl. l. 2. c. 6. ⁵ Bed. *ibid.*

⁶ Malmsb. de Gest. Pont. Angel. l. 2. p. 35.

⁷ Apud Bolland. ad diem XI. Jan. et Mabi. l. Secul. III. Benedictin.

⁸ Vide Wharton. In præfat. ad Angl. Sacram.

⁹ Bar. ad Ann. 709. p. 662.

Constantine probably confirmed the canons of the council in trullo. He returns to Rome. The exarch puts to death some of the chief men of the Roman clergy. Justinian murdered and Bardanes raised to the throne.

cede for him, that God might forgive him his sins, he renewed and confirmed all the privileges, that had ever been granted to his see, and then gave him leave to return home.¹

This is the whole account which Anastasius gives us of that interview, in the life of Constantine. He adds, in the life of Gregory II. who attended Constantine into the east, and was afterwards chosen in his room, that Gregory, being asked by the emperor several questions concerning certain chapters, he answered them all to his entire satisfaction.² But what these chapters were, what questions the emperor asked, what answers Gregory returned, Anastasius, the only writer, who mentions these particulars, has not thought fit to inform us. Baronius, Lupus, and Pagi, are of opinion, and their opinion perhaps is not ill-grounded, that the chapters which the bibliothecarian mentions, were the canons of the council in trullo; and that the questions of the emperor, and the answers of Gregory, all turned upon them: for Justinian had nothing so much at heart, as to get those canons approved by the pope; and it was, in all likelihood, to gain him, and extort, as it were, his approbation, that, forgetful of his own dignity, he flattered his vanity in the manner we have seen. And it is not at all to be doubted, says Lupus,³ but that Constantine, in return for the extraordinary honors that were paid him by the emperor, gratified him so far, as to confirm such of those canons at least, as were not repugnant to the established practice and laws of his own church, that is, all but the five mentioned above;⁴ though, for the sake of them, they had been all indiscriminately condemned and rejected by Ser- gius.⁵

Anastasius, having described the reception, which Constantine met at Constantinople from Tiberius, and from the emperor at Nicomedia, passes immediately, without letting us know either what he did in the east, or what he was sent for, to his return to Rome; and tells us, that the emperor having granted him leave to return home, he set out from Nicomedia, and arrived safe in the port of Gæta; that he was there met by the Roman clergy, and great numbers of people; and was attended by them, with loud shouts of joy, to the city, which he entered on the 24th of October, of the tenth indiction, and consequently of the present year 711.⁶ On his arrival at Rome he found, to his great concern, that John, surnamed Rizocopus, the new exarch, passing through that city in his way to Ravenna, had caused four of the chief men among the clergy to be put to death; and very undeservedly, as Anastasius seems to insinuate; for he ascribes the shameful death, of which, he

says, the exarch soon after died at Ravenna, to a just judgment of God upon him, for the many unjust actions, of which he was guilty.¹

The pope had been but three months in Rome, says Anastasius,² after his return from the east, when he received the melancholy news of the death of the most Christian and orthodox emperor Justinian, and the promotion of the heretic Bardanes to the empire in his room. Of this revolution the Greek historians give us the following account. While Justinian lived in exile in Chersonesus, the inhabitants of that country, and their neighbors the Bosphorans, apprehending he might one day be restored to the empire, and dreading his cruelty, resolved either to put him to death, or to send him in chains to Apsimarus, who had usurped, after Leontius, the sovereign power, as has been related above:³ but Justinian, suspecting their design, found means to make his escape before it could be put in execution, and, getting safe to the court of the king of the Bulgarians, was by him replaced on the throne, in the manner we have seen.⁴ As this good prince, this most Christian and orthodox emperor, delighted in nothing so much as in acts of cruelty and revenge, as in bloodshed and slaughter; he no sooner got the power again into his hands, than he resolved to employ it, not in driving the Saracens from the many fine provinces, which they had lately seized, and quietly enjoyed, or in restraining the incursions of other barbarous nations breaking on all sides into the empire, but in wreaking his vengeance on his own subjects the unhappy people of Chersonesus and Bosphorus. Against them he dispatched, in the very first year after his restoration, a mighty fleet, and a numerous army on board of it, with express orders to spare none, but to put all to the sword they should meet with in those parts, without distinction of sex or age, of guilty or innocent. These orders were executed with the utmost barbarity; multitudes of people, women as well as men, were inhumanly massacred. Some were by the cruel soldiery roasted alive, others expired on the rack, and many were cast into the sea. The children however were spared; which the cruel tyrant no sooner understood, than transported with rage, he ordered a new fleet to be equipped, most of his ships of war having been shipwrecked on their return from Chersona, and gave the command of it to Elias, and Philippicus Bardanes, who had been both banished by Apsimarus to the island of Cephalonia, strictly enjoining them not to leave man, woman, or child alive in those countries, but to put all indiscriminately to the sword, to lay their habitations and

¹ Anast. in Constantin. ² Idem in Greg. II.

³ Lupus in Scholiis ad Canon. Trull. p. 1078.

⁴ See vol. 1. p. 494. ⁵ Ibid. ⁶ Anast. in Constantin.

¹ Anast. in Constantin. ² Idem ibid.

³ See p. 12. note 2. ⁴ Ibid.

The conquests of the Saracens. To what chiefly owing.

cities in ashes, and plough up the ground, on which they stood. With these orders the fleet sailed; but both commanders, instead of executing them, openly revolted, and Bardanes, taking upon him the title of emperor with the consent of Elias, was received with great joy by the people of Chersona, who had escaped the late massacre, into their city. The emperor, upon the first news of this revolt, ordered a third fleet to be equipped; and it was equipped accordingly with incredible expedition: but those, who commanded it, despairing on their arrival at Chersona, of ever being able to reduce that place, the inhabitants being determined, as well as Bardanes and Elias, to defend it to the last, choose rather to acknowledge Bardanes, and join those, against whom they had sent, than return, without executing the orders of the implacable tyrant, to Constantinople. Bardanes, thus proclaimed and supported by two powerful armies, marched straight to Constantinople, which he entered without opposition, Justinian being then at Sinope in Paphlagonia, and the people looking upon the new emperor rather as their deliverer, than as an usurper. Upon his arrival Tiberius, the emperor's son, took refuge in the church dedicated to the virgin Mary, called "ad Blachernas," a famous sanctuary; but he was dragged from thence, and from the altar, which he grasped, by one Strutus, and slain in the presence of Anastasia his grandmother. As for Justinian, Bardanes dispatched against him Elias, whose son, yet an infant, he had lately caused to be murdered in the arms of its mother, and obliged her to marry a man of the meanest condition. Elias came up with him in the neighborhood of Sinope, and, having gained over the troops he had with him, took him prisoner without the loss of a man, cut off his head with his own hand, and sent it to Bardanes by one of his officers, whom Bardanes immediately dispatched with it to Rome, that his death might be known there, and in the other cities and provinces subject to the empire in the west.¹ Justinian had reigned sixteen years, ten before he was driven from the throne, and six after his restoration. He was, of all the emperors after Phocas, the Christian emperors at least the most bloody and cruel; and, what is worthy of notice, of all, after Phocas, the most favorable to the popes, and their see. Phocas laid the foundation of the exorbitant power, that in process of time was usurped by the popes;² and Justinian countenanced their unjust usurpations by punishing, as we have seen,³ with his usual cruelty, those, who offered to withstand or oppose them. Indeed, to establish or countenance such a tyranny in the church, was a work worthy

only of those, who exercised the like tyranny in the state.

Thus did the cruelty of Justinian, which had occasioned the destruction of thousands, give occasion at last to his own, and to that of his family. For in him, and his son Tiberius, ended the family of Heraclius, after they had governed the empire a whole century, that is, from the year 610, when Phocas was murdered, to the present year, 711, when Justinian underwent the same fate. In the time of these princes the Saracens laid, almost undisturbed, the foundations of that mighty empire, which they afterwards raised on the ruins of the Roman. In the reign of Heraclius they began first to be heard of, and at the death of Justinian they had already made themselves masters of all Syria, Egypt, Palestine, and Armenia, of Mesopotamia, of great part of Africa, and of the whole Persian empire. What the rapidity of their conquests was chiefly owing to, has been already shown. The emperors, if they deserve the name, from Heraclius, the first of that race, to Justinian the last, suffered their attention to be so entirely engrossed with the affairs of the church, as utterly to neglect those of the state. In the time of Heraclius, when the impostor Mahomet first made his appearance, was unluckily started the famous question concerning the will and operations of Christ; and that question, impertinent as it is, kept the whole church divided, and the bishops at variance, for the space of almost a whole century. The emperors from the beginning took part in the dispute; and it must raise the indignation of every reader, who peruses the records of those times, to find the Saracens and other barbarians breaking on all sides into the empire, seizing province after province, and laying them all waste in their turns; and the emperors, in the mean time, instead of assembling armies to oppose them, or concerting with their ministers the most effectual means of checking the daily growth of their power, and saving the empire, only intent on assembling bishops, and issuing, as directed by them, edicts, decrees, rescripts, ectheses, types, &c. concerning a metaphysical speculation, that had no kind of connection with the Christian faith or religion. Constantine, the father of Justinian, was, of all the descendants of Heraclius, the most capable of retrieving the losses, which his predecessors had sustained from the barbarians. He had defeated them with great slaughter in several engagements, had utterly ruined their naval power, and would, in all likelihood, by pursuing the advantages he had gained, have driven them, in a short time, quite out of the empire; but thinking it a matter of far greater importance and moment to have it determined, whether in Christ were one will or two, one operation or two operations, that he might be at leisure to

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. 703. Niceph. c. 6. Cedren. in Justin. Hist. Miscell.

² See vol. 1. p. 426.

³ See p. 14.

The new emperor a zealous Monothelite. The doctrine of one will defined in a council. The Monothelite doctrine prevails again all over the east; but is universally condemned in the west. Great disturbances in Rome.

assemble for that purpose a general council, he concluded a peace with the Saracens, in the height of his success, as soon as they proposed it, and almost on their own terms, yielding to them all the provinces they had seized to that time. But after all, neither Constantine nor the other emperors are more worthy of blame than the ecclesiastics of those days, nor perhaps so much: for as it was by their unseasonable and impertinent disputes, and the disturbances they raised in the empire, that the emperors were diverted from attending to the affairs of the state, the evils, which then ensued, ought chiefly to be laid at their door.

But to resume the thread of the history, the promotion of Bardanes, or, as he thenceforth styled himself, Philippicus, was attended with a great change of affairs in the church as well as the state. The new emperor had imbibed from his infancy the principles of the Monothelites, having been brought up under an abbot named Stephen, a most zealous Monothelite, and the favorite disciple of the famous Macarius of Antioch, whom the sixth general council had condemned and deposed as an incorrigible heretic.¹ He therefore no sooner found himself vested with the sovereign power, than he undertook to extirpate the damnable heresy, as he called it, of two wills in Christ, and two operations, and to establish, in its room, the catholic doctrine of one will only, and one operation. In order to that he assembled, in the very first year of his reign, a council in the imperial city, at which assisted, among the rest, John of Constantinople, and the two metropolitans, Andrew and Germanus, the former of Crete, and the latter of Cyzicus; and by all to a man the doctrine of one will, now the faith of the court, was declared the true catholic faith, and the sixth general council, which had defined the opposite doctrine, condemned and anathematized, with all who received it:² and it is observable, that many of the bishops, who assisted at this council, had distinguished themselves under the late emperor, and soon after distinguished themselves again, under the catholic emperor Anastasius, by their zeal for the doctrine which they now so readily condemned.

¹ See vol. I. p. 476.

We are told by Theophanes, that Philippicus, while yet a private man, was assured by a monk of the monastery of Callistratus, a most zealous Monothelite, and well skilled in astrology, that he should be one day raised to the imperial dignity, and be blessed when raised to it with a long and prosperous reign, provided he caused the sixth general council to be annulled, and the doctrine proscribed, which that council had impiously defined. Theophanes adds, "that thereupon Philippicus, believing the monk divinely inspired, not only resolved, but bound himself by a solemn oath, if he ever attained to the empire, to exert his whole power against that council, and against all who should presume to maintain or defend it." (Theoph. ad ann. 2. Philip.)

² Agatho Diacon. in Peroration. Theoph. in Chronic. Niceph. in Hist. p. 31.

The council was no sooner dismissed, than the emperor, who was a man of some learning, as learned at least as most of the ecclesiastics of those days, drew up a confession of faith agreeable to the definition of that council, and sent it to all the metropolitans in the empire, commanding them to receive it, and cause it to be received by the bishops of their respective provinces, on pain of forfeiting their sees, and being driven as obstinate heretics into exile. At the same time he ordered the original copy of the sixth general council, that was lodged in the imperial palace, to be publicly burnt, and the names of Sergius of Constantinople, and Honorius of Rome, who had been condemned and anathematized by that council, to be placed with a pompous encomium, in the diptychs, nay, and their pictures to be set up with his own, as the pictures of men, who having asserted the true catholic doctrine in their lifetime, had, on that score, been unjustly persecuted by the enemies of truth after their death.¹ His confession of faith, anathematizing the doctrine of two wills, the council that had defined it, and all who received that council, was signed and approved by almost all the bishops in the east, and even by the apocrisarii of the apostolic see residing then at the imperial court.² Some few, indeed, remonstrated against it, unwilling to take with the rest of their brethren, the faith of the court for the standard of theirs; but they being driven from their sees, pursuant to the peremptory order given by the emperor, and others, less scrupulous and more complaisant, appointed in their room, the Monothelite doctrine prevailed once more, and in a few months, all over the east.

In the west the zeal of Philippicus, and his attempts in favor of that doctrine, were not attended with the success he expected. As the power of the emperors was there at a very low ebb, and the popes, in a manner, masters of Rome, Constantine not only rejected his confession of faith (for to him it was sent as well as to the other metropolitans and patriarchs) with the utmost indignation, but condemned it in a council assembled for that purpose, as calculated to sap the very foundation of the catholic faith, the authority of the councils and fathers, as suggested and dictated by the enemy of all truth, and fraught with the most execrable and blasphemous heresies. And now the people of Rome, looking upon the new emperor as a heretic, would not suffer his image to be placed in the church according to custom, nor his name to be mentioned at the service; nay, being informed that he employed none but Monothelites, they encouraged the patrician Christopher, who had been lately appointed duke or governor of

¹ Agatho Diacon. ubi supra. ² Nicol. Pap. Ep. 8.

The emperor excommunicated. Philippicus deposed, and Philartemius chosen in his room;—[Year of Christ, 713.]—The new emperor a zealous assertor of the doctrine of two wills; which prevails anew all over the east.

Rome by Justinian, and pretended great zeal for the two wills, to keep his employment in defiance of the emperor; and not to admit into the palace the new governor, named Peter, whom the emperor had sent to succeed him. This gave occasion to a battle or a skirmish at the gates of the palace between the two competitors, in which twenty-five persons were killed or wounded, and more blood would have been shed, had not some of the chief men among the clergy, sent by the pope with the book of the gospels, and crosses in their hands, parted the combatants, by persuading the Christian party (so they called the party of Christopher) to withdraw, though most likely to prevail, and suffer the new governor to take, without farther opposition, possession of the palace.¹

That the pope not only condemned the emperor's confession of faith as heretical, but thundered against him the sentence of excommunication, and even deposed him as incapable of the empire on account of his heresy, is asserted by Platina, and other more modern historians. But of that not the least notice is taken by the contemporary writers; and the excommunicating and deposing of an emperor was not a thing to be passed over in silence, especially as no emperor had, to that time, been excommunicated or deposed by the pope, or by any other bishop or patriarch. Besides, the pope would have placed his image in the church, as has been observed above, and caused him to be prayed for at the public service, which was acknowledging him for emperor and sovereign of Rome, had not the populace prevented him, provoked at the new emperor's attempting to introduce a new faith and religion.²

Philippicus was soon informed of the reception, which his confession of faith had met with at Rome, and had resolved to wreak his vengeance both on the pope and the people. But a conspiracy being, in the mean time, formed against him, he was deposed, and Philartemius, his chief secretary, proclaimed emperor in his room, after he had reigned one year and six months. In his reign, and while he, like the preceding emperors, neglecting the affairs of the state, was wholly employed in assembling councils, in drawing up new confessions of faith, and persecuting those who did not receive them, the Saracens, finding him thus diverted, broke unexpectedly into the empire, took the city of Media, laid waste several provinces, and returned unmolested, carrying with them many thousands of captives. At the same time the Bulgarians, entering Thrace, advanced to the very gates of Constantinople; and having ravaged the country

far and wide, and put an incredible number of people to the sword, marched back, without meeting with the least opposition, loaded with booty. These calamities the people of Constantinople construed into a judgment on the empire for the emperor's striving to establish a doctrine, which the church had condemned in a general council; and some, whom he had otherwise disoblged, taking from thence occasion to conspire against him, one of them, by name Rufus, entering the palace with a company of Thracians, while the emperor was reposing after dinner, put out his eyes, and proclaimed Philartemius, who was immediately acknowledged by all, and the very next day crowned by the patriarch.¹

Philartemius, or, as he was afterwards called, Anastasius, was a no less zealous assertor of the doctrine of two wills, than his predecessor had been of the doctrine of one; and therefore no sooner found himself in the quiet possession of the throne, than he wrote a long letter to the pope, to assure him, that he received the sixth general council, that he professed and unfeignedly believed the doctrine defined by that holy council, and that he would suffer none, within the bounds of the empire, to believe or profess any other. At the same time an edict was issued, and sent by the emperor's order to the metropolitans of the different provinces, commanding them, on pain of forfeiting their sees, and being driven into exile, to receive the sixth general council, to profess the doctrine of two wills, which the Holy Ghost had revealed to his church by the fathers of that venerable assembly, and anathematize all, as enemies to God and the church, who should thenceforth teach or defend the opposite doctrine. The edict met with no opposition, but was everywhere as readily complied with as that which the late emperor had issued out a few months before, commanding all to profess the doctrine of one will, and anathematize the council, that had defined, and those, who taught or maintained, the doctrine of two. John of Constantinople received it among the first; and, on that occasion, wrote a long letter to the pope, or rather an apology for his late conduct, pretending that for the good of the church, and to prevent the cruel persecution, with which it was threatened, both he and his colleagues had thought it expedient and necessary to use some dissimulation, but had never renounced the true catholic doctrine, and the doctrine of two distinct wills in Christ, and two operations: He therefore entreated the pope to receive him to his communion, notwithstanding the reports, that might perhaps have been spread to his prejudice in the west, and to concur with him, under so

¹ Anast. in Constantin. Paul. Diac. l. 6. c. 33.

² Paul. Diac. l. 6. c. 33.

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. Philip. 2. Niceph. c. 7.

Constantine dies;—[Year of Christ, 715.] No council held in London in his time. Admits John of Constantinople to his communion. John dies, and Germanus is translated to that see;—[Year of Christ, 716.]

religious an emperor, in restoring, and establishing, on a lasting foundation, the so long wished for tranquillity of the church.¹ What answer the pope returned to that letter we know not, nor indeed whether he returned any. The example of John was followed by the other metropolitans and bishops in the east, all professing and teaching the doctrine of two wills with as much zeal under Anastasius, as they had taught and professed under Philippicus, the contrary doctrine. And thus the doctrine of two wills prevailed again all over the east, and became the catholic doctrine.

In the mean time Constantine died, and his death happened on the 8th of April, 715, after he had held the see seven years, and fifteen days.² He is chiefly commended by Anastasius for his charity to the poor, great numbers of whom he is said to have constantly maintained at a very considerable expense. Balæus,³ and after him the Magdeburgenses, suppose a council to have been held in London in the time of Con-

stantine, and the worshiping of images to have been first introduced by that council into England: But of such a council no mention is made by Bede, who lived at this very time, nor indeed by any other ancient historian. However, the story of that council was not, as F. Pagi seems to suppose,⁴ invented by Balæus, but copied by him from the records of the monastery of Evesham: For the setting up and worshiping of images is there said to have been approved, in the time of pope Constantine, by a council held in London, on occasion of an image of the virgin Mary, which Edgwin, bishop of Worcester, and founder of that monastery, had, by her order, set up, and caused to be publicly worshiped. But that no such council ever was held is manifest from the silence of all the historians concerning it; and besides, it is certain, as it will afterwards be made to appear, that the worshiping of images was not introduced into England till many years after the times in which this council is supposed to have been held.

GREGORY II., EIGHTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ANASTASIUS, THEODOSIUS, LEO ISAURICUS.—LUITPRAND, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 715.] In the room of Constantine was chosen and ordained, after a vacancy of forty days, and consequently, on the 19th of May, 715, Gregory, the second of that name, a native of Rome, and the son of one Marcellus.⁴ He had been brought up from his childhood in the Lateran palace, under pope Sergius; was afterwards chosen, while yet a deacon, by his predecessor pope Constantine, as the most learned man of that church, to attend him into the east; and had distinguished himself there, as we are told, by his learning and parts, especially in answering the several questions, which Justinian asked him, and solving, as had been observed above, all his doubts and difficulties to his entire satisfaction.⁵

The promotion of Gregory was no sooner known in the east, than John of Constantinople sent, according to custom, his confession of faith to the new pope, acknowledging therein two distinct wills in Christ as well as two distinct natures, and anathematizing all, who acknowledged one will only, or only one nature. This letter the pope immediately answered, and without reproaching the patriarch with, or taking the least

notice of, his late conduct, owned him for his colleague, and admitted him to his communion, and to that of the catholic church.² John died soon after, and upon his death Germanus, of whom we shall have frequent occasion to speak in the sequel, was translated from the see of Cyzicus to that of Constantinople. Germanus was descended of a patrician and illustrious family; but his father, by name Justinian, having been concerned in a conspiracy against Constantine Pogonatus, on the accession of that prince to the throne, he was by his order put to death, and his son, though yet a child, made an eunuch.³ In the reign of Philippicus, the Monothelite emperor, he yielded, as well as most other bishops, to the times, acknowledging, or pretending to acknowledge, only one will in Christ: but having afterwards distinguished himself, under the catholic emperor Anastasius, by his zeal for the doctrine of two wills, and besides, being reckoned one of the most learned men of his time, he was, upon the death of John, named with one voice by the people, the clergy, and the senate of Constantinople, to succeed him in that see.⁴

The new pope wrote to the emperor, as soon as ordained, to acquaint him with his

¹ Epilog. Agath. t. 6. Concil. p. 1408.

² Anast. in Constantin.

³ Script. Britan. Cent. prim. p. 88.

⁴ Anast. in Greg. II.

⁵ Idem ibid. See p. 116.

¹ Pagi ad Ann. 714. n. 11. ² Anast in Greg. II.

³ Zonar. in Constantin.

⁴ Theoph. ad Ann. Incarnat. secund. Alexandrin. 707.

The emperor Anastasius deposed, and Theodosius chosen in his room. The Lombards surprise Cumæ. The pope persuades the governor of Naples to fall on them and retake it.—Two observations of Baronius.

promotion, and give him, according to custom, an account of his faith. But Anastasius was in the mean time deposed, and Theodosius raised to the empire in his room. Of this revolution Theophanes gives us the following account, and with him Nicephorus and Cedrenus agree. Anastasius being informed that their fleet of the Saracens had sailed to Phœnicia, to cut wood there for the use of their navy, he ordered his fleet to assemble at Rhodes from the different ports of the empire, and to sail from thence in quest of the enemy. The fleet assembled accordingly, at the appointed place; but the two admirals, John, deacon of the great church (the ecclesiastics did not think it inconsistent with their calling, to fight against the Saracens,) and the patrician Obscius, falling out before they went to sea, the seamen took the part of the latter, killed John, whom they hated on account of his severity, and thinking they could by no other means escape the punishment due to their crime but by choosing a new emperor, declared Anastasius unworthy of the empire; and obliged the first man they met, one Theodosius, a person of a mean extraction, and then receiver of the revenue at Adramyttium, to accept of the purple. Anastasius, upon the first notice of the revolt, fled to Nice in Bythynia, leaving a strong garrison in Constantinople; which city the rebels, sailing from Rhodes, immediately invested by sea and by land, and took, by the treachery of some of the inhabitants, after they had continued six months before it, and lost a great number both of their men and their ships. Anastasius, hearing the metropolis was reduced, and choosing rather to trust to the mercy of his rival, than to suffer more blood to be shed, delivered himself up to him; and was, upon his renouncing all claim to the empire, and promising to take the habit of a monk, banished by him to Thessalonica, after he had reigned two years, and eight months.¹ Theodosius was very little acquainted with matters of religion; but being told by those about him, that the doctrine of two wills was the true catholic doctrine, and that it had been taught by the apostles and the fathers, he confirmed the laws, which his predecessor had issued against all who taught or professed any other.

In the mean time the Lombards in Italy, improving to their advantage the distracted state of the empire, took by surprize the city of Cumæ. As the Roman church possessed there a considerable patrimony, and the territories of Rome lay quite open, on that side, to the incursions of the Lombards, so long as they continued masters of that place; the pope strove by all means to per-

suaude them to restore it, threatening them with the indignation of the prince of the apostles, and vengeance from heaven, for so wicked an attempt, and even offering to pay them a large sum, and besides assuring them of the protection of St. Peter, if they withdrew their troops, and abstaining from all further hostilities, renewed the peace, which they had concluded with the empire. But the Lombards paid no kind of regard to the entreaties, the threats, or the offers of the pope, who therefore, thinking he might, on such an occasion, recur to arms, and employ force against force, wrote to John, duke or governor of Naples, exhorting him not to suffer so important a place to remain in the hands of the enemies of the empire, and engaging to pay him seventy pounds weight of gold if he recovered it. The duke agreed to the proposal, and marching in the night with Theodimus, subdeacon of the Roman church, at the head of a strong body of troops, surprised the city in his turn, put three hundred of the Lombards to the sword, and carried six hundred of them back with him prisoners to Naples.¹ Baronius observes here, and his observation is not quite unworthy of notice, that as no man can be saved, who keeps what belongs to another, to take from him, even by force, what he unjustly possesses, is in effect delivering him from the danger of eternal damnation; and it was, according to him, with that alone, and not with any temporal view, that the pope encouraged the governor of Naples to make war on the Lombards, and take from them what in conscience and justice they were bound to restore, and consequently could not be saved so long as they kept it.² As the pope acted on so noble a principle, it is a great pity he should have forgot to mention it in the several letters, which he wrote on this occasion to the governor and people of Naples. For in them the importance of the place which the Lombards had seized, their treachery in seizing it, and the dangers, to which the Roman territories were exposed while it continued in their hands, are the only reasons he alleges why they should by no means be suffered to keep it. The annalist farther observes, that Gregory, a man eminent for his learning and sanctity, did not scruple recurring to arms, and recovering, by force of arms, the possessions of the church unjustly taken away by the rapacious laity, when all other means of recovering them had proved ineffectual; and from thence he concludes, that the successors of Gregory safely may, after the example of so great and so holy a pope, raise or hire troops, and wage war, to recover what has been unjustly taken from them, or to defend what they justly possess. But whether this

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. Incar. secund. Alexandrin. 707. Niceph. in Chron. Cedren. ad Ann. Anast. 2.

² Anast. in Greg. II. & Paul. Diac. l. 6.

³ Bar. ad Ann. 315. n. 111.

The emperor Theodosius resigns, and retires to a monastery:—[Year of Christ, 717.] Leo Isauricus chosen to succeed him. Received with loud acclamations at Constantinople, and crowned by the patriarch. Sends his confession of faith to the pope. The pope congratulates him on his promotion. A council held at Rome; [Year of Christ, 721.]

doctrine, and the conduct of Gregory, on which it is grounded, be agreeable or not to the doctrine of our Savior, “ resist not evil ; and if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also ;”¹ I leave the reader to judge. To the two foregoing observations, Baronius might have added a third ; namely, that though the Lombards had seized, and refused to restore the rich patrimony of St. Peter at Cumæ ; Gregory, a man eminent for his learning and sanctity, did not, on that account, excommunicate and deliver up to satan either them or their king ; and from thence he might have concluded, that the successors of Gregory ought to follow therein the example of so great a pope, instead of thundering excommunications, anathemas, curses, as they now frequently do, and once a year, with great solemnity, against all, who encroach, or whom they apprehend to encroach, ever so little on the lands and goods of the church.

The following year the emperor Theodosius, by the advice of the senate, as well as the chief officers of the army, who found him quite unequal to so great a trust, especially at a time when the Saracens, growing daily more powerful, threatened the metropolis itself with a siege, resigned the empire, and taking the monastic habit, retired with his son to a monastery, in the city of Ephesus, and there spent, undisturbed by his successor, the remaining part of his life in the exercises of piety and religion.² Upon his resignation, Leo, surnamed Isauricus, or the Isaurian, because a native of Isauria, was chosen with one voice by the senate and the army, in his room, as a man of known abilities, of an unblemished character, and by all thought the most capable of defeating the designs of the Saracens, and retrieving the honor of the empire. He was of a mean extraction, but of a most comely countenance, of a majestic and graceful mien, tall, well-shaped, and so engaging in his behavior, as to gain the good-will and affections of all, with whom he conversed. He served at first in the quality of a common sentinel ; but from that low station he raised himself by his gallant behavior, and in the course of a few years, to the highest posts in the army. The two emperors Justinian and Anastasius employed him, and always with success, in several expeditions against the barbarians ; and he was, when raised to

the imperial dignity, commander in chief of all the forces of the empire, and at the head of a powerful army on the frontiers of Syria, whither he had been sent to cover Asia Minor, threatened by the Saracens. From thence he set out upon the first intelligence of his election, and arriving at Constantinople on the 25th of March, he was received there by the senate, by the officers of the army, and the people, with all possible demonstrations of joy, and attended with repeated acclamations to the imperial palace. The next day he was crowned, with great solemnity, by Germanus the patriarch ; and took on that occasion the usual oath, to maintain the catholic faith, as it had been taught by the fathers, pure and undefiled.¹ The ceremony was no sooner over, than he wrote a very respectful and obliging letter to the pope, to acquaint him with his accession to the crown, and at the same time sent him, according to custom, his confession of faith, declaring therein, that he received, and ever would hold and maintain, the true catholic faith, as established and defined by the six general councils, and the fathers.

With the emperor’s letter, the pope received one from the patriarch, assuring him, that the emperor was quite orthodox in his belief ; and that his holiness might entirely depend on the sincerity of his protestations, and the purity of his faith. Upon the receipt of these letters the pope, transported with joy, wrote immediately to the emperor to congratulate him, which he did with the warmest expressions of respect and loyalty, on his promotion to the empire ; and to let him know, that he not only received him to his communion, and acknowledged him for his sovereign, but would take care that the Christian princes in the west should all court his alliance, and live with him in perfect friendship and amity. His images were accordingly, by means of Gregory, received with loud acclamations in all the provinces and Christian kingdoms in the west, as well as in Italy, and at Rome ; and he was every where acknowledged for lawful emperor.

From this time to the year 721, we hear nothing of Gregory, besides his building or repairing several churches and monasteries, his striving to restore the decayed discipline among the monks, and sending missionaries to preach the Gospel (if what they preached at this time may be called the Gospel,) in countries not converted to the Christian religion.² In the year 721, the pope assembled a council in Rome, and on the 5th of April, to correct some abuses that had begun to prevail in the west, especially in Italy. The council consisted of twenty-two

¹ Matth. c. 5 : v. 39, 40.

² He is honored by the Greeks, as a saint, and even said by them to have wrought miracles after his death. When near his end, he desired that the word *ὕψιστος* alone, that is, “ health,” might be put on his tomb, and serve for his epitaph, to signify, that death alone can cure us of the many evils and complaints to which we are subject.—(Cedren. ad Ann. Leon. 2.) He had enjoyed the title of emperor about one year and two months.

¹ Niceph. in Breviar.

² Anast. in Greg. II.

Canons issued by the council held at Rome. Winfrid, or Boniface, comes to Rome. Sent by the pope to preach in Germany. He returns to Rome, and is ordained bishop. The oath he took on that occasion. He lays it in the tomb of St. Peter.

bishops, among whom were one from Scotland, and another from Spain, who happened to be then at Rome, of eleven presbyters, and five deacons. The pope presided, and by him were anathematized with the approbation of the rest, and delivered up to satan, in the first eleven canons, all, who should thenceforth marry their fathers, brothers, or sons' wives, their nieces, cousins, or godmothers, or the wives of deacons and presbyters: for the deacons and presbyters were still required, by the canons of the Roman church, though condemned and anathematized by the fathers of the Quinisext council,¹ to quit their wives when they entered into orders; and their wives, though debarred from all commerce with their husbands, were not to marry so long as their husbands lived. By the twelfth, those are excommunicated, who consult soothsayers and sorcerers, or use charms; and by the thirteenth, all who seize or possess gardens, or other lands belonging to the church. In the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth canons are excommunicated and accursed one Adrian, who had married a deaconess named Epiphania, the deaconess who had consented to marry him, and all who had been anyways aiding or assisting to them in so wicked an action. By the seventeenth and last canon, the clergy are forbidden, on pain of excommunication, to wear long hair.² These canons were signed by all who were present, and in the first place by Gregory himself in the following terms: "I Gregory, bishop of the holy catholic and apostolic church of Rome, have signed this constitution published by us."

While the pope was thus employed, arrived at Rome from Germany, where he had preached the Gospel with great success, Winfrid, afterwards archbishop of Mentz, and known by the name of Boniface, a man entirely devoted to the see of Rome, and one, who had no less at heart the interests of that see, than those of the Christian religion itself. He was a native of England, and having embraced the monastic life there, he passed over into Friseland in 716, to preach the Gospel to the people of that country. But a war breaking out between Charles Martel and Radbodus, king of Friseland, he returned to England, and two years after undertook, according to the prevailing humor of those times, a pilgrimage to Rome. As he was warmly recommended to the pope by Daniel, bishop of the West-Saxons, Gregory received him with extraordinary marks of kindness and esteem, and finding him a man quite fit for his purpose, he empowered him, with his blessing, and the blessing of St. Peter, to preach the Gospel not in Friseland only, but all over Germany, appointing

him his legate to all the German nations. Winfrid, thus vested with the necessary powers, and well furnished with relics, a commodity now in great vogue, returned to Friseland; and having, in the course of a few years, established Christianity there, as well as in Thuringia, in Hess, and in some parts of Saxony, he dispatched one of his companions, pursuant to the instructions he had received from the pope, to acquaint his holiness with the success of his mission. Gregory was pleased with the account of the wondrous things he had done, gave glory to God and St. Peter, and at the same time wrote to Winfrid, to congratulate him on his success, and require him to repair to Rome as soon as he conveniently could. Winfrid, upon the receipt of the pope's letter, interrupting for a while his apostolic labors, hastened to Rome, where he was, a few days after his arrival, ordained bishop, the pope changing, on that occasion, the northern and barbarous name of Winfrid into that of Boniface. As Gregory had appointed him his legate to all the inhabitants of Germany, and vested him with the legatine power, he required him, under that pretence, to take the following oath, at the tomb of St. Peter, as soon as he was ordained; and he took it accordingly: "In the name of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, in the seventh year of our most pious emperor Leo, in the fourth of his son Constantine, and in the seventh indiction, I, Boniface, by the grace of God, bishop, promise to you, blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, to blessed Gregory your vicar, and to his successors, by the undivided Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by this your most sacred body, to maintain to the last, with the help of God, the purity and unity of the holy catholic faith; to consent to nothing contrary to either; to consult in all things, the interest of your church, and in all things to concur with you, to whom power has been given of binding and loosening, with your above-mentioned vicar, and with his successors. If I shall hear of any bishops acting contrary to the canons, I shall not communicate, nor entertain any commerce with them, but reprove and retrieve them, if I can; if I cannot, I shall acquaint therewith my lord the pope. If I do not faithfully perform what I now promise, may I be found guilty at the tribunal of the eternal Judge, and incur the punishment inflicted by you on Ananias and Sapphira, who presumed to deceive and defraud you."¹

When Boniface had taken this oath (and it is the first instance that occurs in history, of an oath of obedience, or, as we may call it, of allegiance, taken to the pope,) he laid it, written with his own hand, on the pretended body of St. Peter, saying, "this is the

¹ See vol. I. p. 494.

² Concil. t. 6. p. 1455.

¹ Othlon. in vit. Bonifac. l. 2. c. 1. 14. 20. et Willibald. in ejusdem Vit. c. 5.

Boniface sets out on his return to Germany. Recommended by the pope to Charles Martel. His instructions. Ina, king of the West Saxons, embraces a monastic life at Rome;—[Year of Christ, 725.] Monks prevail chiefly in England. The evils thence arising to the state.

oath, which I have taken, and which I promise to keep." And indeed how strictly he kept it, what pains he took to establish, not in Germany only, but in France, the sovereign power of his lord the pope, and bring all other bishops to the abject state of dependence and slavery, to which he himself had so meanly submitted, will appear in the sequel.

The day after his ordination, the pope, whom he was bound to obey, presented him with a book of the laws or canons of the Roman church, charging him to take those laws, and the customs of that church, for the rule of his conduct, and the conduct of his clergy, as well as of the people, whom he should convert. The book of the Gospels was, it seems, now become too unfashionable to be recommended to the Christian converts, for the rule either of their faith, or their practice. Boniface was ordained on the last day of November, and, on the second of December he set out from Rome on his return to Germany, carrying with him commendatory letters from the pope to Charles Martel, who at that time governed the kingdom of France with the title of mayor of the palace: to all bishops, presbyters, deacons, dukes, counts, and all Christians fearing God: to the clergy and people, whom Boniface had converted: to the Christians of Thuringia, and particularly to five of them, whom he names, and who had, with great firmness and constancy, suffered persecution for the sake of their new religion: to the pagans of Thuringia: and lastly, to the people of the province of the Alt-Saxons, that is, of the ancient Saxons. These letters are all dated the first of December, the day after the ordination of Boniface, and before his departure from Rome. In them the pope exhorts those, to whom they are addressed, to assist the apostle of Germany, for so he styles him, to the utmost of their power, and to hearken to his instructions; promises eternal life to those, who shall concur with him in promoting the great work which he has undertaken; and eternally damns all, who shall presume to obstruct it.¹ In his letter to the clergy and people, whom Boniface had converted, he acquaints them with the instructions he had given him: and the instructions were, I. To admit none to holy orders, who had been twice married, or who had not married a virgin; and none, who were illiterate, who were maimed in any part of their body, who had performed public penance, were entangled in secular affairs, or had been branded with any mark of infamy. II. To ordain no Africans, most of them being disguised Manichees or Donatists. III. To confer holy orders on the Saturdays of the ember weeks only. IV. To

administer the sacrament of baptism at Easter and Whitsuntide, and at no other time, unless in case of necessity. V. To strive to increase the ornaments and estates of the church, and take care never to lessen or impair them. VI. To divide the ecclesiastical revenues, as well as the oblations, into four shares, one to be given to the bishop, another to the clergy, the third to the poor, and the pilgrims, and the fourth to be employed on the fabric.¹ These instructions Gregory copied verbatim, from an epistle written by pope Gelasius in 494, to the bishops of Lucania, of the Brutii, and of Sicily.²

Of Gregory nothing else occurs in history worthy of notice, till the year 725, when he received at Rome Ina, or, as Bede calls him, Hun, king of the West Saxons, who, having resigned his kingdom after a reign of thirty-seven years, and renounced the world to embrace a monastic life, went this year in pilgrimage to the tombs of the apostles.³ He was persuaded by his queen Ethelburg, a most religious woman, according to the religion of those days, to undertake that journey, as well as to quit both his kingdom and the world; and she attended him to Rome, retiring on her return to England to a monastery, where she spent the remaining part of her life.⁴ To retire from the world, to bury one's talents in a monastery, and to become thereby quite useless, or rather burdensome, to the public, was deemed, at this time, the height of all Christian protection, and a full atonement for all kinds of sins.⁵ This notion seems to have prevailed chiefly in England; for in the compass of two hundred and twenty years, we read of no fewer than thirty English kings and queens laying down their crowns, to bury themselves in monasteries; and, by that means, robbing the people, for whose sake they had, by kind Providence, been placed in that station, of the blessing they enjoyed under their wise administration. Their example was followed by such multitudes of people of all ranks, conditions, and callings, that Bede, though a monk himself, and a great admirer of the monkish profession, seems to have apprehended, that great mischiefs would thence, in process of time, arise to the state. For, speaking of the crowds, that flocked daily to monasteries, he expresses himself thus: "peace being established in the kingdom of Northumberland, both the nobility and common people, laying aside the exercise of

¹ Othlon. l. 1. c. 20.

² Gelas. ep. 4. Vide Coingt. in Annal. Eccl. Franc. ad Ann. 722. n. 17.

³ Bed. l. 5. c. 7.

⁴ Malm. de gest. Reg. Ang. l. 1. c. 2.

⁵ In the collections ascribed to Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, the ceremony of putting on the monkish habit is called a second baptism, and is said to be no less effectual than the first in cleansing them, who take it, from all sin.—(Concil. t. 6. Labb. col. 1875.)

Bede's opinion of the monasteries of his time. England never tributary to Rome. The pope's answer to some doubts of Boniface;—[Year of Christ, 726.]

arms, betook themselves to monasteries, and persuaded their children to retire thither too: but what this will end in, time must show."¹ The same venerable historian, in the letter he wrote in 735, a little before his death, to Egbert, archbishop of York, tells that prelate, that it is his duty to make, together with the king, such regulations with respect to monasteries, as might be most for the honor of God, and the good of his country, lest their numbers increasing, the kingdom should thereby lose its main strength, and be rendered incapable of withstanding a foreign invasion.² In the same letter he advises Egbert to lessen, with the approbation of the king and his council, the number of monasteries, rather than suffer them to increase; to erect in their stead new episcopal sees, and endow them with the lands and revenues of the suppressed monasteries, that "those houses, of which many," he says, "are, as we all know, unworthy of the name of monasteries, may be thus brought from serving the ends of pride and vanity, to bear part of the necessary charges attending the episcopal office."³ He adds, that to employ thus the wealth of such monasteries, was no crime, but rather a great instance of wisdom and virtue; it being no more a crime in one prince, to convert the mistaken charities of another to better uses and purposes, than it is a crime in a just and wise judge to reverse a wrong judgment, or in a good clerk or scribe to correct the mistakes of a bad one. From these words, and from what he farther adds, namely, that notwithstanding the great number of monasteries there was scarce a place fit for the education of youth, or for men, who were tired of the world, to retire,⁴ it is manifest that monasteries were far from being, even at this time, those schools of learning and virtue, which the legendary writers would persuade us they were.

But to return to Ina; he is said, by Polydore Virgil, to have made his kingdom tributary to the pope and St. Peter, and to have laid on every house or family, in his dominions, the tax of a silver penny, known by the name of Rome-scot, or Peter-pence, to be paid annually to the pope, or St. Peter, as a token of their subjection to the apostolic see.⁵ But the truth is, that tax was imposed by Ina, with a design, as Matthew of Westminster informs us, to build a house, or, as we may call it, a college, in Rome for the education of the youth of his kingdom, as well as for the reception of such of his successors or subjects, as should undertake pilgrimages, now daily undertaken in England, by persons of both sexes, and all ranks, to the tombs of the apostles; and to that use

it was applied. For with the money accruing from that tax, Ina not only built and endowed a house, where the west-Saxon youth were educated, and the pilgrims received and entertained, but likewise a church adjoining to it, and dedicated to the virgin Mary, where the English performed divine service, and were buried if they happened to die at Rome. That college, or school, as it is called by our historians, was afterwards enlarged, and its revenues greatly increased, by Offa, king of Mercia, who, in 791, imposed the same tax on his subjects, and for the same purpose. But the house being, some time after, consumed by fire, Ethelwolph, not satisfied with rebuilding it at an extraordinary expense, and with great magnificence, imposed, for its better support, on the whole kingdom, the tax of Rome-scot, or Peter-pence, till then, that is, till the middle of the ninth century, levied only in Wessex and Mercia. These charities, for they were no more than charities, have been, by Polydore Virgil, and after him, by all the popish writers, turned into tributes; as if the three above-mentioned kings had made their kingdoms tributary to Rome, and had thereby acknowledged themselves the vassals of their liege lord the pope. But of that, though worthy of particular observation, not the least notice is taken by any of our ancient historians; nay, Matthew of Westminster, and Matthew Paris tell us in express terms, that the money arising from the aforesaid tax was sent to Rome, for the support of the English there, and that it was raised for that purpose.¹ But that charity the popes afterwards abused, converting it to their own use; and it was, in all likelihood, to excuse that misapplication and abuse, that they pretended it was not a charity, but a tribute to St. Peter, which they might consequently dispose of at their pleasure. However that be, certain it is, that the same tax was continued all over England, and levied, when there was no farther occasion for it, by collectors sent from Rome, (one of whom was Polydore Virgil, who came first into England with that character,) till Henry VIII. quarreling with the pope, eased his people of that burden.

The following year the pope received a letter from Boniface, the apostle of Germany, containing several questions or doubts to be resolved by him, and among the rest these two; I. Whether children, sons or daughters, when offered up to God by their parents, and placed by them in monasteries, may, when they attain to the years of discretion, quit their monasteries, and marry. II. Whether a man, whose wife is by sickness rendered incapable of complying with the conjugal duty, may in that case marry another. To the first the pope answers,

¹ Bede Hist. Eccles. l. 5. c. 4.

² Idem, Ep. ad Egbert. p. 250.

³ Idem ibid. p. 260, 261.

⁴ Idem ibid.

⁵ Polydor. Virg. l. 5.

¹ Matth. Paris in Vit. Willegod.

Leo commands the Montanists and Jews to receive the sacrament of baptism. The Jews comply, but not the Montanists. The emperor shocked at the worship that was given to images. He resolves to abolish it. Not unapprised of the difficulty of such an undertaking.

that it is not lawful for children, consecrated to God by their parents, to change their state and marry; and consequently that they must observe celibacy, though not their own choice, and live continent, whether they have the gift of continency, or have it not. A most equitable decision, and entirely agreeable to the doctrine of St. Paul!¹ In answer to the second, Gregory would have the husband to contain, if he can; but declares it lawful for him, if he cannot, to marry another wife.² If so, why should not those, who have been offered up to God by their parents, be nevertheless allowed to marry, if they cannot contain? Why should not a deacon, a presbyter, and even a bishop? Is any vow or promise they can make more binding or sacred than the vow of matrimony? But the doctrine laid down here by the infallible pope, is now rank heresy in the church of Rome; and the council of Trent denounces anathema against all, who think the bond of matrimony dissoluble in any case whatever, even in case of adultery;³ it being as a sign or emblem, says Bellarmine,⁴ of the indissoluble conjunction of Christ with his church.

The church had now for the space of twelve years, that is, ever since the year 713, when Philippicus, the Monothelite emperor was driven from the throne, enjoyed a profound peace and tranquillity, none daring under the two succeeding emperors, Anastasius and Theodosius, nor indeed under the present emperor Leo, to profess the Monothelite or any other doctrine condemned by the church; nay, Leo, though in other respects a very wise prince, suffering himself to be carried by his zeal beyond all bounds, issued an edict in the sixth year of his reign, commanding the Montanists, or the followers of the famous Montanus,⁵ and even the Jews, to receive the sacrament of baptism, and profess the Christian and catholic faith, on pain of death, and the forfeiture of all their effects. With that edict the Jews pretended to comply; but the Montanists, more honest than they, chose rather to die than dissemble; and shutting themselves up in their houses by common consent, or, as they pretended, by divine inspiration, set fire to them, and consumed themselves and all their effects in the flames.⁶

But the emperor, however zealous in maintaining and propagating the catholic faith, could not approve of a custom or practice, which had begun to obtain, and which he found, to his no small surprise, several prelates of the church, and among the rest

the patriarch himself, more inclined to favor and promote, than to oppose or discountenance; I mean the practice of worshiping images so much abhorred, and so often condemned, by the primitive church, and the fathers. For the people, not satisfied with using images only for instruction, or as helps to devotion and memory, the only ends for which they had been first allowed, and very unadvisedly, to be set up in churches and places of worship, had begun to use them no longer as helps to, but as the objects of their devotion, bowing down to them, prostrating themselves before them, kissing them, &c. But that kind of worship Leo looked upon, and so did the bishops, whom he consulted on so important an occasion, not only as plainly repugnant to the worship, "in spirit and truth," recommended by our Savior in the Gospel, but as rank idolatry, and as expressly forbidden in the decalogue as theft, murder, or adultery. He had therefore resolved, as soon as he was at leisure from his wars, and the more urgent affairs of the state, to put a stop to the growing superstition; and restore the Christian worship to its primitive purity. Pursuant to that resolution, having at length by his valor and conduct settled the empire in peace, he undertook the intended reformation; and undertook it the more readily, as he looked on the surprising success, that had attended his arms, as a sure token of the approbation of heaven, and a certain pledge of a particular assistance and protection in carrying the design he had formed into execution. The wise prince was not unapprised of the difficulty of such an undertaking, and the danger, to which it would expose him, of loosing his crown, and perhaps his life too: for though the worship of images had but lately begun to obtain, though it had not yet been approved by any council or assembly of bishops whatever; yet as it was wonderfully suited to the inclination and humor of the people, it obtained already among them almost universally, especially in the imperial city, being countenanced there by the patriarch. Besides, the monks, who had a great ascendant over the ignorant multitude, and had begun to feel the good effects of the new superstition in the wealth of their churches and monasteries, had all to a man declared for it, preached it to the people, and daily confirmed it with the most absurd tales of visions and miracles invented by them for that purpose. The emperor therefore well knew, that the monks would every where oppose, to the utmost of their power, the designed reformation, and exert the same zeal in stirring up the populace against him as had been formerly exerted by the craftsmen of Ephesus, in stirring up the populace against the apostle of the Gentiles preaching. "that they be no Gods which are made with

¹ I Corinth. c. 7: v. 9.

² Greg. Ep. 13. Concil. I. 6. p. 1446.

³ Concil. Trident. Sess. 24. Can. 7.

⁴ Bellar. de Matrim. l. 1. c. 16.

⁵ See vol. I. p. 14. ⁶ Theoph. ad Ann. Incarn. 714.

The emperor acquaints the senate and clergy with his design, and issues an edict against images. Leo did not by this edict command images to be destroyed, but only forbid them to be worshiped. That edict not issued at the instigation of the Jews.

hands."¹ However, thinking it incumbent upon him to attempt, at all events, the cure of so great an evil, and being at the same time terrified with some extraordinary events, which had lately happened, and which he looked upon as so many tokens of the wrath of heaven against the people for the idolatrous worship, which they gave to images, as well as against himself for conniving at it, he resolved to endure it no longer. Having therefore assembled, in one or two distinct councils, the clergy and the senate (for he is said on this occasion to have called a synod, and convened the senate), he acquainted them with his design; and finding several bishops ready to concur with him in the execution of it, and, no doubt, the greater part of the laity, who could have no interest in opposing such an undertaking,² he issued an edict forbidding any kind of worship to be thenceforth given to images, and caused it to be immediately notified to all the subjects of the empire.

This famous edict the emperor published in the tenth year of his reign, the twelfth of pope Gregory the second of that name, and 726th of the Christian era; a year ever memorable in the ecclesiastical annals for the dispute, to which that edict first gave occasion, and the unheard of disturbances which the dispute it occasioned raised both in the church and the state. And truly this, it must be owned, was the most, I may say, the only important controversy that had been yet moved in the church; the parties disagreeing, not about mere metaphysical and empty speculations, whether in Christ was one person or two, one nature or two, one will and one operation, or two wills and two operations? but concerning a most essential and practical point of the Christian religion and worship, whether, notwithstanding the divine prohibition, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, &c., Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them," it was lawful to make graven images, to bow down to them, to worship them? And here it is to be observed, that Leo did not by his edict order at once, as is supposed by Baronius,³ images to be every where pulled down, to be cast out of the churches and broken, but only forbid them to be worshipped; nay, he was not, it seems, at first,

averse to the use of images as ornaments, or even as helps to devotion and memory, provided no worship was given to them: for, at the same time that he forbid them to be worshiped, he ordered them to be placed higher in the churches, that, as men were divided in their opinions about them, they might neither be worshiped nor abused; and it was not till he found by experience, that, so long as images were allowed, idolatry could not be prevented, for so he called it, that he ordered them to be cast out of the churches and broken.

The later Greek historians, Cedrenus, Zonaras, Glycas, and Constantine Manasses, to prejudice their credulous and ignorant readers against the emperor Leo, and his present undertaking, will have the above-mentioned edict to have been issued by him at the instigation of the Jews, the avowed enemies of the Christian religion; and the story they invented for that purpose, though destitute even of the least appearance of truth, and only calculated for the dark and ignorant ages in which they wrote, is still gravely related by the advocates for the worship of images, in the account they give us of the first rise or origin of what they call the heresy of the Iconoclasts, or breakers of images.¹ But what the true motives that

¹ Bar. ad Ann. 726. n. 2. Maimbourg. Hist. de l'Herésie des Iconoclastes.

They gravely tell us the following tale, which I should not have thought worthy of a place in this history, were it not delivered by Baronius, by Maimbourg, by Natalis Alexander, and many others, as a truth not to be questioned. While Izid or Jezid, caliph of the Saracens, reigned in Syria, two Jews, well skilled in magic and astrology, being admitted to his presence, under color of having something of great moment to communicate to him, assured him, that he would be blessed with a long and happy reign, provided he caused the images, which the Christians worshiped, to be demolished throughout his dominions. The caliph gave entire credit to the two impostors; and a most rigorous edict was immediately issued against images. But Providence interposed in their defence, and the unhappy Jezid died before his edict could be put in execution. He was succeeded by his son Mohavias, who resolved to revenge the death of his father on the Jewish impostors, being no doubt fully satisfied, that it was a judgment upon him for having hearkened to them, and at their instigation attempted to destroy the Christian images: but the Jews by a timely flight into Isauria, escaped the punishment that was due to their crime. While they were traveling in that province, they one day happened to meet a young lad named Conon, driving an ass loaded with small wares to sell about the neighboring villages; and having observed something very extraordinary in his mien and deportment (for they were, it seems, as well skilled in physiognomy as in astrology and magic,) they invited him to sit down and refresh himself with them. The youth complied; and the Jews, having learned of what country he was, his name and profession, and the names and profession of his parents, assured him thereupon, that notwithstanding the meanness of his birth, and his present condition, he would one day attain to the empire. The Jesuit Maimbourg, in his history of the Iconoclasts, or image-breakers, or rather in the romance which he wrote on that subject, tells us even at what hour of the day the Jews and young Conon met on the road; points out the very place where they sat down together; relates several particulars of that conversation, which his original authors, less accurate than he, had passed over in silence; nay, and even informs us,

² Acts c. 19: v. 26.

³ As all records and writings against images were, by the ninth canon of the second council of Nice, ordered to be destroyed, we know nothing of this but what we read in the acts of that council; and there it is said, that several bishops, and among the rest, Constantine, bishop of Nacolia, in Phrygia, approved of Leo's impious design, and concurred with him in the execution of it. It was not, therefore, without consulting a single bishop, and only at the instigation of some of the most wicked among the laity, that Leo undertook to make war upon images, as has been confidently advanced by Baronius, and after him by Maimbourg, and other popish writers.

¹ Bar. ad Ann. 726.

What the doctrine and practice of the primitive church were concerning images. No images worshiped or used during the first three centuries of the church.

induced Leo to put a stop to the worship of images, we have seen already; and be-

how Conon in the mean time disposed of his ass; inasmuch that from his account one would conclude that he had been one of the company.—(Maimb. Hist. des Iconocl. l. 1.) Conon, less credulous than the caliph, gave at first no ear to the Jews, thinking that they only diverted themselves at his expense, and took delight like common fortune-tellers, in feeding him with vain hopes. But as they positively affirmed, that what they had foretold him would certainly come to pass, and affirmed it over and over again with great gravity, he began at last to hearken to them, and asked them what reward they expected for so flattering and pleasing a prediction: as to reward, answered the Jews, we expect no other for the present, but that you promise, upon oath, to grant us what we shall ask when our prediction is fulfilled, and you in a condition to grant it. Conon, now no longer questioning their sincerity, repaired with them, as they required him, to the neighboring church of the martyr St. Theodore; and there, being assured anew by the two fortune-tellers of his future promotion, and besides of an hundred years of life, he bound himself by a solemn oath to grant them, when raised to the empire, whatever they should ask. They then took leave of each other; and Conon, from a pedlar, became at once a candidate for the empire, went immediately and enrolled himself in the army, changing his former name into that of Leo, as better suiting his new profession. And truly his behavior was answerable to his name; for, relying on the promise of the Jews, and consequently regardless of all danger, he distinguished himself on all occasions in a most eminent manner; and thus rising by degrees, he was at last, after thirty years service, appointed commander-in-chief of all the imperial forces, and soon after raised to the empire. He was scarce seated in the throne, when the two Jews appearing before him, and putting him in mind of his promise, challenged the performance of it, since their prediction was at last fully accomplished. The emperor, now satisfied that they were not impostors, but true prophets, divinely inspired, and apprehending that as they had raised him from the lowest station in life to the highest, so they might from the highest degrade him to the lowest, told them, that he well remembered his promise, that he owned himself indebted to them for the empire, and was therefore ready to comply with their demands, be they what they would. Hereupon the Jews, as being of all men the most void of self-interest, instead of laying hold of so favorable an opportunity to enrich themselves, or to obtain some advantageous grant or exemption in behalf of themselves and their nation, at this very time most miserably oppressed, contented themselves with asking the same favor of the emperor, which they had asked thirty years before of the caliph: that he would cause the second commandment to be strictly observed by the Christians, and order for that purpose the images, to which they paid, in defiance of that commandment, an idolatrous worship, to be destroyed throughout his dominions. The emperor was greatly surprised, and well he might, at the disinterestedness of the Jews, and their zeal for the observance of the law; and no less was he pleased with their asking what it would cost him nothing to grant, when they might have asked, and he expected they would, half the wealth of the empire. He therefore renewed with great joy, the promise which he had formerly made; and in compliance with it, issued in due time, the above-mentioned edict. Thus the historians, whom I have quoted above; and what credit they deserve I leave the reader to judge, only observing here, that of such an extraordinary event not the least notice is taken by any of the contemporary historians, nor indeed by any writer whatever, till near four hundred years after it is said to have happened; that by no emperor were the Jews more cruelly persecuted than by Leo, who is supposed to have been indebted to them for the empire; that the fathers of the second council of Nice, whose authority no papist will question, suppose Izyd to have issued his edict against images at the instigation of the Jews, in the seventh year of Leo's reign; and consequently, that if their authority may be relied on, the whole account of the adventure of Leo, of his meeting, while yet a youth, the Jews, who had deceived Izyd, of his being foretold by them, that he should one day attain to the empire, &c., must be a mere fable.

sides, what matters it whether it was by a Christian or a Jew, by a bishop or a Rabbi, that he was persuaded to forbid that kind of worship? If it is a thing unlawful in itself to worship images, it would have been no less commendable in him to have forbidden them to be worshiped at the persuasion of a Jew, or a Mahometan, than at the persuasion of a Christian; as it would be no less commendable in a prince to issue severe laws against theft, murder, or adultery, at the persuasion of a Jew, than at the persuasion of a Christian. The Jews indeed were, it must be owned, the first Iconoclasts, nay and for many ages, the only Iconoclasts in the world, as they were for many ages the only true worshipers of the true God; and we never find them rebuked by their prophets for their aversion to images, but, on the contrary, most severely punished and reprov'd, when of Iconoclasts they became Iconolaters, and worshiped images instead of breaking them.

The above-mentioned edict was no sooner published, than the monks took the alarm, and with them the populace. But as, in order to justify the many enormous excesses, which they committed, and I shall have occasion to relate, they pretended that the practice of setting up and worshipping images, condemned by Leo, had been ever approved by the church; and therefore branded that most religious and excellent emperor with the reproachful names of innovator, apostate, heretic, nay, and heresiarch, as if no Christian before him but Jews only, and Saracens, had thought such a practice unlawful, or presumed to condemn it; it may not be improper to inquire, before I proceed, what was the practice, and what the doctrine, of the primitive church, concerning the subject of the present dispute, that the reader may judge who were the innovators, the apostates, the heretics, the emperor in forbidding images to be worshiped, or they, who, in opposition to him, maintained and countenanced that kind of worship.

And first, as to the practice of the primitive church; that the Christians, for the first three centuries after Christ, and the greater part of the fourth, neither worshiped images, nor used them in their worship, has, by several protestant divines, been so fully proved from the concurring testimonies of all the primitive fathers, that many eminent Roman catholic writers, ashamed to dispute so plain a truth, have ingenuously owned it.¹ But Baronius, Bellarmine, Turrianus,

¹ These are the learned Petavius and Pagi, the one a Jesuit, and the other a Franciscan; Nicholas de Clemangis, Giraldus, Polydore Virgil, Mendoza, Casander, Erasmus, &c. There was little or no use of images during the first four centuries, says Petavius and Pagi.—(Petav. Theologic. Dog. l. 5. c. 13. Pagi Critic. Bar. ad Ann. 56.) The universal church, says de Clemangis, decreed that no images should be placed in the churches.—(De Clemang. Lib. de Nov.

Attempts to prove the antiquity of image worship.

Binius, Natalis Alexander, and the far greater part of the popish divines, choosing rather to contradict all the fathers, than allow the protestants to have antiquity on their side in so important a dispute, antiquity, to which they so often appeal, will have the use and worship of images to be as ancient as the Christian religion itself. To prove that, they gravely allege a decree, supposed to have been made in a council held by the apostles at Antioch, commanding the faithful, "that they may not err about the object of their worship, to make images of Christ, and to worship them;"¹ nay, they are not even ashamed to relate, and urge against protestants, all the absurd and ridiculous tales, that are told by Evagrius, Metaphrastes, Damascene, Nicephorus Callistus, Theodororus Lector, and other fabulous writers, concerning the following images; the image of our Savior, sent, by our Savior himself to Abgarus, king of Edessa;² another of our

Savior made by Nicodemus;¹ the famous Veronica, or holy handkerchief;² a picture

letters, it is true, are quoted by pope Adrian as genuine.—(Adrian in Respons. ad Capitul. Carol. Mag. c. 18.) But was Adrian more infallible than Gelasius, who condemned them as apocryphal?

¹ The bishops of the second council of Nice, an assembly of the most remarkably credulous and ignorant men that perhaps ever met, to prove the antiquity of the use and worship of images, told a wonderful story of an image of our Savior made by Nicodemus, perhaps when he came to Jesus by night. That image, said the good fathers, had been long worshipped by all true Christians in the city of Berytus in Syria. But some sacrilegious Jews having found means to convey it away, and crucified it out of hatred to Christ and the Christians, there issued from it, as if Christ himself had been crucified anew, an incredible quantity of blood and water, which was sent into all parts of Asia, Africa, and Europe.—(Con. Nic. 2. Act. 4.) For this tale the council quoted a treatise on the passion of the image of our Lord, which they ascribed to St. Athanasius. But that St. Athanasius was not the author of that treatise, is allowed even by Bellarmine, who, speaking of that work, expresses himself thus: "The treatise on the passion of the image of our Lord was quoted, read, and received, by the second council of Nice, under the name of St. Athanasius. But it seems to have been written by a much later author; and Siebert informs us in his chronicle, that the miracle related there happened in the year of our Lord, 766, when the lawfulness of image-worship first began to be questioned."—(Bellarm. de Script. Eccles. in Observat. in tom. 4. Athan.) So that, to prove the antiquity of the use and worship of images, a miracle was alleged by the very learned bishops of that venerable assembly, which had been wrought, according to Bellarmine and Siebert, in their own time, and but twenty years before they met; for that famous council was first opened in the year 786. But that it was not wrought in their time, and consequently in no other, is evident from their supposing it to have been wrought 400 years before. And here I cannot help observing the disingenuity of Bellarmine, allowing in his book on the ecclesiastical writers, (Idem, ibid.) the above-mentioned treatise to be the work of a much later writer than Athanasius, nay, and the supposed crucifixion and miracle to have happened about the year 766, and yet pretending where he undertakes to prove the ancient use of images, (Idem, lib. de Imagin. c. 12.) the same treatise to have been written by a very ancient author, because it was quoted by the fathers of the council, as a very ancient work; which is allowing, in the one place, the fathers to have been mistaken in quoting it as an ancient work, and proving it in the other (where the more ancient it was, the better it served his purpose) to be an ancient work, because it was quoted as such by the fathers.

² We are told, that as our Savior was carrying his cross to mount Calvary, a pious woman, named Veronica, seeing him bathed in sweat under so great a burden, and touched with compassion, made her way through the crowd, and wiped his face with a handkerchief; and that our Savior, to reward the good woman for that small relief, left the impression of his countenance on the cloth. That image, called by the name of its original owner, the Veronica, is supposed to have been brought to Rome, in the time of the emperor Tiberius; and there it is kept to this day, and exposed, at solemn times, to public adoration; the many miracles, says Pamelius, (Pamel. Annot. in Apologet. Tertull. c. 12.) that are daily wrought by it, leaving no room to question its authenticity. It is once a year visited, and solemnly worshipped, by the pope, and all the cardinals; and the following prayer is appointed to be said at the showing of it: "Hail, holy face of our Redeemer, printed upon a cloth as white as snow; purge us from all spot of vice, and join us to the company of the blessed. Bring us to our country, O happy figure! there to see the pure face of Christ." Reasonable requests indeed, to be made to a painted handkerchief! To every repetition of this prayer, pope John XXII., annexed ten thousand days' indulgence. As that cloth is supposed to have touched the body of Christ, it is worshipped with the worship of Latria, that is, with the same supreme or sovereign worship that is due to God; and it has an altar consecrated to it in the church of St. Peter at Rome, called "The altar of the most holy handker-

Celebrit. p. 151.) As the Romans were some time (for the space of one hundred and seventy years) without images, says Giraldus, so were we Christians in that church which is called primitive.—(Girald. Syntagm. l. 1. p. 14.) The worship of images was condemned, as appears from St. Jerom, by almost all the holy fathers, says Polydore Virgil, (Polydor. Virgil. de Invent. Rerum, l. 6. c. 13.) for fear of Idolatry. And Mendoza—the private bishops abstained for awhile from the worship of images (that is, for the space of seven hundred years, as shall be shown,) lest the heathens should deride them, or imagine that the Christians worshipped them as gods.—(Mendoz. de Concil. Elib. l. 3. c. 5.) How much the Christians abhorred all veneration of images in the beginning of the church, Origen alone sufficiently shows in his book against Celsus, says Cassand.—(Cassand. Consult. cap. de Imagin. p. 168.)—Erasmus owns, that to the days of Jerom, who died in 420, men of approved religion would suffer no graven or painted images in places of worship.—(Erasm. vol. 5. Symbol. Catech. p. 989.) And Petrus Crintius finds fault with some of the fathers, especially Lactantius and Tertullian, for suffering themselves to be so transported by their zeal against the images of the heathens, as to condemn images, and the worship of images, in general.—(Petr. Crin. de Honor. Disciplin. l. 9. c. 9.)

¹ Bar. ad Ann. 102. Binius Not. in Concil. Antioch. t. 1. p. 62.

² Evagrius writes, that Abgarus, king of Edessa, being extremely desirous of seeing our Savior, invited him by a letter into his small kingdom; and that finding from his answer he was not to expect so great a favor, he sent a painter into Judea, to draw his picture. This the painter attempted; but being dazzled by the brightness of the glory, that shone in his face, and unable to proceed, our Savior took a piece of linen cloth, imprinted his picture on it, and sent it to Abgarus. Thus Evagrius, (Evag. l. 4. c. 26.) and after him Metaphrastes, (Metaphrast. in Vit. Constantin.) Damascene, (Damascen. de Imaginib.) Nicephorus Callistus, (Niceph. l. 2. c. 2.) Baronius, Bellarmine, &c. But of this famous image no mention is made by any writer whatever before the time of Evagrius, that is, till the latter end of the sixth century; for that author ended his history, such as it is, in the twelfth year of the emperor Mauritius, that is, about the year 595, of the Christian era. Eusebius, who wrote near three hundred years before Evagrius, mentions indeed the pretended letters from Abgarus to our Savior, and from our Savior to Abgarus; (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 1. versus fin.) and even translated them out of Syriac into Greek; but takes no kind of notice of the above-mentioned picture. A plain proof, that in his time the fable of the letters was already invented, but not the fable of the image, or the picture. I say the fable of the letters, which I hope no Roman catholic will take amiss, since it was proscribed as such, by pope Gelasius, in a council of seventy bishops.—(Tom. 3. Concil. et apud Gratian. dist. 15. Can. Sancta Romana.) These

Some emblematical figures used in the primitive times. Such figures different from images. The supposed statue of our Savior at Paneas.

of Christ, and seven of the virgin Mary, drawn by St. Luke, whom they suppose, upon the authority of Metaphrastes, a writer of the ninth century, to have been her secretary, and an eminent painter.¹ But of the supposed apostolical decree no mention is made, no notice is taken, by any writer whatever, till seven hundred years after the times of the apostles, that is, till the dispute about images, and the worship of images, made such a council and such a decree necessary. And on that consideration both are given up, as inventions of the more modern Greeks, by Petavius,² by Pagi,³ and by all the Roman catholic writers of judg-

chief." But of this wonder-working image no mention is made, nor is the least notice taken, by any writer whatever during the long dispute about the antiquity and lawfulness of images, nor indeed during the first ten centuries after Christ. And who can believe, that such an image could have remained so long utterly unknown to the Christian world; or, if it had been known, that no writer would have mentioned it; that none of the advocates for images, not even the fathers of the second council of Nice, who believed every old woman's story they had ever heard, would have availed themselves of it against their adversaries? An image of our Savior, made by himself, would have been a stronger proof of the lawfulness of images, than one made by his night disciple Nicodemus. As for the miracles said and believed to be daily wrought by the Veronica at Rome, no less stupendous miracles are said to be daily wrought by the Veronica in Spain, and by another at Jerusalem. For in these three different places Veronicas are shown, are worshipped with the worship of Latria, and by their respective votaries proved to be originals, from the miracles they daily work. This multiplication of Veronicas occasioned warm disputes, each of the contending parties pretending theirs to be the original, and the other two only copies, till a lucky discovery of the Jesuit Gretser put an end to the quarrel: for by him it was found out, that the handkerchief of Veronica had three foldings, that on each of them our Savior imprinted a distinct image, and consequently that they are all originals. It were to be wished that Gretser had likewise discovered, and let us know, where these three originals were kept concealed from all mankind, for the space of one thousand years and upwards.

¹ We are told by Nicephorus Calistus, (Niceph. Hist. l. 14. c. 2.) that St. Luke drew a picture of our Savior, and no fewer than seven of the virgin Mary; and what he writes is confirmed by the following inscription, which I have often seen in one of the chapels of Santa Maria in Via Lata in Rome: Here was formerly the oratory of St. Paul the apostle, of St. Luke the evangelist, and of St. Martial, all three martyrs; and here was likewise found the image of the blessed virgin Mary, one of the seven that were painted by St. Luke. "It was at Rome," says Paulus Aringhus, speaking of this inscription, "that the worship of the virgin Mary was first begun and recommended to the world; there St. Luke made war on the Iconoclasts with his pencil, which served him instead of a sword against the heretics, enemies of images."—(Paulus Aringhus, Rom. subterr. l. 3. c. 12.) From these pictures Nicephorus gives us a very minute description of the virgin Mary as to her person, her stature, size, complexion, &c., and even of the length of her fingers, which, he says, were somewhat too long, and not quite proportioned to the rest of her body. (Niceph. Hist. Eccles. l. 2. c. 23.) But in the time of St. Austin, who lived in the fifth century, not one of these pictures had yet been heard of; for that father tells us, that in his days no one could give any account of the person of Christ, or of the virgin Mary: (August. de Trinit. l. 7. c. 4. et 5.) nor indeed was any of them heard of till the time of Nicephorus, that is, till the fourteenth century. But since his time they have multiplied to such a degree, that twenty at least are now shown in different parts; all painted by St. Luke, and all alike famous for the miracles they work.

² Petav. Dog. Theol. de Incar. l. 15. c. 14.

³ Pagi Critic. Bar. ad Ann. 56.

ment and candor; and so are the images mentioned above, though declared authentic by several popes, and still honored by them with an extraordinary worship.

The first instance that occurs in any credible author of images among Christians, is that of certain cups, or chalices, as Bellarmine will have it, on which was represented the parable of the good shepherd carrying the lost sheep on his shoulders.¹ But all that can be inferred from thence is, that the church, at that time, did not think emblematical figures unlawful ornaments of cups or chalices. And what protestant, how averse soever to images, and the worship of images, ever thought otherwise? The representation of the good shepherd was the representation, or image, of a type of Christ, not of Christ himself, no more than the representation or image of a woman lighting a candle, and sweeping the house till she finds the piece of silver, which she had lost; of a hen gathering her chickens under her wings; of a vine; of a gate, &c. These are all images, not of Christ, but of things to which Christ is compared in the parables; and here we only inquire, whether images of God, of Christ, of the saints, were worshipped by the primitive Christians, or used by them in their worship? The image of the good shepherd, say they, was the image of Christ under that type or figure, and consequently a true object of worship. But the image of Christ, under a type or figure, is nothing in effect, but the image of a figure or type of Christ; and if such an image is an object of worship, the images of a woman sweeping the house, of a hen gathering her chickens under her wings, of a gate, vine, &c., must all be allowed to be objects of worship; or rather, a real woman, hen, vine, and gate, they being the real types of Christ, and their images only types of the types. Indeed I can see no reason why a shepherd, carrying a lost sheep on his shoulders, should be painted with a glory round his head, and not a hen gathering her chickens under her wings; or why a papist should not fall down on his knees, and worship the image of the hen, as well as the image of the shepherd; nay, why he should not worship a real shepherd, and a real hen, rather than their images.

The other instance they allege to prove the antiquity of the use and worship of images, is out of Eusebius: for that historian tells us, that in his time were to be seen two brass statues, and he saw them himself, in the city of Paneas, or Cæsarea Philippi; the one of a woman on her knees, with her arms stretched out, the other of a man over-against her, with his hand extended to receive her. These two statues were said, as Eusebius informs us, to be the images of

¹ Tertul. de Pudicit. c. 10.

No proof of the use of images among Christians, much less of the worship. That statue not worshiped by the Christians. Why images were neither used nor worshiped in the primitive times. Reasons alleged by the advocates for images.

our Savior, and the woman whom he cured of an issue of blood; and to have been erected by her on her return home, as a lasting monument of her gratitude for so miraculous a cure. The historian adds, that from the foot of the statue, said to be our Savior's, sprung up an exotic plant, which was said to cure all sorts of distempers, as soon as it grew to touch the border of his garment.¹ Hence they conclude, that not only emblematical figures, but real images, were used as early as our Savior's time, and that the use of them was confirmed by a standing miracle. But, 1st, those statues were only said to be images of Christ, and the woman, whom he cured; the woman was only said to be a native of that place; she was only said to have erected those statues, and indeed very improbably, "as she had spent all that she had on physicians;" and lastly, the plant that grew at the foot of the statue, was only said to cure all sorts of distempers: for Eusebius vouches none of these things, but seems rather to question them all. But, secondly, allowing all that is said to be true, it will not follow from thence, that the use of images was so early introduced among Christians: for Eusebius supposes the woman, who erected the statue of our Savior, to have been a pagan; nay, and ascribes the erecting it to a pagan custom. "No wonder," says he, "that the pagans thus preserved the remembrance of the benefits which they had received of our Savior. It was their custom to transmit to posterity such marks of gratitude to their benefactors; and I myself have seen several pictures of Christ, and his apostles Paul and Peter, thus preserved by them to our days."² It is quite surprising, that this passage should be alleged, as it is on all occasions, by the advocates for image-worship, to prove that the use and worship of images obtained among Christians in the earlier times; when, on the contrary, it evidently proves, that in the time of Eusebius, or in the beginning of the fourth century, it was still thought a heathenish custom to make any images of Christ or his apostles.

But the above-mentioned statue, says Baronius, Bellarmine, and Natalis Alexander, was placed in the diaconicon, or vestry of the church of Paneas, and worshiped there by the Christians. This they confidently affirm upon the authority of Nicephorus Calistus, whom Baronius himself styles a writer of fables, and Bellarmine the most fabulous of all writers. And truly had they but looked into Philostorgius, of whom Nicephorus borrowed all he says of that statue, they would have been confirmed in the opinion which they entertained of him. For whereas Nicephorus says, that the Christians

kept the statue, and worshiped it,¹ Philostorgius tells us in express terms, that they carefully preserved it, "but paid no kind of worship to it, because it is not lawful for Christians to worship brass, or any other matter;"² no, not brass, or any other matter, though representing Christ himself. I shall add here the answer given by Charlemagne to those who in his time instanced the above-mentioned statue, to prove the antiquity of the use and worship of images. "That story," says he, "though we should allow it to be true, is quite foreign to the subject in debate; that image having been erected by a weak, ignorant woman, to express her gratitude after the best manner among the Gentiles. And what is that to the church of God? Should we even suppose miraculous cures to have been wrought by the herb, that grew at the foot of the statue, it would not follow from thence, that men are to worship images, but rather that they ought to quit their idols, and embrace the true faith, signs not being, according to the apostle, for believers, but unbelievers."³

These are the only instances that have been yet alleged to prove the antiquity of the use and worship of images, but instances so very little to the purpose, even in the opinion of many learned Roman catholic divines, that they have chosen to give up the question rather than allege them, and ingeniously owned, as has been observed above, that for the first four ages after Christ, there was little or no use at all of images among Christians. But it was not, say they, because the primitive Christians thought the use and worship of images unlawful in themselves, that they forbore to use and to worship them, but lest they should thereby give offence to the Gentiles, who might think that the Christians worshiped their images as they worshiped theirs, or should at least expose such of them as embraced the Christian religion to the danger of idolatry, that is, of paying the same worship to the images of Christ and the saints, after their conversion, which they had paid to the images of the false gods before their conversion. But these motives ceasing when idolatry was quite rooted out, and the Christian religion established in its room, the Christians, finding images great helps to devotion, and seeing no reason why they should still forbear the use of them, thought it advisable to admit them into their churches, and give them due worship, for the sake of those whom they represented.⁴ Thus they account for the Christians not having nor worshiping images, while idolatry prevailed over the

¹ Niceph. l. 10. c. 30.

² Philost. Eccles. Hist. l. 7. c. 3.

³ Carol. Lib. de Imagin. l. 4. c. 15.

⁴ Petav. Dogm. Theolog. ubi supr. Antost. Pagl. Critic. Bar. ad Ann. 56. Francis. Pagl. Brev. Pont. Rom. t. 1. p. 522. Dupin. Nouv. Biblioth. t. 2. p. 306.

¹ Euseb. Hist. Eccles. l. 1. 7. c. 18.

² Idem, ibid.

Reasons alleged by the primitive Christians for their neither using or worshipping images. They thought it a thing unlawful in itself, to make any images of the Deity. The reasons they alleged against the use and worship of images extend to all images, and hold good in all times.

Christian religion, that is, for the first three centuries of the church, and the greater part of the fourth; and for their using and worshipping them, when the Christian religion prevailed over idolatry.

But the primitive Christians have themselves accounted for their neither using nor worshipping images; and the reasons which they allege why they neither used nor worshipped them, are such as must hold good in all times, in the times when the Christian religion prevailed over idolatry, as well as in those when idolatry prevailed over the Christian religion. For the chief reasons we find alleged by them, against the use as well as the worship of images, are: because all material images of the Deity are "unworthy of God," are "unsuitable to his divine nature, debase his Godhead, and lessen his majesty. It is an injury to God," says Justin Martyr, "to make an image of him of base wood or stone."¹ "Visible representations of the Deity," says Clemens Alexandrinus, "lessen his majesty, and make him contemptible;"² such representations of the Trinity, as are frequently seen in the churches abroad, of an old man holding a crucifix in his hand, with a dove on his shoulder; or of an old man on the one side with a globe, and a younger on the other with a cross, and a dove between them; or of an old man in the dress of the pope; for as they blasphemously call the pope god upon earth, so they sometimes blasphemously represent God the Father, as the pope of heaven. What images among the pagans more debased the Divine nature, or were better calculated to beget a mean opinion of God in the minds of the ignorant multitude? And yet these and such like representations are allowed in the church of Rome, and Clement XI. in our days condemned some, who, shocked at seeing "the truth of God thus changed into a lie, and the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, had ventured to censure them. Clemens Alexandrinus commends Numa for forbidding images of God like to man, or to any living creature; and says that he acted therein very wisely (more wisely than the infallible Head of the church,) "since God ought only to be represented to our minds."³ And St. Austin, after quoting Varro, saying that the Romans, for the space of one hundred and seventy years, worshiped the gods without pictures or images; that their worship would have been more pure, had images never been introduced; and that they, who first introduced them, took away from men the fear of the gods, and added to their error; St. Austin, I say, after quoting that passage, and approving it, adds, that if "Varro had dared to speak his mind

openly against so ancient an error, he would have said, that one God ought to be worshipped; and that he ought to be worshipped without an image, images serving only to bring the Deity into contempt."⁴ The same father declares elsewhere, "That it would be impious in a Christian to set up a corporeal image of God in a church; and that he would be thereby guilty of the sacrilege condemned by St. Paul, of turning the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man."⁵ From these passages, (and many more might be alleged to the same purpose, it is manifest beyond contradiction, that the primitive Christians thought it a thing unlawful in itself even to make any images, or representations, at least, of the Deity; and consequently that it was not, as is pretended, out of any temporary motive, that they abstained from the use of such images in their worship.

The other reasons, which they alleged, in their disputes with the Gentiles, against the use and worship of images, are taken either from the nature of the images themselves, or from the prohibition of the divine law; and consequently such as extend to all images, and must necessarily hold good in all times. The reasons taken from the images themselves are, that they are the work of men's hands, made of earth, the same earth with that of which vessels are made for the most common and meanest uses;⁶ that they are destitute of life, and all sense; incapable of assisting those, who apply to them, or hurting those, who despise them; more insignificant than the most imperfect insect, and less worthy of worship;⁷ that the works of God are not to be worshiped, much less the works of men; that it were more reasonable to worship the artificers; and that the images themselves, were they not destitute of all sense, would worship those who made them;⁸ that birds, mice, and spiders, have less folly than men, since they despise, and even defile, without fear, the things before which men fall down with fear and trembling;⁹ that the objects, worshiped by images, would laugh at that kind of worship, if capable of laughter; and would be provoked by it to indignation, if subject to anger;⁷ that, if they are in heaven, we ought to direct our eyes to heaven, and not to stones, to wood, or to walls;⁸ that man is the living image of God, and therefore can worship no image but what is less worthy of worship than himself, whom yet it would be a crime to worship:⁹ and are not all images, even the

¹ Aug. 1. de Civ. Dei, l. 7. c. 5. et l. 4. c. 32.

² Idem de Fide, et Symb. c. 7.

³ Lact. l. 2. c. 3.

⁴ Tertull. Apol. c. 12. Minuc. p. 26. Arnob. l. 6. p. 202.

⁵ Lact. l. 2. c. 2. Athan. contr. Gent. Aug. in Psal. 113.

⁶ Tertull. Apol. c. 12. Minuc. p. 22. Clem. Alex. Protrept. Lact. Arnob. Aug. ubi supra.

⁷ Arnob. l. 6. p. 189.

⁸ Idem, p. 195.

⁹ Lact. l. 2. c. 17.

¹ Justin. Apol. 2. p. 44. ² Clem. Alex. Strom. 5.

³ Clem. Alex. Strom. 1. et Protrept. p. 46.

The second commandment understood by the fathers as forbidding the use and worship of all images whatever. And by some, as forbidding the very arts of painting and engraving.

images of Christ, and the virgin Mary, the famous Madonna of Loreto not excepted, the work of men's hands, made of earth, destitute of sense and all life, incapable of assisting those, who apply to them, &c. and, on that consideration, no more worthy of worship than the images of the heathens? If the fathers had thought that any images whatever might, at any time whatever, be lawfully worshiped, they would not have thus condemned that worship in general; and condemned it for reasons, that evidently conclude against the worship of all images, and in all times.

The other reason, which the primitive fathers of Christians alleged why they neither used images in their worship, nor worshiped them, was the prohibition of the divine law, "thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image," &c. and that prohibition they understood as extending to all images made with respect to the worship of God, and consequently to the images of Christ, of the virgin Mary, of the saints and angels, and of the true God as well as of the false and heathenish gods. "We Christians," says Origen, "have nothing to do with images on account of the second commandment; the first thing we teach those, who come to us, is to despise idols, and all images, it being the peculiar character of the Christian religion to raise our minds above images, and all worship of creatures, agreeably to the law, which God himself has given to mankind."² The same father distinguishes elsewhere between worship and service; and, after telling us, that worship belongs to the body, and service to the mind, he adds, "but we are forbidden by the divine law to give either to any image or similitude;"³ so that, by the second commandment we are forbidden, according to Origen, to perform any external act of worship, such as bowing down, kneeling, &c. to any image whatever. When the Jews and Christians were, on account of their enmity to images, compared by Celsus to the Scythians, the Numidians, the Seres, and other barbarous nations, that had neither civility nor religion, Origen answered, that men should examine the reason and motive of the action as well as the action, since those, who acted alike, might act upon very different principles; and consequently, the same action might in some be worthy of reproach, and of praise in others; that the Jews and Christians agreed indeed with some barbarous and lawless nations in abstaining from the use and worship of images, but disagreed in the motive, their only motive being to obey the express command of God, saying, "thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image," &c. and that the Christians, in compliance with that command, would rather die than defile them-

selves with such impieties.¹ And it is to be observed, that Origen does not allege here the second commandment as a reason why the Jews and Christians did not use nor worship the same images, that were used and worshiped by the heathens; but why they neither used nor worshiped any images of their own: for it was because they had no images at all, none even in their own way of worship, that Celsus compared them to the barbarous and lawless nations mentioned above. With Origen the other fathers all agree: "God by his law forbids all similitudes," says Tertullian, "especially the similitude of himself;"² and in answer to those, who alleged, or might have alleged, the instance of the brazen serpent, against this general command, he reasons thus: "God by his law forbade the making of any likeness; and it was by an extraordinary command that he required the likeness of a serpent to be made. If thou observest the same God, thou hast his law, 'make no likeness.' As to the command of making a likeness afterwards, do thou also imitate Moses; make no image whatever against the law, unless God command thee also, in particular, so to do:"³ and, in the same treatise, "every figure," says he, "is by the law of God an idol, and every service performed about it is idolatry."⁴ "The sense of the law," says Lactantius, "is, that nothing is to be worshiped, that is seen."⁵ "The idols," says St. Cyprian, "which the law forbids us to make, or to worship, are such as the prophet describes, saying, they have eyes and see not, ears and hear not," &c.⁶ that is, all images that are worshiped, whomsoever they represent. "By the first commandment," says St. Austin, (for he and Fulgentius call the first commandment what all the other fathers call the second), "all similitudes, even of God himself, are forbidden to be worshiped, because no image of God is to be worshiped, but what is God himself; neither is that to be worshiped in his stead, but together with him."⁷

Some of the fathers, namely, Tertullian,⁸ Clemens Alexandrinus⁹ and Origen,¹⁰ were of opinion, that, by the second commandment, the very arts of painting and engraving were rendered unlawful to a Christian, styling them evil and wicked arts, arts invented, and brought into the world, by the devil. "We Christians," says Clemens of Alexandria, "are plainly forbidden to exercise these deceitful arts, the prophet saying, 'thou shalt not make the likeness of any thing in heaven, or on the earth.'¹¹ Origen commends

¹ Orig. cont. Cels. l. 7. p. 357.

² Tert. de Spect. c. 23.

³ Idem de Idololat. c. 5.

⁴ Idem ibid. c. 3.

⁵ Lact. l. 2. c. 2.

⁶ Cypr. Exhort. Martyr.

⁷ Aug. Ep. 119. c. 11.

⁸ Tertull. de Idol. c. 3.

⁹ Clem. Alex. Admonit. ad Gent. p. 41.

¹⁰ Orig. contr. Cels. l. 6. p. 182.

¹¹ Clem. Protept. p. 30.

¹ Orig. cont. Cels. l. 7. ² Idem ibid. l. 5.

³ Idem, Exhort. ad Martyr. et in Exod. Hom. 8.

The heathens neither worshiped their images as gods, nor false gods through them.

the Jews for suffering no painter or statuary in their republic, as acting therein agreeably to the divine law.¹ "The divine law proclaims," says Tertullian, "Thou shalt make no idol, and, adding, neither the likeness of any thing in heaven, or in the earth, has forbidden the servants of God to exercise such arts." And to the excuse of the image maker, saying, "I have no other means of earning a livelihood," he answers, "What hast thou to do with God, if thou wilt live by thy own laws? The church permits all men to labor; but not to labor in those arts, which the discipline of God does not allow."² Had Tertullian only thought it unlawful, as some have understood him, to paint or engrave images of the false gods, and not of the true God, of Christ or the virgin Mary, he would have naturally exhorted the painters and engravers to paint and engrave them, to copy the picture, which our Savior sent to the king of Edessa, the Veronica, or some of the pictures drawn by Nicodemus and St. Luke, and not required them, as he absolutely does, to quit their profession, and earn a livelihood by some other means. It is true that the fathers, who thought it unlawful for a Christian to exercise the arts of painting and engraving, suffered themselves to be transported by their zeal against images, beyond the bounds of all reason: but yet, their thinking so, whether right or wrong, plainly shows, that the church, in their days, neither used, nor thought it lawful to use, pictures or images in their worship, under any color or pretence whatever, not even as helps to memory, or books for those who could not read; for if she had, she never would have suffered the arts, to which she owed such books and helps, to be thus condemned as unlawful.

The popish writers, to elude the testimonies of the fathers, thus condemning the worship, the use, and even the making of images, would have us to understand them as speaking only of the images of the heathens, or of the worship of images as practised by the heathens, who, they say, either worshiped the images themselves as gods, or worshiped false gods through them; and were, on that account, condemned by the fathers, and deservedly condemned, as guilty of idolatry: but that, they say, does not at all affect the worship, which they give to images, since they neither worship them as gods, nor worship false gods through them, but the true God, or his saints and holy angels; for on them the worship terminates, that is given to their images: but, I. The fathers thought it unlawful to worship, to use in their worship, or even to make any images of the true God, as has been proved above. II. They allege the second commandment as a reason, why they neither

worshiped the images of the heathens, nor any of their own, as has been likewise shown; and consequently thought it a breach of that commandment to worship either. III. The heathens, I mean the wiser heathens, who stood up for the worship of images in opposition to the fathers, neither worshiped their images as gods, nor did they worship false gods through them: that they did not worship their images as gods, but only as representations of the beings, which they worshiped, whatever those beings were, has by a very eminent writer been made to appear evident beyond contradiction, from the testimonies of the Christian as well as the heathen writers.¹ And indeed, none but fools and idiots could think, as was observed by Celsus, that the wood or stone of their images made and governed the world; that an image, made by a smith or a carpenter, was the Creator of the world, the Maker of the very man who made it, and of the very metal of which it was made.² Neither did

¹ Stillingfleet's Defence of the Discourse of Idolatry, &c. p. 382. et seq.

² "Images," says Maximus Tyrius, "are only intended to help our memory, and a kind of manuduction to the gods; but no more like to them, than heaven is to the earth." And a few lines after, "whether men," says he, "worship God by the art of Phidias, as the Greeks do, or by the worship of living creatures, after the manner of the Egyptians, or by the worship of rivers, or of fire, as is practised by other nations, I condemn not the variety; let them only understand, love, and remember Him, whom they worship."—(Max. Tyr. Diss. 35.) "You are mistaken," say the heathens in Arnobius, "if you think that we look on our images as gods: We do not believe that the brass, the silver, the gold, and the other materials that compose them, are gods of themselves, nor do we worship them; but in them those to whom they are consecrated; and who dwell in them, in virtue of their consecration."—(Arnob. l. 7. p. 200. 202.) And St. Austin introduces a heathen speaking thus; "I do not worship that visible sign, or image; but the invisible deity, that dwells in it.—(Aug. in Psal. 113.) And here we may observe, that, as the Roman catholics believe the virgin Mary and the saints, to be in a particular manner present in their images, after they are consecrated; and to be in a more particular manner present in some, than in others; for in some they work miracles, and not in others; so did the heathens believe that their gods were present, after a particular manner, in their images; and made, as it were, to dwell in them by their consecration. In the famous apology, which Athenagoras wrote for the Christian religion, in the latter end of the second century, and dedicated to the two emperors Marcus Aurelius, and Commodus, the heathens are brought in declaring, that "images were only representations of the gods, to whom they were consecrated; and that the honors, gifts, and sacrifices, offered to the images, did not belong to them, but to the gods, whom they represented."—(Athen. Apol. p. 17.) The emperor Julian, as zealous an advocate for the worship of images, and as orthodox, with respect to that article, as the pope himself, reasons thus on that subject: "He, who loves the king, takes pleasure in seeing the picture of the king; and he, who loves his child, or his father, loves every representation of his child, or his father: in like manner he, who loves the gods, loves every representation of the gods; and, beholding their images, secretly fears and reverences them;" and, in another place, "The images of the gods," says he, "were placed by our ancestors, as signs and symbols of their presence; not that we should believe them to be gods, but that we should worship the gods, by giving worship to them."—(Julian. Oper. p. 537. 539.) The very doctrine of the church of Rome, with respect to the worship of the saints and their images. Tully, in his treatise on "The Nature of the Gods," will have the

¹ Orig. ubi supra, l. 6. p. 321.

² Tertull. de Spect. c. 23. et de Idol. c. 4.

Different grades of worship.

they worship false gods through their images, but, according to the different opinions that obtained among them,¹ either the true God, and him alone, or together with him, but in

gods to have been first represented in human shape, "either by the advice of wise men to bring the ignorant multitude the more easily to worship them, or out of superstition, that when they worship the images, they might believe that they approached and worshipped the gods themselves."—(Cic. de Natur. Deor. l. 1. c. 27.) When Symmachus pleaded, under the emperor Valentinian, for the toleration of the pagan religion, he alleged the following reason in behalf of paganism, that "the same God was worshipped by all;" and "that, by several ways, men aimed at the same end."—(Symmach. l. 11. Ep. 54.) And it is observable, that St. Ambrose, who answered him, does not charge the pagans with worshipping their images as gods; but finds fault with them for worshipping the true God by images, when he has declared, that he will not be worshipped after such a manner, "Non vult se Deus in lapidibus coli. God will not be worshipped in stocks and stones."—(Ambros. Relat. Symm. 2.) To these testimonies I shall add one more, that of Plutarch, who, speaking of the Egyptian idolatry, that is, of the worship of living creatures, as practised by the Egyptians, tells us, that "though the ignorant and superstitious people worshipped the living creatures themselves, as gods, and thereby exposed their religion to scorn and contempt, their wiser men did not worship the animals, but looked on them only as representations of some divine perfection, which they discovered in them, and through them worshipped the Deity." Nay, Plutarch thinks, that living creatures are better representations of the Divine Being, than images, that have neither life, sense, nor motion; and that God should rather be worshipped in his own works than in the works of men.—(Plut. de Isid. p. 352.) From these passages it is manifest beyond all dispute, that the wiser heathens neither looked on their images, nor worshipped them, as gods; and consequently that the worship of images was not on that account condemned in them by the fathers as unlawful, or idolatrous.

¹ Some of the heathen philosophers, or, as we may call them, divines, namely, the Stoics, acknowledged but one God, the first cause of all things; and him alone they worshipped under different names, titles, and representations: "We worship but one God," says one of them, "Maximus Madaurensis, under different names, thereby to express his different powers diffused through the world."—(Max. Madaur. apud Aug. ep. 43.) "The same deity," says another, "is worshipped under different names, in different images, and with different customs."—(Apuleius apud Metam. l. 11.) Thus, under the different names, and in the different images of Saturn, Jupiter, Neptune, Minerva, &c., they worshipped one and the same God, meaning by Saturn his eternity, by Jupiter his power on earth, by Neptune his power on the sea, by Minerva his wisdom, &c., as Marsilius Ficinus, (Ficin. in Platon. Phæd.) Cælius Rhodiginus, (Cæli. Rhodig. Antiq. l. 16. c. 12.) Simon Majolus, (Majol. Dies Canonic. Part. 2. Col. 1.) and many others, have made it appear from the writings of the Stoic philosophers. On the other hand the Platonists held a plurality of gods; not a plurality of uncreated, and self-existent or independent beings; but of inferior beings, whom they called gods, though they supposed them to have been created by, and to depend upon the supreme God. To the supreme God they gave the highest adoration and worship; and to the inferior gods an inferior worship, proportioning the degrees of their worship to the degrees of the perfections, which those beings had received, or were supposed to have received, from the supreme God over all, as has been fully proved by the learned Cardinal Bessarion, in his vindication of Plato.—(Card. Bessarion advers. Calumnias Platon. l. 2. c. 3.) In short, the Platonists worshipped the supreme God with the worship of Latria, and the inferior gods, that is, angels and saints, or men whom they believed to be saints, with the worship of Dulia, or Hyperdulia; inasmuch that Paulus Benius Eugubinus could find no other difference between the Platonic principles of worship, and those of his church, but that the Platonists called those gods whom the church called angels or saints: (Paul. Eugub. Platon. et Aristot. Theolog. Decad. 2. l. 2.) a very small difference indeed between his church and those whom the fathers accounted idolaters!

an inferior degree, the heavenly intelligences, and deified men, that is, men whom some extraordinary excellency had raised above the condition of other men, and they, on that account, styled gods, a name given, even in Scripture, to princes, to judges, and to other magistrates: I said, "in an inferior degree;" for they, who worshipped with the supreme God other inferior deities, supposed the inferior deities to have been all created by the supreme God, and to depend entirely upon him; and consequently could not worship them and their images with the same worship which they gave to the supreme God and to his images, but with an inferior worship, that is, says Augustinus Steuchus, an Italian bishop of great reputation, "with that worship, which is, with great reason, given by us to saints and angels;"² and it is to be observed, that many of those, whom the heathens styled gods, and worshipped with a relative, inferior, and subordinate worship, are allowed by several Roman catholic writers to have been good men, "the servants of the great God," as Hierocles called them;³ and, according to the principles of the church of Rome, worthy of the worship that was given them.⁴ If

¹ Exod. 22: 28. Psal. 82: 1. 6.

² August. Steuch. de perenni Philosoph. l. 5. c. 1.

³ Hierocli. apud Aug. Psal. 96.

⁴ Vide Campanell. Triumph. Atheism. c. 11.

Some Roman catholic writers, and among the rest Campanella, have undertaken to prove, that the heathens, under the names of their several deities, worshipped Noah, Abraham, Isaac, and the other patriarchs, who were as great saints, says Campanella, and as worthy of worship as any of the apostles, even as St. Peter himself.—(Campan. Triumph. Atheism. c. 11.) However, what Bellarmine says here, may perhaps be true; namely, that among those, whom the heathens worshipped, were some who had been wicked men; nay, and some who had never existed. But how many has the church of Rome long worshipped as saints, who were afterwards found unworthy of the worship that was given them, and struck out of the calendar? How many have still a place in the calendar, who never existed? Whom did the heathens ever worship, whose existence may be more justly questioned, than that of St. Almachius, or St. Almanac, St. Curandarum Viarum, St. George, St. Christopher, of the seven sleepers, of the ten thousand virgins of Cornwall, or of the holy virgins St. Faith, St. Hope, and St. Charity, the three daughters of a venerable matron named St. Wisdom? What the popish divines allege in such cases to justify their worship, and render it lawful; namely, the general intention of worshipping those only, who deserve to be worshipped; will, in the like cases, equally justify the worship of the heathens, who intended, as we may well suppose, to worship such only as deserved to be worshipped.

"But all the gods of the heathens," adds Bellarmine, "are in Scripture called devils;" (Psal. 96. ver. 5.) ergo, the heathens neither worshipped the true God in their images, nor good men, nor good angels; but the infernal spirits, or devils. Had Bellarmine perused, with the least degree of attention, the works of the famous Aquinas, which are said by pope Pius V. to have been approved by Christ himself, he would have found this very objection answered by him. For that great divine, after showing that the heathens, though they worshipped the true God, were, nevertheless, by the fathers, justly charged with idolatry, because they worshipped other gods besides him, puts this question, "How all the other gods whom they worshipped, could be called devils, since they worshipped, among the rest, the heavenly intelligences, who were not devils, but good angels?" And to that

Idolatry to worship the true God in an image. The Jews worshiped the true God in the golden calf, and yet guilty of idolatry. Idolatry to give any religious worship whatever to a creature.

the fathers therefore condemned, and condemned as idolatrous, the worship of images, even in those, who neither worshiped the images themselves as gods, nor worshiped false gods by them, according to the received meaning of that word, but either the true God alone under different representations and images, or together with him, but in an inferior degree, the heavenly spirits, and the servants of the great God, that is, in the language of the church of Rome, angels and saints, it must be idolatry, according to their doctrine, to worship the true God by images, or to worship, even with an inferior worship, any creature, how perfect soever, and excellent, and much more the meanest of all creatures, the work of men's hands. And, if that be idolatry, I leave Baronius and Bellarmine to show, that the heathens were, and they are not, according to the doctrine of the fathers, guilty of idolatry.

Several Roman catholic writers, and among the rest cardinal Du Perron, and Natalis Alexander, a most zealous advocate for the worship of images, well aware that they cannot excuse from idolatry the worship, which they give to images, if they allow the heathens, whom the fathers charged with idolatry, to have neither worshiped the images themselves as gods, nor to have worshiped false gods by them, have endeavored to prove, that the heathens looked on their images as gods, and worshiped them as such with the highest worship; and reason thus; should we allow the worshiping of God by images to have been forbidden by the second commandment, as is pretended, it would indeed follow from thence, that those who thus worshiped God, would worship him in an unlawful manner; but so long as they worshiped the true God, and worshiped no other God besides him, they could not be justly charged with idolatry, which consists in worshiping something as God, that is not God, or in worshiping, and with the same kind of worship, more gods than one: hence they conclude, that, since the fathers charged the heathens with idolatry, they must either have worshiped the images themselves as gods, or false gods by them, and with the same worship which they gave to the supreme God: but, I. The heathens themselves declared, over and over again, in their disputes with the fathers, that they did not look on their images as gods, but only as representations of the gods; that in them they worshiped those to whom they were consecrated; that the honors,

gifts, and sacrifices offered to the images, did not belong to them, but to the gods whom they represented, &c.¹ and surely they knew better what they worshiped than Natalis Alexander, or the cardinal himself. II. To worship God in a prohibited and unlawful manner is idolatry, according to the Scripture notion of idolatry. Thus the Israelites, worshiping the golden calf contrary to the express command of God, saying, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, &c, thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them," are charged in Scripture with idolatry, though they neither believed that image to be the true God, "the God that brought them out of the land of Egypt," nor worshiped it as such, but intended to worship the true God in it, as has been unanswerably proved by the learned bishop of Worcester,² and is owned by Ferus,³ Abulensis, Caietan,⁴ and several other Roman catholic writers.⁵ Nay, Bellarmine himself thinks, that the Jews may be said, "and not improbably, to have worshiped the true God in the molten image:"⁶ if so, in what could their idolatry consist, but in worshiping an image, though in the image they intended to worship the true God? III. God, by commanding us to worship him, and to worship him alone, has appropriated all religious worship to himself; and therefore to give any religious worship to an image, or any other creature, is giving to a creature the worship that is due to God alone, which none will pretend to excuse from idolatry.

I know that the popish writers, to clear their church from that imputation, distinguish here between supreme and inferior worship, absolute and relative, direct and reductive; worship by itself, and worship by accident; worship of Latria, and worship of Dulia, Hyperdulia, &c. "The heretics," says Arriaga, "allege many passages from the Scriptures, the fathers, and the councils, where it is said that God only is to be worshiped. But to all the passages that have been, or can be alleged, we answer in one word, that they are to be understood of the worship of Latria, or supreme worship, which must be given to God alone; and would become idolatrous, if given to any but to God." But God commands us to worship him and serve him only, without any distinction of the nature, kind, or degrees of worship; the Jews, to whom the

¹ See p. 34, 35. note 2.

² Stillington ubi supra, p. 748. et seq.

³ Joh. Ferus in Act. 7.

⁴ Apud Bellar. de Imag. l. 2. c. 13.

⁵ "The Israelites were not so stupid," says Ferus, "to believe that Aaron could make a God; non tam stupidi erant, quod crederent Aaron posse facere Deum;" or that the image which he made, had brought them out of the land of Egypt before it was made. They meant no more, therefore, than that Aaron should make them an image of the God who brought them out of Egypt; and in that image they worshiped him.—(Ferus ubi supra.)

⁶ Apud Bellar. de Imag. l. 2. c. 13.

he answers, "That, though the heavenly intelligences were not devils in themselves, they were so nevertheless, as they were the gods of the heathens, that is, as they had divine worship given them.—(Thom. Aquin. contr. Gent. l. 1. c. 42. et Caietan. in Aquin. 22. Quæst. 94. Art. 4.) And, in that sense, all the popish saints may be said to be devils, St. Peter himself not excepted, since they too have divine worship given them; the very same worship, that was given by the heathens to the heavenly intelligences.

Idoltry to give worship to the most perfect creature. The primitive Christians did not forbear the use and worship of images, lest they should give offence to the Gentiles; and, lest they should expose their proselytes to the danger of idolatry. The worship of images gives now as great offence to many Christians, as it formerly gave to the pagans; and exposes the proselytes from paganism to the same danger.

law was first given, knew of no such distinctions, but thought it idolatry to give any kind of worship whatever to a creature; and so did the fathers in the fourth and fifth centuries, charging the Arians with idolatry, for worshipping Christ, while they believed him to be but a creature, though they could not, in that supposition, worship him with the worship of Latria, but only with an inferior, subordinate, and relative worship, with the worship of Dulia, or rather with that of Hyperdulia, which, in the present system of the popish worship, is due to the virgin Mary alone, and was, in the Arian system, due only to Christ as the first of all creatures. Had the fathers thought it lawful to give any kind of worship whatever to a creature, they would not have charged the Arians with idolatry for worshipping, even with an inferior worship, one, who, in their opinion, was the most perfect of all creatures: the only answer they give here to clear themselves, in the worship of saints and images, from the idolatry, which the Arians were charged with, in the worship of Christ, by the fathers, is, that the Arians worshipped Christ as God, though they believed him to be but a creature; which is supposing them to have been all mere idiots, that they may not themselves be thought idolaters.

As for the reasons alleged above, by Petavius and others, why the primitive Christians abstained from the use and the worship of images, namely, lest they should thereby give offence to the pagans, or expose such of them as embraced the Christian religion to the danger of idolatry, or of giving the same worship to images after their conversion, which they had been accustomed to give to them before their conversion; I have shown already, that it was not out of any temporary motive that the primitive Christians forbore to worship images, or to use them in their worship, but for reasons, that must render the one and the other ever unlawful. I shall add here, that the aversion, which the primitive Christians showed to all images, and all worship of images, was one of the chief exceptions of the pagans against the Christian religion;¹ and that the fathers ought therefore to have rather recommended and countenanced that kind of worship, than abstained from it, for fear of giving offence to the Pagans: they would thereby not only have removed that exception; but, as the pagans were all accustomed to the worship of images, and it is far more easy to bring men from worshipping some images to worship others, than to bring them from worshipping images to worship none, they would have greatly facilitated, instead of obstructing their conversion.

As to the danger of idolatry in the proselytes from paganism, I should be glad to know what worship a pagan gave to the image of Jupiter, for instance, before his conversion, which, according to the Romish principles of worship, would have become idolatrous, if given to the image of God or of Christ after his conversion; or what worship he gave to the images of the inferior gods, while yet a pagan, which it would in him have been idolatry to give, when a Christian, to the images of the virgin Mary, and to the saints? As the pagans neither worshipped their images as gods, nor false gods through them, but either the true God, and the heavenly intelligences, or the souls of good men; nay, and worshipped the true God with the highest adoration and worship; and the inferior gods, as they called them, with an inferior, relative, and subordinate worship; in the popish system of worship they needed only, upon their conversion, to have changed the names; and by that change alone, without the least alteration either in their worship, or in most of the objects of their worship, they would have become good Christians, as well as good catholics.

To what has been said in answer to the reasons alleged by Petavius and Pagi, why the primitive Christians abstained from all worship of images, might be farther added, that, if the primitive Christians thought it advisable to abstain from that worship, though not unlawful in itself, for fear of giving offence to the pagans; the present church of Rome ought, in like manner, to abstain from the same worship, knowing that it has given, and that it still continues to give, great offence, not only to the enemies of the Christian religion, but to millions of Christians, who think that the worship which she requires to be given to images, cannot be excused from idolatry. They do not even pretend the worship of images to be either commanded in Scripture, or necessary to salvation; and to keep up, to the great scandal of the Christian name, a division among Christians for what is neither commanded in Scripture, nor necessary to salvation, is wicked, and quite inexcusable.

If the primitive church thought it advisable to forbear the use and worship of images so long as idolatry prevailed over the Christian religion, that is, for the space of near four hundred years, lest the pagans, accustomed to worship images, should give them the same worship after their conversion which they had given them before it; the church of Rome ought, for the very same reason, not to have allowed her missionaries to carry any images with them into the East and West Indies, upon the discovery of those countries, nor suffered images to be worshipped, or to be used there, till the pagan

¹ Orig. in Cels. l. 8. p. 399. 404. et l. 6. p. 189.

The use and worship of images first introduced by heretics; by Simon the sorcerer, in the first century; and in the succeeding century by the Gnostics, and the Carpocratians.

superstition was quite rooted out, and the Christian religion established in its room. If the primitive church acted very wisely, as Petavius and Pagi tell us she did, in not permitting images to be used, or to be worshiped till the Christian religion had prevailed over idolatry; the church of Rome must be said to have acted very much otherwise, in permitting images to be used and to be worshiped where idolatry still prevailed over the Christian religion, and consequently where the converts were exposed to the danger, to avoid which the church had, in the primitive times, thought it advisable to abstain from the use of images as well as the worship.

As the dispute about the worship of images divided the whole church, as soon as it was moved, and keeps it to this day divided into two opposite and irreconcilable parties; before I proceed to the dreadful disturbances, which it occasioned in the state, as well as the church, I must beg leave to inform the reader, and hope it will not be thought foreign to the subject, by what steps that execrable superstition, though condemned in the strongest terms, as well as the plainest, by all the primitive fathers, crept nevertheless into the church; when, and under what color or pretence, images were first admitted into the places of Christian worship; when they first began to be worshiped; by whom the use, as well as the worship of images, was first introduced among Christians; and by whom approved and countenanced. It will from thence still further appear, that to forbid images to be worshiped was no innovation in Leo, no heresy, no apostacy from the faith; but, on the contrary, that it was an innovation, that it was heresy, and apostacy from the faith of all the preceding ages, to worship them.

And here we must allow the use and worship of images among Christians, or those who pretended to be Christians, to be as ancient as the Christian religion itself. For they were first used and worshiped, if St. Austin is to be credited, by Simon, the famous sorcerer, who was contemporary with the apostles, and gave his own image, as that father informs us,¹ and the image of his harlot, to be worshiped by his followers. As he was therefore the first, who recommended the use and worship of images, he may be justly styled the author and father of that superstition: and probably some, whose images have been, and are still worshiped in the church of Rome, no more deserve that honor, nor perhaps fare better in the other world, than he and his harlot.

In the following century the Gnostic and Carpocratian heretics, pretending they had images of Christ made by Pontius Pilate, crowned, censured, and worshiped them after the manner of the heathens, as we read in

Irenæus,¹ Epiphanius,² and Austin.³ But the worship which they gave to those images, though no less authentic than any supposed to have been made by Nicodemus, or St. Luke, nay, than the Veronica itself, was accounted by the catholic church among the abominations of those heretical sects; and they were, on that score, by all the fathers, arraigned of idolatry.⁴ They are said, it is true, to have worshiped, with the images of Christ, the images of Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle. But the fathers condemned them for "worshiping the images of Christ, and the images of the philosophers of this world;" that is, for the worship which they gave to the images of Christ, as well as for the worship which they gave to the images of the philosophers. For had the fathers thought it no crime to worship the images of Christ, but only to worship the images of the philosophers, they would have found fault with those heretics for joining, in their worship, the images of the philosophers with the images of Christ, and not for worshiping, without any distinction, the images of Christ, and those of Pythagoras, Plato, and Aristotle.⁵

Thus was the use and worship of images introduced, indeed in the earliest times among Christians, but introduced, by the worst of heretics; and by them alone they continued to be used till the beginning of the fourth century, when some Christians in Spain, thinking they might lawfully use pictures at least as ornaments, began to adorn with them the walls of their churches. But the Spanish bishops, looking upon that practice as a dangerous innovation, and plainly repugnant to the practice and doctrine

¹ Iren. l. 1. c. 24.

² Epiph. hæres. 27.

³ Aug. de hæres. c. 7.

⁴ Iren. Epiph. Aug. ibid.

⁵ The Gnostics, say some here, worshiped the images of Christ with sovereign worship, or the worship of Latria; and were, on that account, justly charged by the fathers with idolatry. But if the Gnostics were, on that account, justly charged with idolatry, how will the church of Rome clear herself from idolatry, in giving, as she does, sovereign worship to the cross, to the nails, to the spear, to all the instruments of the passion, nay, and to every thing that has touched the body of Christ, the skin of the ass not excepted, on which our Savior rode into Jerusalem? The image of Christ represents Christ; and why should contact entitle a piece of wood, or of iron, to sovereign worship, and representation not entitle an image? Nay, representation is, according to the practice and doctrine of the church of Rome, as good a title to sovereign worship as contact, if the object represented be worthy of that worship. Thus sovereign worship, or the worship of Latria, is not only given in that church to the cross, on which Christ suffered, but to all other crosses, as representations of that cross; and it is a current doctrine among the popish divines, that images are to be worshiped with the same worship which is given to the prototypes, or objects, which they represent; because the worship, say they, passes from them to their objects. Now it can be no more idolatry, according to that doctrine, to worship the images of Christ, than to worship Christ himself, with sovereign worship, or worship of Latria. And if that be no idolatry, I should be glad to know in what the idolatry consisted, which the Gnostic heretics were charged with by the fathers, or what worship they gave to their images, which the church of Rome does not approve of, or does not allow to be given to hers.

¹ Aug. ad Quodv. c. 1.

The use of images in churches, even as ornaments, condemned by a council of Spanish bishops in the beginning of the fourth century. St. Epiphanius a zealous iconoclast in the latter end of the same century. ;

of the three preceding ages, condemned it in a council held at Eliberis, in 305, issuing, with one consent, the following decree; "it pleases us," or we decree, "that pictures ought not to be in churches."¹ and they give the reason why pictures ought not to be in churches, "lest that, which is worshiped or adored, be painted upon walls;" the very reason, that was alleged by the primitive fathers against all pictures and images, such representations serving only to debase the objects of our worship, and beget wrong apprehensions of the Deity in those who behold them, especially in the ignorant multitude.² And it is to be observed, that the present canon extends to the pictures of Christ, as well as to those of God the Father; for Christ is a true object of adoration and worship, and nothing, that is worshiped or adored, ought, according to the council, to be painted upon walls.³ This decree was

inviolably observed for several ages by the churches of Spain, as will be shown in the sequel of this history.

That images ought not to be in churches, was not an opinion peculiar, in this age, to the bishops of Spain. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, and metropolitan of Cyprus, thought so too; and gave as signal an instance of zeal against all pictures and images, as any that occur in the whole history of the Iconoclasts. The fact is related by himself in a letter to John, bishop of Jerusalem; and I shall give it in his own words: "As I was traveling," says he, "to a holy place called Bethel, I passed through a village of Palestine, named Anablatha; and observing there a burning lamp in a house,

¹ Concil. Elib. can. 36.

² See p. 32.

³ This decree has afforded good employment to the Roman catholic divines; and they have left nothing unattempted to elude it. Some of them have pretended the council of Eliberis, or at least the decree against pictures, to be a mere forgery; which was cutting the knot they could not untie.—(Bellar. de Imag. l. 2. c. 9. Bar. ad Ann. 392.) But that opinion is now universally exploded, as rash and groundless.—(Petav. de Incarn. l. 15. c. 14. Dupin Nouv. Biblioth. tom. 2. p. 306.) And indeed an Arian, or a Nestorian, might as well pretend the councils of Nice, and of Ephesus, or the decrees of those councils condemning their doctrines to be mere forgeries, and the inventions of heretics. Others therefore will have the fathers of Eliberis to have only forbidden pictures upon walls, and to have been induced by the regard and veneration, which they had for pictures, to issue that prohibition, the good bishops apprehending, that the saltpetre, or moistness of the walls, might spoil and disfigure them; or that the Christians not being able to remove them in time of persecution, and carry them with them, as Rachel carried her teraphim, they would be thereby exposed to the insults of the pagans. Thus they interpret in favor of images the very decree, that was issued against them. But the decree of the council was, "That pictures ought not to be in churches," without any kind of distinction between pictures upon walls, and pictures upon canvas, upon boards, or upon vails; between pictures that could, and pictures that could not be removed; so that all pictures were banished by that decree from the churches, or places of Christian worship. On the other hand, the reason which the council alleged why images ought not to be in churches, namely, "lest that, which is worshiped, be painted;" plainly shows, that their intention was to forbid, agreeably to the doctrine of the purer ages, the painting any ways, or in any place whatever, that which was worshiped, or the Deity and Christ, the only objects of worship at that time among Christians. They added upon walls, to suppress the practice that had begun to creep into the churches of Spain, and had given occasion to that decree. And indeed the original use of pictures was, as we shall see, to embellish and adorn the walls of the churches; and they had been, for some ages, on the walls, before they were preferred to a place on the altars. Some, to elude this canon, find nothing else satisfactory to recur to, but the new notion of the *Disciplina Arcani*; and tell us, that by the council of Eliberis were only forbidden the images of the Trinity; and that they were forbidden, lest the Catechumens should be let into the secrets of the Christian religion, and understand the mystery of the Trinity before their time. This pleasant notion was invented by Mendoza; (Mendoz. Not. in Con. Elib. c. 36. Concil. t. 1. p. 1240.) was approved by Bona; (Bon. Rer. Liturg. l. 1. c. 16.) and is highly extolled by Schelstrat (Schelstrat. Discip. Arcan. in Arcan. c. 6.) and Pagi, (Pagi Critic. Bar. ad Ann. 55. n. 6.) as a full and

satisfactory answer to all the arguments, which the protestants can urge from the above mentioned decree against images, and the worship of images. But in the first place, from the words of the decree it is manifest, that it was the design of the council to forbid all pictures in churches. Is not that the plain, natural, and obvious sense of the words, "It pleases us that pictures ought not to be in churches?" Thus they were understood even by Bellarmine; (Bellar. de Imag. l. 2. c. 9.) "The council," says he, "speaks of pictures in general;" and I should be glad to know what terms, less liable to misinterpretation, could Mendoza himself have suggested to forbid all pictures in churches? In the second place, who can believe the Spanish bishops to have known so little themselves of God, and the mysteries of our religion, especially of the Trinity, as to imagine that the catechumens could understand them, from pictures or images? It was, on the contrary, because all pictures and images of the Deity are apt to beget wrong notions of God in those who behold them, that such representations were condemned, as I have shown, and proscribed by the fathers: and Aubespine, bishop of Orleans, was of opinion, that for the same reason they were condemned and proscribed by the present council. "All images of God and the Trinity," says that prelate, "were forbidden by the fathers of Eliberis, lest the catechumens, and new converts, should entertain wrong notions, and dishonorable thoughts of God, when they saw him, whom they had been taught to believe invisible, immaterial, and incomprehensible, circumscribed in visible colors and lines.—(Aubespine. Not. in Can. 36. Con. Elib.) And truly the only reason alleged by the council in prohibiting such representations was, "lest that which was worshiped and adored, should be painted;" or, in other words, lest an invisible, immaterial, and incomprehensible being should be circumscribed in visible colors and lines. The decree of Eliberis, says here Ivo, (Ivo Part. 3. c. 4.) was but a temporary decree to prevent the converted Gentiles from giving the same worship to the images of God, or of Christ, which they had given before their conversion to the images of Jupiter, Mars, or Apollo. But, not to repeat here what has been said above of the worship of the Gentiles, the council did not forbid images, lest that which was painted, should be worshiped, but lest that which was worshiped should be painted. To conclude, no interpretation has yet been offered to elude the force of that canon, which is not plainly repugnant to the natural sense and meaning of the words; nay, and has not been exploded as such as some of the most eminent writers of the church of Rome, and among the rest by the learned Petavus and Dupin; (Petav. et Dupin ubi supra.) who, ashamed of the mean shifts and subtleties used on this occasion by their brethren, have ingenuously owned, that at the time of the council of Eliberis, that is, in the beginning of the fourth century, no images were yet allowed in the churches of Spain; and that the Spanish bishops, not yet apprised of the great advantages attending the use of images, did not think it lawful for the Christians to use them. The same thing is owned by Melchior Canus; but he charges the Spanish bishops not only with imprudence, but impiety, in issuing such a decree.—(Can. Loc. Theol. l. 5. c. 4.)

The use of images, in the opinion of Epiphanius, contrary to Scripture. Pictures introduced in some places as ornaments about the latter end of the fourth century; in Italy by Paulinus of Nola; and in France by Severus of Bourges. The use of images opposed by some, even in the fifth century.

and being told it was a church, I went in to pray; and on entering, found a veil hanging before the door, on which was painted the image of Christ, or some saint; for I do not well remember whose image it was. But seeing the image of a man hanging in the church of Christ, 'contrary to the authority of the holy Scriptures,' I tore it, and advised the keepers of the church to use it as a winding-sheet for some of their poor. They complained, and required me to give them another veil in the room of that which I tore. Their demand was just, and in compliance with it I send them one by the bearer, which I beg you will order the presbyters of the place to receive as sent by me; and at the same time to command them to take care, that no such veils, 'as they are inconsistent with our religion,' be for the future hung up in the church of Christ. For it is incumbent upon you to 'redress such abuses, unworthy of the church of Christ, and the people committed to your care.'¹

Here we have the use of pictures or images in churches, condemned "as contrary to the authority of the holy Scriptures, as inconsistent with the Christian religion, as unworthy of the church of Christ, and the Christian people;" and thus condemned by one, whom all allow to have been a man of as much learning as any of his time, nay, and whom the church of Rome, though she now condemns his doctrine, still honors as a saint.² As St. Jerom translated that letter into Latin; and in translating it, found no fault either with the sentiments or the behavior of the metropolitan of Cyprus on that remarkable occasion; we may well conclude that father to have approved of both, the rather as he elsewhere bestows on Epiphanius the highest commendations, styling him "the father of all bishops, a true pattern of the primitive sanctity, a holy pope, &c."³

However, the use of pictures in churches

did not at this time meet everywhere with the same opposition, which it met with in Spain, and in Palestine. Some of the more eastern bishops, looking upon pictures as proper ornaments for churches, and reconciled to them in that light, began, in the latter end of this century, to admit them into their places of worship, as appears from the testimonies of Gregory of Nyssa, and Asterius, quoted by Petavius.¹ About the same time they were introduced in the west by Paulinus, bishop of Nola in Italy; who, having built in that city a magnificent church in honor of St. Felix, embellished it with the pictures of martyrs, and the histories, of Esther, of Job, of Tobit, of Judith, and other Scripture histories, painted on the walls, as he himself informs us.² However, he owned it was a rare custom in his time, that is, in other words, an innovation, to paint churches, or to have pictures in churches, "pingere sanctas raro more domos," and thought it necessary to apologize for it; saying, that he did it to entertain the populace, and divert the multitude from the excesses and riots, which they were apt to run into, when they met to celebrate the anniversary festival of the dedication of the church.³ The example of Paulinus was followed by Severus, bishop of Bourges, and his intimate friend, who, having built a baptistery in that city, caused the picture of Martin, formerly bishop of Tours, and that of Paulinus, then living, to be painted on the walls;⁴ and Paulinus, who was a poet, and in that age not a bad one, sent him an epigram to be placed under the two pictures, exhorting men to imitate the one as a saint, and the other as a penitent sinner.⁵

But the custom that was rare in the latter end of the fourth century, became common in the fifth; and pictures of saints and of martyrs were admitted into most churches, but still admitted only as ornaments; and they met, even as such, with some opposition both in the east and west. In the east Theodotus of Ancyra, and Amphilochius of Iconium, would not suffer images or pictures in the churches of their respective dioceses, under any pretence or color what-

¹ Epiph. apud Hieron. tom. 2. ep. 6.

² No room is left here for the shifts and subterfuges, that have been used by the advocates for images to elude the decree of Eliberis. For the picture at the sight of which Epiphanius expressed such indignation, was the picture of Christ, or some saint, and not of the Deity, or the Trinity; was on a veil, and not on the wall of the church; and consequently capable of being removed, and in no danger of being disfigured by the moisture or saltpetre of the walls, or being insulted and abused by the pagans. And it is to be observed, that this happened in the latter end of the fourth century, when the Christian religion prevailing over idolatry, the use of images could not give that offence to the Gentiles, which it would have given, as is supposed, when idolatry prevailed over the Christian religion. Some here have recourse to the common evasion, and pretend either the whole letter to be supposititious, or that part of it, at least, which makes against images.—(Bar. ad Ann. 392. Bellar. de Imag. l. 2. c. 9.) But that the letter is genuine, that Epiphanius believed the use of images in churches to be against the holy Scriptures, and that in his time none were suffered in the Cyprian churches, is now allowed by all but Baronius and Bellarmine.

³ Hier. ad Pammach.

¹ Petav. de Incar. l. 15. c. 13.

² Paulin. Natal. 9. Felic. p. 615.

³ Idem. Natal. 20. p. 617.

⁴ The pictures of the living were at first intermixed, as appears from this instance, with those of the dead; and we read of the pictures of Macedonius, of Acacius, of Gennadius, patriarchs of Constantinople, set up, while they were still living, in the churches in that city.—(Bar. ad Ann. 488. Vales. Not. in Theodor. Lect. l. 2. p. 167.) Of Timotheus, the successor of Macedonius, it is recorded, that whatever church he went into, he would never begin divine service, till the picture of Macedonius was taken down and removed.—(Theodor. Lect. l. 2. p. 563.)

⁵ "Adstat perfecta Martinus regula vitæ;

Paulinus veniam quo merare docet.

Hunc. peccatores, illum spectate, beati:

Exemplum sanctis ille sit, iste reis.—(Paulin. Epig. 12. ad Sever.)

The use of images obtains universally in the sixth century. Images worshipped by some as soon as admitted into the places of worship. That worship condemned by St. Austin, and, in his time, by the church.

ever, alleging, that "the Christians had no tradition to represent the saints in material colors; and that they strove to imitate their virtues, but cared not to have their persons and bodies represented to them in pictures or images."¹ And it is to be observed, that Amphilocheus, who cared not to have the images of the saints, was one of the most learned men of the age he lived in; and is highly commended by St. Jerom, and likewise by the famous St. Basil, who addressed to him his book on the Holy Ghost. In the west, St. Austin, speaking of some Gentiles, who blasphemously gave out, that the author of the Christian religion had written books of magic, and left them with his two followers, Peter and Paul, conjectures those two apostles to have been named because they were seen in some places painted with Christ; and adds, "thus they deserve to err, who seek Christ and his apostles, not in the holy Scriptures, but on painted walls."² Indeed the worship of images, the grossest of all errors, never had obtained, had men sought Christ only in the Scriptures; nor could it long obtain, were not the books taken from the people, in which alone St. Austin thought they should seek Christ, and painted walls substituted in their room. The same father elsewhere finds fault with the Manichees, on account of their fondness for images; and ascribes it to a wicked design in them, of reconciling the heathens to their mad and despicable sect.³

But though in the fifth century the use of images was still opposed, or at least not approved, by some of the most eminent men for learning and sanctity who lived in that age; in the following century it became universal, and the churches were everywhere filled, both in the east and the west, not only with the histories of the Old and New Testament, painted on the walls and the windows, but with pictures of Christ, under the type of a lamb,⁴ of the virgin Mary, of

the apostles, and other saints, especially of the martyrs and their passions or sufferings. However, no statues, but only paintings or pictures, were yet suffered in the churches, as has been observed by Petavius;¹ all massy images, whether of wood, stone, or metal, being thought to bear too near a resemblance to the idols of the Gentiles. And thus was the use of images, which the primitive Christians had so much abhorred in their worship, and places of worship, brought, by degrees, and, we may say, by stealth, into the church: for though it was now become general, it had not yet been authorized by any general council; nay, images had not been yet so much as once mentioned in any council whatever, except that of Eliberis, which expressly forbade them.

As to the worship of images, they were no sooner admitted into the churches, and places of worship, than they began by some to be worshipped; it being natural, as was observed by St. Austin,² for those, who pray looking on an image, to be so affected as to believe that the image hears them, and can grant them what they ask. And here we may observe by the way, that St. Austin did not at all approve of the practice of praying before an image, but looked upon it as capable of seducing those, who thus prayed, to address their prayers to the image itself. As in his time, that is, in the latter end of the fourth, or the beginning of the fifth century, images first found admittance into the Christian churches and oratories; so in his time they first began to be worshipped. And what was his opinion concerning the worship that was given them, nay, and the opinion of the church in his time, we may gather from his treatise "on the Manners of the Catholic Church." For the Manichees, taking occasion, from the practice of a few, to reproach the whole church with the worship of images, St. Austin answered thus, in the treatise I have mentioned: "Name not such professors of Christianity as know not, or observe not the laws of the religion which

¹ Apud Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 6.

² Aug. de Cons. Evang. l. 1. c. 20.

³ Idem contra Adamant. c. 13.

⁴ No images of Christ, in the figure of a man, were allowed in the church till the latter end of the seventh century, as has been observed, and fully proved by Cassander.—(Cassand. Consult. de Imagin. 165.) Till that time he was only represented under the type or figure of a lamb; all images representing him in human shape being thought not only imperfect, but false and unworthy of him, since they could only represent him as a man, whereas he was both God and man. Thus when Constantia, sister of Constans, and wife of Licinius, wrote to Eusebius, at that time bishop of Cæsarea, desiring him to send her a picture of Christ; the bishop sent her the following answer: "That he could not send her, nor could he suppose that she had desired him to send her, a picture of the divinity or Godhead of Christ, since no man knew the Father but the Son, and none knew the Son but the Father; that as to his human nature, it was tempered with the glory of the divinity, and therefore could not be expressed in dead and lifeless colors, nor with the shadows of a pencil."—(Euseb. apud Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 6.) When that letter was read in the second council of Nice, the fathers of that very learned assembly could find nothing to object against it, but that

Eusebius was a heretic, and an Arian, though in that very letter he acknowledged, in the plainest terms, the divinity of Christ, and the Arians were as orthodox, with respect to images, as the catholics themselves. We know at least of no disagreement, in that particular, between them and the catholics; and therefore the authority of an Arian ought to have been of as much weight with the fathers of the council, in what concerned images, as the authority of a catholic. But Asterius, bishop of Amasa, was a good catholic; and yet exhorted the Christians of his time to bear Christ in their souls, to carry the incorporeal Word in their minds, but not to humble him anew by painting him in the servile form, which for our sake he took upon him.—(Aster. Homil. de Divit. et Lazar. p. 565.) And in that servile form he was not painted, at least in churches, or places of worship, but only represented under the type of a lamb, till the time of the Quinisext council, that is, till the year 691, when the worship of images beginning to obtain, the fathers of that assembly, thinking it indecent to worship the image of a lamb, decreed that Christ should be thenceforth painted in the form of a man.—(Concil. Quinisext. Can. 83.)

¹ Petav. de Incar. l. 15. c. 14. ² Aug. in Psal. 113.

In the sixth century images still used only as helps to devotion, as books for the ignorant, &c.; and likewise in the beginning of the seventh. The worship of images condemned by Gregory the Great, in the strongest terms.

they profess, nor the ignorant multitude, who, in the true religion itself, are either superstitious, or so given up to their lusts, as to forget what they once promised to God. I myself have known some, who were worshippers of tombs and pictures. But how foolish such men are, how hurtful, how sacrilegious, I propose to show in another treatise. In the mean time I would not have you thus to slander the catholic church, upbraiding her with the manners of those, whom she herself condemns, and endeavors daily to correct as untoward children."¹ Thus St. Austin: and from his words it is manifest, that to worship images was thought by him, and by the catholic church in his time, a superstitious practice, repugnant to the principles of the Christian religion; and that it was condemned as such, both by him and the church. And it is to be observed, that those, of whom St. Austin speaks, were sons of the church; and therefore cannot be supposed to have worshiped these images as gods, or to have worshiped false gods by them.

The fathers of the two succeeding centuries were of the same mind with St. Austin concerning the worship, though they countenanced the use of images. For in the sixth, when images being every where admitted into the churches, the Jews began to charge the Christians, on that account, with a breach of the second commandment, the only answer they returned to so heavy a charge was, that the second commandment did not forbid images to be made, but to be worshiped, or to be made in order to be worshiped; that they neither bowed down to them, nor worshiped them, but used them only as helps to memory and devotion, or as books to instruct those, who could not read.² Had they thought it consistent with the second commandment to give any kind of worship whatever to images, they would have taken care to distinguish, as the worshippers of images do now when they answer the same charge, between the worship that was not, and the worship, that in their opinion was, consistent with that commandment; and not declared without any restric-

¹ Aug. de Morib. Eccles. Cath. c. 34.

² These pleas and pretences for the use of images were all borrowed of the heathens. "Images," say they in Maximus Tyrius, "serve the ignorant instead of books; put us, when we look on them, in mind of the objects which they represent; are a kind of manufacture to the gods; and raise our minds from what is material and visible, to what is immaterial and invisible.—(Max. Tyr. Dissert. 38.) But these pretences did not satisfy the primitive fathers; and they urged the prohibition of the divine law, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image," &c., against the use of images in the worship of God, under any color or pretence whatever; and thus said the fathers of Frankford, in answer to that plea, "What madness is it to pretend, that, by an image we may be put in mind of Christ's presence on the earth! O unhappy memory, which, that it may remember Christ, who should never be out of the mind of a good man, needs the beholding of an image?—(Lib. Carol. 4. c. 2.)

tion, limitation, or distinction, that they did not worship images, but used them only as helps to memory, as books for the ignorant.

That they were to be used only as such, and by no means to be worshiped, was still the doctrine of the church in the beginning of the seventh century, if the doctrine of pope Gregory the Great may be called the doctrine of the church: for when Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, caused the images throughout his diocese to be cast out of the churches, and destroyed, because they began to be worshiped by the people, as has been related elsewhere,¹ Gregory found fault with him indeed for destroying them; but, at the same time, commended his zeal in not suffering them to be worshiped. "We commend your zeal," said he, "in not allowing images, or anything that was made with hands, to be worshiped: but we cannot approve of your breaking them, since images were set up in churches, that the ignorant may see on the walls what they are not capable of reading in books: you should therefore have preserved them for that purpose; and been satisfied with restraining the people from worshiping them: thus the illiterate would by them have been instructed in history; and would not have sinned in giving them worship."² Serenus, who knew, and knew by experience, how difficult a thing it was to restrain the ignorant multitude from worshiping images so long as they were suffered in the places of worship, and had, in all likelihood, ordered them to be removed out of the churches, and broken, because he could by no other means prevent their being worshiped, was so surprised at his being found fault with on that account, that he could not believe the letter came from the pope, and therefore paid no kind of regard to it: but Gregory soon wrote to him again, repeating what he had said in his former letter; namely, that images were set up in churches only to instruct the minds of the ignorant; and exhorting him to preach that doctrine to his flock; and not to forbid images to be made, but to forbid them by all means to be worshiped. "It is one thing," says he, "to adore an image, another to learn from an image what is to be adored: what those, who can read, learn from books, they who cannot read, learn from pictures: they serve the barbarians in the room of books, which you, who live among the barbarians, ought to have minded, and checked your zeal, however right, lest, by your indiscretion, you should have scandalized them, and estranged them from you."³

¹ See vol. I. p. 416.

² Greg. l. 7. Ep. 110.

³ Frangi non debuit, quod non ad adorandum in ecclesiis, sed ad instruendas Solomodo mentes fuit necessarium collocatum. Si quis imagines facere voluerit, minime prohibe; adorari vero imagines omnibus modis devita. Unde et precipue Gentibus pro lectione pictura est. Quod magnopere a te, qui inter

Gregory the Great makes no distinction between one worship and another. About the middle of the seventh century, images looked upon as something more than helps to memory. Commonly worshiped in the beginning of the eighth century by the monks and the populace.

As part of Serenus's flock, provoked at his destroying their images, had separated themselves from his communion, the pope exhorts him, to bring back, by gentle methods, those whom his indiscretion had estranged from him. You would do well, says he, to call your people together; and, having shown them from Scripture, that it is not lawful to worship any thing that was made with hands, because it is written, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve;" tell them, that finding they worshiped the images, which were set up only for instruction, your spirit was stirred in you, and you could not help destroying them: that nevertheless you are willing to allow them the use of images according to the ancient institution, (an institution of about two hundred years' standing,) provided they used them only for instruction; but that you will by no means suffer them to be worshiped.¹ Thus Gregory; and from both letters it is manifest, that so late as the beginning of the seventh century (for both were written in 601) images were still thought, and by the infallible head of the church, to have been set up for no other purpose, but to instruct the minds of the ignorant; that by the infallible head of the church it was still deemed a sin, and a breach of the second commandment, to give them any kind of worship whatever; and that to cast them out of the churches, and destroy them, to prevent their being worshiped, was not yet, in the opinion of the infallible head of the church, either heresy or apostacy from the true faith; but only indiscretion, or the act of a right, but indiscreet zeal, in one living among the barbarians, who, having been accustomed to the use of images before their conversion, ought, according to the doctrine of Gregory, to have been indulged in the use of them after it. I know, that the popish divines distinguish here between sovereign and subordinate worship, absolute and relative, proper and improper, between worship for the sake of the image, and worship for the sake of the prototype, &c. But had Gregory thought it lawful to give one kind of worship to images, or the work of men's hands, and unlawful to give another, he would, without all doubt, have informed Serenus on so remarkable an occasion, and it was his duty as head of the church, what worship he might allow his people to give to their images, and what he might not; and not said, without distinguishing between the one and the other, that he must by no means allow images to be worshiped, "adorari vero imagines omnibus modis devita;" or, as these words are

gentes habitas, attendi debuerat, ne dum recto zelo incaute succenderis, ferocibus animis scandalum generares;" are Gregory's own words.

¹ Greg. l. 9. Ep. 9.

translated, perhaps inadvertently, by Dupin, "that he must not allow images to be worshiped in any manner whatever."¹

From the beginning of the seventh century, when Gregory condemned the worship of images, as we have seen, to the beginning of the eighth, not a single instance occurs of any worship given, or allowed to be given to them, by any council or assembly of bishops whatever: however, as, about the middle of the seventh century, we begin to read of wondrous things performed by images, of victories obtained by their means, of distempers cured by applying them to the part affected, &c., we may well conclude, that, if they were not then yet commonly worshiped, they were at least commonly looked upon as something more than mere "helps to memory," or "books for the ignorant." Some are of opinion, and their opinion is not ill grounded, that it was during the famous dispute concerning the will and operations of Christ, which was moved in 626, and carried on with great warmth, till the end of that century, that the worship of images began to obtain; the bishops being too much taken up in determining so important a point, to restrain or correct the abuses, which, during that time, crept into their churches.

However that be, certain it is, that though, in the beginning of the seventh century, images were by no means allowed to be worshiped, as we have seen, they were nevertheless commonly and publicly worshiped in the beginning of the eighth; nay, and that some of the chief bishops of the church, instead of destroying them, as Serenus had done, when they found they were worshiped, or teaching their people, agreeably to the doctrine of Gregory, that images were set up only for instruction, began to teach the quite opposite doctrine; and even to pretend, so utterly were they unacquainted with the practice and doctrine of all the preceding ages, that the worship of images was enjoined by the apostles, and had ever since the apostolic age been constantly practised by the catholic church. At the same time the monks, finding in the gifts and the offerings, that were daily made to their images, the good effects of that new devotion, spared no pains to promote and establish the growing superstition; insomuch that in the year 726, when Leo published his famous edict, it had already spread into all the provinces subject to the empire. But though it obtained almost universally among the people, it was still opposed, and opposed with great zeal, by several bishops; nay, some of them, finding that the use of images had by degrees degenerated into worship, were even for casting them every where out of the

¹ Dupin Nouv. Biblioth. tom. 5. p. 122.

The church divided into three parties about the use of images. The worship of images obtained yet only in the empire. What may be gathered from what has been said. Disturbances in Constantinople, occasioned by the imperial edict.

churches; and that they looked upon as the only effectual means of preventing them from being worshiped by the ignorant multitude, and restoring the Christian religion to its primitive purity. But others thought, that images ought to be retained to instruct the ignorant, and excite the people to devotion and piety, the only purposes for which they were originally introduced; but that the people should by all means be restrained from giving them any kind of worship.

Thus was the church, in the present controversy, divided into three different and opposite parties, some approving of the use, but condemning the worship of images; others condemning the use as well as the worship; and some approving both of the use and the worship; nay, and pretending, that not to use images, or to use them only for instruction, and not to worship them, was heresy, Judaism, and apostasy from the Christian faith: against the use of images were urged by those, who thought that images ought all to be removed out of the places of worship, and destroyed, the prohibition of the divine law, the doctrine and practice of the primitive church, the decree of the council of Eliberis, the example of Epiphanius, and the difficulty of restraining the ignorant multitude from praying to the images themselves, and worshipping them, so long as they were allowed to pray and worship before them. On the other hand, for the use of images, were alleged by those, who thought, that they ought neither to be worshiped, nor destroyed, the practice of the three last ages, the many advantages accruing from them, as they pretended, especially with respect to the illiterate vulgar; the definition of Gregory, that images were neither to be destroyed, nor worshiped; and the canon of the Quinisext council, allowing Christ to be painted in the form of a man. As the third opinion, that images were not only to be used, but to be worshiped, was destitute of all proof from, nay, and plainly repugnant to, Scripture, reason, and antiquity, nothing was alleged, as we shall see, to support that opinion by those who maintained it, but fabulous stories, but visions, or dreams of visionary monks, and miracles pretended to have been wrought, either by the images themselves, or by those who worshiped them. And here it is to be observed, that though the worship of images obtained at this time almost universally, among the people, in the countries subject to the empire, being there countenanced and recommended by the bishops of Constantinople, and Rome; France, Germany, Spain and Britain, were yet quite free from that superstition; nay, when the present controversy was moved, and the second council of Nice defined, to the great surprise, I may say, of the whole Christian world, that im-

ages were to be worshiped, they rejected, as will be shown in the sequel, with the utmost indignation and abhorrence, that definition.

And now, to conclude, from what has been said it is manifest beyond contradiction; I. That the primitive Christians neither worshiped images, nor used any in their worship, or places of worship.¹ II. That the reasons, which they alleged against the use as well as the worship of images, were such as must necessarily hold good in all times; and render both the use, and the worship of images ever unlawful.² III. That when they first began to be used, they were used only as ornaments, or as helps to memory, and books for the ignorant; and that some of the most learned men in the church could never be reconciled to them, even in that light.³ IV. That till the latter end of the fourth century they were used only by heretics; and worshiped by none but by heretics, till the latter end of the seventh.⁴ Lastly, That in the beginning of the eighth century, when Leo undertook to put a stop to the growing superstition, it was yet unknown to, or was zealously opposed by, the far greater part of the Christian world; and consequently, that if it was a damnable heresy in that emperor, as was then, and is still pretended, not to worship images, or forbid them to be worshiped, the far greater part of the catholic church was at that time, and the whole catholic church had been for near seven hundred years, guilty of a damnable heresy. Having thus made it undeniably appear, for the justification of Leo as well as of those, who then adhered, and still adhere to him, that his edict was entirely agreeable to the doctrine and practice of the church in all the preceding ages, I shall now resume the thread of the history, not doubting but the importance of the subject will excuse, with every protestant reader, the length of the digression.

The imperial edict, though, not forbidding the use, but only the worship of images, was no sooner published, than the monks took the alarm, and with them the populace, especially the women, who distinguished themselves, as we shall see, in this dispute; and, as it formerly happened at Ephesus, on the like occasion, the whole city was at once filled with confusion;⁵ nay, and the whole empire. For though it was, but in the beginning of the preceding century, "a crime to worship images with any kind of worship;" and only indiscretion to pull them down, to cast them out of the churches, and break them, lest they should be worshiped;⁶ it was now with the monks, with the superstitious multitude, and the women, a heinous crime not to worship them; and heresy, apostasy from the faith, Judaism, to

¹ See p. 28. ² See p. 31.

³ See p. 39.

⁴ See p. 42. ⁵ Acts c. 19. v. 24. et seq.

⁶ See p. 42.

The inhabitants of the Cyclades revolt;—[Year of Christ, 727.] They are defeated, and all taken or slain. Leo's generosity to the prisoners. The patriarch Germanus remonstrates against the undertaking of the emperor. The reason he alleges.

forbid them to be worshiped: and the emperor was accordingly no longer looked upon as a Christian, orthodox, and religious prince; though he had been esteemed such by all, even by the pope, till the publication of this edict; but as a declared heretic, nay, as a heresiarch, as an apostate from the faith; and one, who had nothing less in view, than utterly to abolish Christianity, and establish Judaism in its room. These notions were industriously propagated among the populace, chiefly by the monks, to stir them up against the emperor, and defeat the undertaking; insomuch that had not Leo, foreseeing the danger, caused strong bodies of troops to be posted in the different quarters of the city, and by that means prevented the people from assembling, a general revolt would have ensued; and he, in all likelihood, have fallen a victim to the rage of the incensed multitude.

The imperial edict was no better received in the provinces, than it was at Constantinople; but no where was the publication of it attended with greater disturbances, than in the islands of the Archipelago: for it was no sooner published there, than the people, thinking that the whole of the Christian religion was at stake, and thereupon moved, says Theophanes, with divine zeal, openly withdrew themselves from all subjection and obedience to one, who had, by his heresy, forfeited all right to command them; flew to arms; and having declared Leo deposed from the empire as an enemy to God and his church, proclaimed one Cosmas, a leading man among them, and a most zealous advocate for image worship, emperor in his room: as they were all expert mariners, and had, as a trading people, a good number of ships, they armed them all with incredible expedition; and, in a very short time, put to sea with a considerable fleet under the command of Agallianus, and Stephen, two brave and experienced officers. They steered their course strait to Constantinople, not doubting but they should surprise the emperor; and, being joined by their friends, who were very numerous in that city, and no less dissatisfied than they, drive him, almost without bloodshed, from the throne. But, instead of surprising Leo, they found him, to their great surprise, ready to receive them; and the imperial fleet drawn up before the harbor, and only waiting their approach to engage them. An engagement ensued accordingly, which was neither long nor doubtful; for, by means of the artificial fire, with which Leo had some years before destroyed the whole naval power of the Saracens, the fleet of the rebels was all at once seen in a flame; and all, but such as choose to yield, and throw themselves upon the mercy of the conqueror, miserably perished, either consumed by the flames, or swallowed up by the sea. Agal-

lianus, chosing rather to die, than to fall into the hands of the enemy, threw himself, armed as he was, into the sea. But Stephen, the other commander, and the usurper Cosmas, were both taken, and, by the emperor's order, publicly beheaded. The other prisoners, (for not a man escaped,) were all spared; and by the cruel, inhuman, and blood-thirsty tyrant, as Baronius is pleased to call Leo, set at liberty, and suffered to return unmolested to their respective homes.¹ This rebellion, Theophanes calls a godly conspiracy; and truly, to worship images, and maintain that worship even with treason and rebellion, was in his time, that is, in the beginning of the ninth century, the height of all godliness. However, the church of Rome has, it seems, been ashamed to canonize Cosmas, Stephen, or Agallianus, though they fell, and were the first, who fell martyrs in that godly cause.

In the mean time the patriarch Germanus, a most zealous patron of the new superstition, apprehending, that the emperor would ascribe the success, that had attended his arms against the rebels, to the justice of his cause; and be thereby encouraged to pursue the war, which he had begun against God, and his saints; thought it his duty to undeceive him; and with that view he either went in person, or sent, as we read in the acts of the pretended martyr Stephen, one of his ecclesiastics, a man greatly respected for his piety, to represent to him that the worship of images, which he condemned as idolatrous, had from the earliest times obtained in the church; that our Savior himself had approved of it; and, in token of his approbation, sent his picture to Abgarus, king of Edessa, to be worshiped by him, and his people;² that the woman, whom he had miraculously cured of an issue of blood, having, out of gratitude, erected a statue to him in the city of Paneas, he had, by a standing miracle, authorized posterity to follow her example;³ that the worship of images had, by the apostles, been recommended to the faithful; that from their time to the present, no Christian, but only Jews and Saracens, had ever questioned the lawfulness of that kind of worship; and that the six general councils, consisting of different bishops, and held in different times and places, had all not only approved, but enjoined it.⁴ As these were the only reasons

¹ Theoph. Ann. Incar. secund. Alexandr. 718.

² See p. 29. note (2).

³ See p. 30.

⁴ Spanhem cannot persuade himself, that the patriarch was capable of alleging, to so wise and learned a prince as Leo, the fables that were told of the picture at Edessa, and the statue at Paneas; and much less, that he was so utterly unacquainted with the ancient practice and doctrine of the church, as not to know, that the primitive Christians had abhorred, not the worship only, but even the use of images; and not the least mention had been made of images in any of the six general councils. That learned writer therefore suspects, and not without reason, the speech that is

The patriarch attempts anew to divert Leo from his resolution; but in vain. The emperor acquaints the pope with his resolution; who warmly opposes it. The emperor orders his edict to be published in Italy. The people rise in Ravenna.

alleged by the patriarch to prove the lawfulness of image worship, and divert the emperor from the resolution he had taken, it is not at all to be wondered, that Leo, instead of hearkening to him, dismissed him, as he is said to have done, without so much as deigning to return him an answer; and thenceforth appeared more determined than ever to have his edict put in execution; and by all, without exception, rigorously observed.¹

However, the patriarch thinking it incumbent upon him, says Theophanes, to leave nothing unattempted he could think of to retrieve the emperor from his impiety, repaired again in a few days to the imperial palace; and being received by Leo with uncommon marks of respect and esteem, as he did not yet despair of being able to gain him, he put him in mind of the oath he had taken at his coronation, not to attempt or to suffer any change or innovation whatever, in the doctrine and practice of the church; represented to him the danger to which he exposed both himself and the empire, by condemning as unlawful and wicked, what all good Christians had ever thought lawful, and highly pleasing to God; threatened him with vengeance from heaven, which, he said, an undertaking so hateful to God and his saints, would not fail to bring down upon him, and all who were concerned in it with him; and, declaring, with great intrepidity, that, as for himself, he had rather suffer the most cruel death, than approve, or seem to approve, so impious a tenet, earnestly entreated him to revoke the edict which he had too rashly issued; and allow the church to enjoy that tranquillity, which his valor and conduct had, with the blessing of heaven, procured to the state. But Leo, continues Theophanes, was hardened in his iniquity, and not to be moved; nay, though convinced by the patriarch, that to worship images was no idolatry, (it is a pity he forgot to tell us with what arguments the patriarch convinced him,) the more the holy prelate strove to divert him from the execution of his edict, the more warmly he insisted on its being executed, and by all punctually complied with.² However, he dismissed the patriarch, as all agree, without offering him the least violence; a plain proof, that to contradict him, and not to acquiesce at once in his sovereign will and pleasure, was not with him,

said to have been made by the patriarch, to have been made, not by him, but by some of the later Greeks for him.—(Span. Hist. Imag. Restitut. sect. 2.) Baronius himself is forced to own, that nothing was determined concerning the worship of images, by any of the six general councils; (Bar. ad Ann. 726. n. 6.) but yet thinks, that, as they did not condemn that worship, they may be truly said to have approved it. But that is supposing the worship of images to have obtained at the time of those councils; and nothing is more certain, than that images did not begin to be worshipped, till after the last of the six general councils.

¹ Stephan. Diac. in Vit. S. Steph. Junior.

² Theoph. ubi supra.

as Maimbourg would have us believe, treason and rebellion.

Leo had written a long letter to the pope as soon as he published his edict, to acquaint him with the resolution he had taken of extirpating the idolatry that had begun to prevail in the church, as well as the motives, that had induced him to take it, and exhort his holiness to concur with him in so commendable an undertaking. That letter the pope immediately answered; and, on this occasion, several letters passed, as appears from the writers of those days, between him and the emperor: but, as none of them have reached our times, all we know for certain is, that the pope declared with great warmth for the worship of images; that he alleged all the reasons and arguments he could think of, to dissuade the emperor from attempting any innovation, as he called it, in the faith or practice of the church; that he threatened him with the indignation of St. Peter; and openly declared, that, far from concurring with him in so impious an undertaking, he could not think of it without horror; would ever oppose it to the utmost of his power; and think himself happy, should he shed the last drop of his blood in so godly a cause.¹ But nothing was capable of shaking the constancy of Leo, whom yet Maimbourg paints as a cowardly and timorous prince: his zeal for the purity of the Christian worship was proof against all opposition; and he was no less ready to hazard his life to root so detestable an abuse out of the church, than the pope, or the patriarch, were ready to hazard theirs to maintain it. Having therefore this year, without any regard to the remonstrances of the patriarch, caused the images to be placed higher in all the churches of Constantinople, and removed out of the reach, and almost out of the sight of the people, to prevent their being worshipped, pursuant to his edict, he sent a copy of the edict to Scholasticus, exarch of Ravenna, strictly enjoining him, without any regard to the remonstrances of the pope, to publish it, and cause it to be punctually complied with in that, and all the other cities subject to the empire in Italy. The exarch, in obedience to the order of the emperor, published the edict as soon as he received it, in the city of Ravenna: but the populace, rising as soon as it was published, openly declared, that they would rather renounce their allegiance to the emperor, than the worship of images, and the catholic faith. Hereupon great disturbances ensued; and while the soldiery strove to appease them, the superstitious multitude grew outrageous, fell on them, and a great deal of blood was shed on either side. Of these disturbances Luitprand, king of the Lombards, was no sooner informed,

¹ Anast. in Greg. II. Paul. Diacon. l. 6. c. 49. Theoph. ubi supra.

The king of the Lombards reduces Ravenna. The pope stirs up the Venetians against him;—[Year of Christ, 728:]—who, in conjunction with the exarch, recover the place. The pope strives anew to divert the emperor from his undertaking. Leo said to have hired assassins to murder the pope.

than thinking that a favorable opportunity of making himself master of the seat of the exarch, and driving the Greeks out of all Italy, he drew his forces together, with incredible expedition; and entering the territories of the empire, appeared unexpectedly before Ravenna, and closely besieged it. The garrison made at first a vigorous resistance; but the politic king having gained the populace by pretending great zeal for the worship of images, they were in a few days obliged to surrender at discretion. From Ravenna the king marched, without loss of time, to the other cities of the exarchate, where the same disturbances reigned; and being every where received by the people, not as an enemy, but as one sent from heaven to defend the catholic faith, and protect them who professed it, he found himself at once, and almost without bloodshed, master of all the Pentapolis, which he reduced to a dukedom, appointing Hildebrand, his grandson, to govern it with the title of duke.¹

The popes had ever entertained great jealousy of the power of the Lombards, well apprised that, were they lords of Italy, they would keep a watchful eye over them, and be better able to discover and defeat their ambitious designs, than the emperors of the east, who were at a distance. Gregory therefore, alarmed at the rapidity of Luitpraud's conquests, and apprehending, that were he not diverted from pursuing them, he should himself be soon obliged to acknowledge him for his lord and sovereign, made his zeal for what he called the catholic faith give way, on this occasion, to his interest; and, under pretence of serving his liege lord the emperor, wrote a very pressing letter to Ursus, duke or doge of Venice, the Venetians making already no small figure, conjuring him to assist his son the exarch, and exert his zeal for the holy faith, by attempting, in conjunction with him, the recovery of the exarchate, which the wicked nation of the Lombards had unjustly taken from his sons the great emperors Leo and Constantine. It was, as we have seen, out of zeal for the holy faith, or what the pope thought the holy faith, that the people had withdrawn themselves from all subjection to the emperor, and submitted to the Lombards: but as it was not the interest of the holy see, that they should continue subject to them, it was, with the pope, zeal for the holy faith to drive them out, though good catholics, and reinstate the emperor, though a heretic, in the possession of the country which they had seized. What was the interest of the holy see, was, with the popes, the interest of the holy faith; and it was by pretending to promote the interest of the holy faith, that they so successfully promoted the interest of the

holy see. The Venetians, no less jealous of the power of the Lombards than the popes, especially under so warlike and enterprising a prince as Luitprand, promised to assist the exarch in the recovery of the exarchate with the whole strength of their republic. They fitted out accordingly a considerable fleet, pretending it was designed for the service of the emperor against the Saracens; but appearing with it, when least expected, before Ravenna, invested the place by sea, while the exarch, who had raised what forces he was able in the cities still subject to the empire, laid siege to it by land. Luitprand was then at Pavia; but the town was taken by storm, before he could assemble his troops to relieve it.¹

The city of Ravenna being thus recovered, the pope, flattering himself that, as it had been recovered chiefly by his means, the emperor would, out of gratitude, hearken to his remonstrances, took care to acquaint him with the eminent service he had done to the empire; and, at the same time, earnestly entreat him to give over an undertaking, that exasperated, to the greatest degree, the minds of the people; estranged them from his government; and would be certainly attended in the end with a general revolt, and the loss of the provinces, that still remained to the empire in Italy. He added, that as the worship of images had been ever approved by the catholic church, he not only would not himself comply with his edict forbidding that worship, but would, to the utmost of his power, prevent it from being complied with by others. Leo well knew, that Gregory had consulted his own interest, in getting the Lombards driven out of the exarchate, more than his, or that of the empire, and, being at the same time sensible, that his edict would not be received by the people, so long as the pope, whom he now despaired of gaining over to his side, continued to oppose it, resolved to rid himself, by some means or other, of so powerful an adversary. Pursuant to that resolution he hired, says Anastasius, three assassins to murder the pope; and, at the same time, wrote to Mauritius, duke or governor of Rome, secretly enjoining him to assist the assassins in perpetrating the murder, and screen them after it from the fury of the people. But the murderers finding no favorable opportunity of putting their design in execution, though one of them is said to have been a deacon, who attended the pope, the emperor began to suspect that the exarch Scholasticus, who owed the recovery of the exarchate and his dignity to the pope, did not countenance them as he ought. He therefore removed him, and sent Paul the Patrician to govern in his room, with pri-

¹ Paul. Diac. l. 6. c. 32. Anast. in Greg. II.

¹ Paul. Diac. l. 6. c. 32.

Leo falsely accused of having employed assassins to murder the pope. The emperor orders the pope to be seized and sent to Constantinople; but the king of the Lombards espouses his cause, and protects him. The emperor orders the edict against images to be published in Rome;—[Year of Christ, 729.]

vate instructions to encourage them with the promise of great rewards, and assure them, if they succeeded in the attempt, of his protection and favor. But, in the mean time, the conspiracy was luckily discovered, nobody knows how, nor by whom; and two of the conspirators, falling into the hands of the enraged populace, were by them put immediately to death. The third had the good luck to escape to a monastery, and there, as it was a greater crime to force him from it, than it would have been to have murdered him out of it, he was suffered to spend the remainder of his life.¹

For this account, which has supplied all the later historians with ample matter for invectives against Leo, the world is indebted to Anastasius alone: for he was the first, who discovered that plot, and acquainted posterity with it. The historians, who lived much nearer to those times than Anastasius, namely, Theophanes, Paulus Diaconus, Nicephorus, and pope Adrian I., and were themselves no less prejudiced than he, and no less desirous of prejudicing the world against that excellent prince, take no kind of notice of any attempt made by him, or by others, at his instigation, on the life of the pope: a plain proof, that the pretended conspiracy was not in their times yet discovered, nor heard of: for, to do them justice, they have omitted nothing they ever had heard, true or false, that could render the name and memory of Leo odious to all future generations. But no wonder that the above-mentioned writers were all strangers to that plot, or attempt, since the pope himself was, it seems, as great a stranger to it as they: for in the letter, which he wrote to Leo in 730, to show that it was not without the greatest provocation, that he had stirred up the people of Italy against him, he does not charge the emperor with having ever attempted his life, with having hired assassins to murder him; but only with having threatened to have him seized, and conveyed in chains to Constantinople, as it had happened to pope Martin, in the time of the emperor Constantine.² And who can believe, that had the emperor made such an attempt on the life of the pope, had the assassins, whom he employed, been apprehended, and put publicly to death, the pope would not have known it, or, knowing it, would not, on such an occasion, have upbraided the emperor with it?

The design of the emperor was therefore, in all likelihood, only to have the pope apprehended without bloodshed or noise, and sent to Constantinople, that he might not have it in his power to raise disturbances, to stir up the people to sedition and rebellion, and prevent by that means the execution of

his edict in Italy. Agreeably to that design, he sent fresh and most pressing orders to the exarch, to get the pope, by all means, and at all events, into his power, and convey him prisoner to Ravenna, and from thence by sea to Constantinople. In obedience to that order, the exarch, finding the pope was too much upon his guard, and too well guarded by the populace to be seized and conveyed away privately, as it had formerly happened to pope Martin,¹ resolved to proceed by open force; and having accordingly drawn together a considerable body of troops, he ordered them to march with all possible expedition to Rome, to join the garison there, and in conjunction with them to seize on the pope, in spite of all opposition, and carry him with them back to Ravenna. With these orders they set out on their march to Rome; but being informed, on their arrival in the neighborhood of Spoleto, that a body of Lombards, far superior to them in strength, and in number, was advancing full march to meet them, they laid aside all thoughts of their intended expedition to Rome, and returned in great haste to Ravenna.² Those troops had been sent by the king of the Lombards to protect the pope, and prevent his falling into the hands of the exarch. For that politic prince, foreseeing the disturbances, that would be raised in Italy by the pope, and not doubting but they would end in a civil war between him, (as he was supported by the populace,) and the exarch, had resolved to suffer neither party to prevail over the other, but by always siding with the weaker to keep the balance even between them, and by that means prolong the war, till, the one and the other being sufficiently weakened, he should be able to crush them both. Pursuant to that resolution, though he was highly incensed against the pope for stirring up the Venetians to retake Ravenna, yet he no sooner heard of the march of the imperial troops, than, sacrificing his revenge to his interest, he espoused his cause, and sent a strong body of Lombards to protect him.

But as no reasons or arguments had yet been offered, either by the pope, or the patriarch, to satisfy the emperor, and convince him, that to bow down to images, and worship them, was not idolatry, he still persisted in the resolution he had taken, not to suffer any kind of worship to be given to them, at least in the empire. He sent accordingly, in the beginning of the following year, fresh and peremptory orders to the exarch Paul, to cause his edict to be published, and strictly observed, in all the cities of Italy subject to the empire, especially in Rome, threatening to look upon those, who did not comply with it, as rebels and heretics, and

¹ Anast. in Greg. II.

² Apud Bar. l. 9. 65, et seq.

¹ See vol. I. p. 452.

² Paul. Diac. ubi supra.

The exarch excommunicated. The people of Rome revolt. All the people of Italy stirred up by the pope against the emperor. Great disturbances in Ravenna. The exarch murdered; and likewise the duke of Naples and his son.

to treat them as such. The pope had flattered himself, that the disturbances, which the publication of the imperial edict had occasioned in the exarchate, would have diverted the emperor from pursuing his design; but, looking upon him now as an incorrigible heretic, and well apprised, that the superstitious multitude only waited for the signal to renounce their allegiance, and fly to arms, thought it high time to give it; and he thundered accordingly, with great solemnity, the sentence of excommunication against the exarch as a heretic, and an abettor of a most execrable heresy, for attempting, in obedience to the express command of his sovereign, to publish the edict against images in Rome, or rather against image-worship; for, by that edict, the emperor did not command all images to be cast out of the churches, and broken, as has been observed above; but only required his loving subjects to worship God in spirit and in truth, to abstain from the worship of images as of so many idols, and to suffer them to be raised higher in all places of prayer, that the ignorant populace might not be tempted to bow down to them, to kiss them, or to perform to them any other external acts of religious worship, that were due only to God. However the sentence of excommunication was no sooner thundered against the exarch, than the people of Rome, persuaded that the whole of the Christian religion was at stake, flew to arms, and, having overpowered the garrison, pulled down all the statues of the emperor, broke them to pieces, and openly declared, that since, of the defender, he was become a persecutor of the catholic faith, and of those who professed it, they no longer acknowledged him for their lord and sovereign.¹

The pope was sensible that the people of Rome were not capable, alone and unassisted, to support him against the emperor, and the whole strength of the empire; and therefore undertook, not only to persuade the other cities subject to the empire in Italy to follow the example of Rome, but to unite the different states there in a league against the emperor as a common enemy. With that view he wrote, as soon as he had excommunicated the exarch, a circular letter to the Venetians, to king Luitprand, to all the Lombard dukes, and all the chief cities in Italy, exhorting them to continue steadfast in the catholic faith; to guard themselves against the new and execrable heresy, which the emperor had undertaken to establish in the church; and to oppose with all their might the execution of the impious edict, which he had issued for that purpose. Upon the receipt of the pope's letter the people took every where the alarm, as if the emperor had not only renounced himself, but intended to oblige all his subjects to renounce

the Christian religion together with him. The people of Pentapolis, now Marca d'Ancona, not satisfied with renouncing their allegiance to Leo, with pulling down his statues, and breaking them, appointed by their own authority magistrates to govern them, during the pretended interregnum: nay, and were for choosing a new emperor, and conducting him to Constantinople, not doubting but the people would everywhere join them in defence of the church and the catholic faith. But the pope, remembering the bad success that had lately attended the people of the Cyclades in the like attempt, and therefore not approving of that project, it did not take place. The Lombards, and the Venetians from the beginning a wise and politic people, promising themselves great advantages from these disturbances, joined with great readiness the pope, and the other rebels, under color of defending the catholic cause, and the cause of the church.¹

But the exarch, Paul, a bold and enterprising man, not in the least disheartened in seeing so great an alliance formed against the emperor, resolved to cause the imperial edict to be observed, at all events, at least in the place of his residence, in the city of Ravenna; and he ordered it accordingly to be published anew, threatening to treat as rebels all, without distinction, who did not comply with it. But the officers no sooner began to remove the images, in order to place them higher, and out of the reach of the people, than the populace, rising in a tumultuous manner, fell upon them, and those who supported them, declaring that images had been worshiped in the church ever since the times of the apostles (for so they had been taught by the pope and the monks;) and that they would continue to worship them in spite of the emperor. But the exarch had, besides the soldiery, a considerable party among the citizens, who, declaring for the emperor, and the faith of their ancestors, who, they said, had worshiped no images, but thought it idolatry to worship them, fell in their turn on the populace; and great numbers were killed on both sides in the fray. But the party of the exarch was, in the end, quite overpowered; and the populace thereupon raging without restraint or control, a general massacre ensued; and, among the rest, the exarch himself was inhumanly murdered.²

In Naples, Exhilaratus, duke or governor of that city, did all that lay in his power to persuade the people to receive the imperial edict, and abstain, in compliance with it, from the worship of images. But finding all his endeavors defeated by the pope, and therefore looking upon him no longer as a

¹ Paul. Diac. l. 6. c. 9. Anast. in Vit. Gregor. II.

² Idem l. 6. c. 10. Regin. Chronol. l. 1. p. 47. Sigon ad Ann. 726.

Luitprand makes himself master of the Pentapolis. The people of the Ravenna receive the new exarch; who is said to have hired assassins to murder the pope; but very improbably.

bishop, whose duty it was to teach the people submission and obedience to those, whom God had placed over them, but as a traitor, a rebel, an incendiary, he resolved, and thought it would be no crime, to deliver the empire, by his death, from one who seemed to aim at nothing less than the utter ruin both of the state and the church. This design he only communicated to two persons, whom he thought the most capable of putting it into execution. But they betrayed him, and he was immediately torn to pieces by the enraged multitude, with his son Adrian and another person of distinction, who was said to have composed a libel against the pope.¹ Perhaps Exhilaratus too was only said, by the monks, and emissaries of Rome, to have formed the design of murdering the pope, that they might, by that means, stir up the populace to murder him. The pope well knew, that the emperor was extremely desirous of getting him into his power; and so did the people of Rome, who therefore, carefully guarded him, as we are told,² night and day. It is not therefore at all probable, that the governor of Naples should have engaged in an attempt, which he must have been sensible could not possibly, in these circumstances, be attended with success.

In the mean time Luitprand, who had undertaken the defence of the pope with no other view, but to improve to his own advantage the disturbances, which he foresaw he would raise, if thus protected, entered the Pentapolis, at the head of a numerous army; and, pretending great zeal for the catholic faith, for the worship of images, and the safety of their common father the pope, was every where received by the populace as their deliverer, with loud acclamations of joy. However, the people of the city and dukedom of Naples, bearing an irreconcilable hatred to the neighboring Lombards, with whom they were ever at variance, continued steadfast in their allegiance to the emperor, and received the new duke sent from Constantinople to govern them in the room of Exhilaratus.³ At the same time arrived at Ravenna with a considerable fleet, and a good number of troops on board, the eunuch Eutychius, sent by the emperor, as he was a man of great address, intrepidity, and experience in war, with the title and authority of exarch, to reduce the revolted cities in Italy, and persuade, if by any means he could, the king of the Lombards to abandon the pope. As the inhabitants of Ravenna had not revolted, nor submitted to the Lombards, they received Eutychius into the city, and acknowledged him for their lawful governor, declaring that they would ever continue faithful to the emperor, though

they could not, in compliance with his edict, renounce the catholic faith. The exarch dissembled for the present, flattering himself that he should soon be able to make them pay dear for the death of his predecessor, and the many enormous excesses of which they were guilty.¹

The first thing, says Anastasius, which the new exarch attempted, and had chiefly at heart, was to accomplish what his predecessor and others had attempted in vain, to get the pope murdered; and he dispatched accordingly, on his first arrival in Italy, a messenger to Rome with a letter, which he had received from the emperor at his departure from Constantinople. The letter was directed to all the officers of the emperor in that city, and they were required by it, and commanded, to put the pope to death, at all events, as a disturber of the public tranquillity, and an enemy of the empire. But the letter was intercepted by the Roman people; and they would have torn the messenger to pieces in the transport of their zeal, had not the pope interposed, and contented himself only with excommunicating the exarch.² Thus Anastasius; and from thence the modern advocates for images have all taken occasion, and above all Maimbourg, to indulge themselves in long descants on the cruelty, treachery, and barbarity of Leo, as if it were cruelty, treachery, or barbarity in a prince to put to death, or cause to be put to death, a traitor, a rebel, a declared enemy both to him and the state. But against this attempt lie the same objections, that have been alleged above against that of the exarch Paul, the silence of all the other writers, though they lived much nearer to those times than the bibliothecarian, nay, and of the pope himself, who reproached the emperor indeed with many other things, but never charged him with having, at any time, attempted upon his life, or given the least encouragement to such an attempt. Besides, what advantage could the emperor have reaped from the death of the pope? He well knew, that were he removed, the revolted Romans would choose, without his consent or approbation, another in his room, and no doubt one who, they were sure, would espouse the same cause, and promote it with the same zeal. But he had good reason to believe, that could he once get him into his power, he should be able to prevail upon him, as his predecessor Justinian formerly prevailed on Vigilius,³ to condemn what he had hitherto approved, and approve what he had hitherto condemned. All the attempts, therefore, said by Anastasius to have been made upon the life of the pope, (and Baronius⁴ reckons up no fewer than six,) were,

¹ Paul. Diac. l. 6. c. 10. Regin. Chronol. l. 1. p. 47. Sigon. ad Ann. 726.

² Anast. in Greg. II.

³ Vide Freher. in Chron. Exarch. Raven.

¹ Paul. Diac. ubi supra.

² Anast. in Greg. II.

³ See vol. I. p. 368.

⁴ Bar. ad Ann. 726. p. 77—79.

The exarch strives to gain the king of the Lombards; and gains him in the end. Rome besieged by the exarch and the king. The pope repairs to the king's camp. How received there.

in all likelihood, attempts only to seize him; means not being wanting to convince him, had the emperor had him in his power, that images were not to be worshiped.

However that be, the new exarch, despairing of ever being able to reduce the pope, and the other rebels, so long as they were supported by the king of the Lombards, applied to him in the first place; and he left nothing unattempted to gain him, or engage him at least to stand neuter, and suffer the emperor, and his friend and ally, if he would not assist him, to bring his rebellious subjects back to their duty. He even offered to yield to the Lombards for ever the cities they had seized, and persuade the emperor to renounce, in the most solemn manner, all title and claim to them, provided they joined him, and acted in concert and conjunction with the imperial troops against the pope and the Romans. But the king had nothing less in his view, than to conquer all Italy; and that he flattered himself he should be able to accomplish, when by a long war (and he was determined by some means or other to prolong it) both parties were sufficiently weakened. He therefore withstood all the offers, of the exarch, alleging that he could not in honor abandon the pope, nor in conscience the catholic cause. But that he only pursued his own interest, under the cloak of honor and conscience, as most princes do, who pretend to either, was soon made to appear on the following occasion. Two Lombard dukes, Thrasimund of Spoleto, and Gregory of Benevento, seeing Luitprand engaged in a war with the emperor, took from thence occasion to shake off the yoke, and claim, in their respective dukedoms, a power and authority independent of the king. Their revolt gave, at this juncture, great uneasiness to Luitprand, apprehending that the other dukes would be all prompted by them, to follow their example: but it offered to the exarch the most favorable opportunity he could have wished for of applying anew to the king, and attempting to engage him in the interest of the emperor and the empire; and he took care not to let it pass unimproved. For he was no sooner acquainted with what had happened, than pretending great friendship for the king, and no less zeal for the rights and authority of princes in general, he declared that, far from lending any kind of assistance to the rebel dukes, it being a precedent of most dangerous consequence for one prince to assist or protect the rebels of another, he was ready to join the king with all the forces under his command against them, on condition, that when they were reduced, he engaged to join him with all his forces against the pope and the Romans. The proposal was approved by the king; the two armies joined; and marching thus joined,

without loss of time, to Spoleto, surprised there, and struck the two dukes with such terror, that they immediately submitted, and, throwing themselves at the king's feet, sued in that humble posture for pardon, which he readily granted them.¹

From Spoleto the two armies marched, pursuant to the agreement between the king and the exarch, to Rome, and encamped in the meadows of Nero, as they were called, between the Tiber and the Vatican. The Romans had openly revolted from the emperor, and pulled down the statues, had by their own authority appointed magistrates to govern them, and used the officers of the emperor with the utmost barbarity, and all, who offered to oppose them, and maintain his authority. As for the pope, he not only had not restrained the people from such excesses, but encouraged them in them; and could not but know that he was looked upon, and very deservedly, as the first and chief author of all the excesses, which they had committed. We may therefore well imagine how great was the consternation and dread, that seized both the people and him, at the sight of two numerous armies come to revenge the many enormities of which they were, and knew themselves guilty. They were forsaken by the only ally they had, and who alone was able to protect them; nay, he was, of their friend and protector, become their avowed enemy; and they expected, and could expect, nothing but present destruction.

In that extremity the only means that occurred to the pope, (and he thought it might possibly succeed,) of escaping the vengeance, with which he was threatened, was to repair to the camp of the Lombards, and there deliver himself up to the king. He hoped that, as the king had but very lately given so remarkable an instance of his good nature and mercy, in pardoning those who had revolted from him, he might perhaps be prevailed upon to interpose his good offices with the exarch in favor of those, who had revolted from the emperor; the rather as he had encouraged them in, and reaped no small advantages from their revolt. Animated with that hope, he set out, attended by some of his clergy, and of the chief citizens of Rome; and arriving at the king's quarters, presented himself unexpectedly before him; represented to him, in a pathetic speech, his present distress; and earnestly begged, that to the glorious instance, which he had lately given of his royal mercy, he would add another still more glorious, that of delivering him, the city of Rome, and the whole Roman people, from the jaws of death and destruction. The king, who was, it seems, a man of great humanity, was touched with his speech, and so affected, if

¹ Anast. in Greg. II.

The king obliges the pope and the Romans to submit to the emperor. The pope persuades the Romans to join the exarch against the usurper Tiberius. That no great merit in the pope. The emperor resolves to remove the patriarch Germanus.

we believe Anastasius, with his distress, that, throwing himself at his feet, he begged pardon for entering into an alliance against him; and, assuring both him and the Romans of his protection, he attended him to the neighboring church of St. Peter, and there disarmed himself in the presence of his officers, laying his girdle, his sword, and his gantlet, with his royal mantle, his crown of gold, and a cross of silver, on the tomb of the apostle.¹ However, to fulfill his engagements with the exarch, he obliged both the pope and the Romans to submit to him, to acknowledge his authority, and to receive him, after he had promised a general amnesty, into the city.²

While the exarch was still at Rome, he was informed, that one Petasius, who had taken the name of Tiberius, and pretended to be descended from the ancient emperors, had seduced several cities in Tuscany, and was by them proclaimed emperor. This intelligence gave him great uneasiness, the army of the usurper being already, as he was informed, far superior in number to his, and acquiring daily new strength. But he had treated the pope and the Romans, though master of the city, with the greatest humanity and kindness; had taken no manner of notice of the many excesses, which they had committed; and never once mentioned the edict against images; but, waiting for fresh orders on that head from the emperor, had connived, in the mean time, at their worshipping what images they pleased. The pope, therefore, partly out of gratitude, and partly to regain the favor of the emperor, and incline him to hearken to his complaints and remonstrances, persuaded the Romans to join the imperial troops, and march jointly with them against the rebels in Tuscany. With that reinforcement the exarch took the field, defeated the rebels, and, having taken the usurper, cut off his head, and sent it to the emperor.³ The pope did no more than what was his duty, and the duty of every subject to have done at such a juncture; and I cannot well comprehend in what he displayed that nobleness of mind, that greatness of soul, which on this occasion Baronius and Maimbourg so much admire and extol in his holiness. At the same time that these writers bestow the highest encomiums on the pope, for thus returning, say they, good for evil, and favors for injuries, they paint the emperor as a monster of ingratitude, for still urging the execution of his edict against images; as if he ought to have suffered, out of gratitude to the pope, and in return for the service he had done him, all his subjects to turn idolaters. The popes, as we may observe here by the way, proved ever very faithful and loyal to the emperors, when Rome was, or they apprehended it to

be, in the least danger of falling under the yoke of a prince, who might reside there, and by his presence defeat their ambitious designs, and confine their authority within its due bounds. For thus were the bishops of Constantinople, though no less ambitious than the bishops of Rome, and ever aspiring to the same grandeur and power, restrained from the attaining of either. The loyalty therefore, of the pope, on occasion of the present rebellion, was not perhaps so much owing to the regard he had for the interest of the emperor, as to that which he had for his own: nay, it is not at all improbable, that Gregory, considering the distance of the emperor, the distracted state of the empire, the weakness of the imperial army in Italy, and the attachment of the people, especially of the Romans, to him, entertained at this time some thoughts of making himself, or at least paving the way for his successors to make themselves, as they soon did, masters of Rome; and consequently, that it was to prevent any other power from prevailing in Italy, which would have defeated at once all his designs, that he exerted so much zeal against the usurper.

In the east the imperial edict was no better received by the people, especially at Constantinople, than it was in the west by the people of Rome. However, the presence of the emperor, and the numerous forces, which he kept constantly on foot to oppose the attempts of the Saracens, awed the populace; and restrained them at least from openly revolting, though the patriarch Germanus, the famous Damascene, and under their banners the whole body of monks, who found their account in the new superstition, made it their business to stir them up to sedition and rebellion, persuading the ignorant multitude, as appears from their writings, that the worship of images was approved by our Savior himself, was commanded by the apostles, was looked upon by the primitive church not only as lawful, but even as necessary to salvation: and consequently, that to renounce that worship was to renounce Christianity, and turn Jew or Mahometan.¹ Leo, "that monster of cruelty, with whom contradiction was treason, that inhuman wild beast thirsting more after blood than his namesake the lion," as he is painted by one of the impartial writers of those days, quoted by Baronius and Maimbourg, had now for three whole years borne patiently with Germanus, respecting his character, and, unwilling to use any violence with a man of his years; for he was at this time in his ninety-fifth year; but finding that the aged patriarch, relying on his good nature, grew daily more daring and insolent; that, in spite of all the kindness he could show him, he still obstinately continued, and made

¹ Anast. in Greg. II.² Idem. *ibid.*³ Idem. *ibid.*⁴ Apud Bar. ad Ann. 727. p. 83, 89.

A great council assembled by the emperor. Determined there, that images should be cast out of the churches and broken. That determination probably approved by all but Germanus, who opposes it, and resigns his dignity. Not ill used, nor put to death by the emperor.

it his study, to inflame the minds of the people against him, not only as the protector, but the author of a most damnable heresy; nay, and that he had the presumption to anathematize, in an assembly of the clergy, all, who did not worship images, who thought it idolatry to worship them, or communicated with those, who thought so; he resolved to oblige him, and thought it was high time, to resign his dignity, or alter his conduct. Having therefore sent for him to the imperial palace, he let him know, that since he abused the authority that was given him to promote the Christian religion, and the purity of worship among Christians, to countenance idolatry, and the worship of idols, he must either quit that authority, or use it for the purpose for which it was given him. Here Maimbourg makes the patriarch recur to all the futile and unmeaning distinctions, that are used in the schools of the Jesuits to excuse the worship of images from idolatry. But Leo, he adds, was extremely ignorant, and consequently did not understand those distinctions. If not to understand them argues an extreme ignorance, I should be glad to know where the man is to be found that has any knowledge.¹

The emperor, finding that Germanus was not to be gained, but at the same time unalterably determined, as he thought it his duty, to banish idolatry (for so he called the worship of images) at all events, and in spite of all opposition, from the church, or at least from the empire, assembled a grand council a few days after his interview with the patriarch, Theophanes says on the seventh of January, 730, to concert with his ministers, and the chief men of the empire, the most proper and effectual means of accomplishing so commendable a work. At that council assisted the emperor in person, the senate, all the great officers of state, all the bishops, who were then at Constantinople, and among the rest the patriarch himself, in virtue of an express order from the emperor. They met in the great hall of the magnificent palace adjoining to the Hippodrome, called the palace of the nine-

¹ Theophanes writes, that, at this interview, Germanus told the emperor, that, according to an ancient prophecy, all images were indeed to be one day pulled down, and cast out of the churches; but that it was not, he thanked God, in his reign that so wicked a thing was to happen; that the emperor thereupon asked him, in whose reign it was to happen; and that he answering in the reign of one Conon, Leo replied, "That is my name, the name that was given me at my baptism." At these words the good patriarch, adds Theophanes, struck with horror, cried out in the greatest consternation, "Heaven forbid such a prophecy should be accomplished in your reign! the prince, in whose reign that happens, is to be the forerunner of anti-christ."—(Theoph. ad Ann. Leon. 13.) Thus Theophanes. But that Leo was not the forerunner of anti-christ, though he caused all the images to be pulled down, and cast out of the churches; and consequently, that the author of the pretended prophecy was a false and lying prophet; will now, I believe, hardly be denied even by Baronius.

teen bed-tables, because on Christmas-day the emperor used to entertain the nobility there at nineteen tables, none of them sitting on that occasion, but all lying on beds after the manner of the ancient Romans.¹

As the fathers of the second council of Nice ordered all writings, records, acts of councils, &c. against images, to be destroyed, the only thing we know of this council is, that it was there determined, that since images could not be allowed, as was now found by experience, and idolatry prevented, or the ignorant multitude be restrained from worshipping them, they should be all pulled down, cast out of the churches, and destroyed.² A determination worthy of so Christian an emperor, and so august an assembly! Baronius, and his transcriber Maimbourg, would make us believe, that the emperor abruptly declared, at his first coming into the council, and without consulting any of the assembly, or giving them an opportunity of speaking on the subject, that it was his will and pleasure, that all images should be cast out of the churches, and broken; as if he had called together all the chief men of the empire only to disoblige and affront them at a time when he most stood in need of their aid and concurrence.

As the worship of images had yet prevailed only among the monks, the populace, and the women, I am rather inclined to believe that the above-mentioned determination was approved and agreed to by all but Germanus. We do not, at least, read of its being opposed by any but him; and it is not at all to be doubted, but had others opposed it as well as he, their names would have been transmitted to posterity as well as his, and with the highest encomiums. He, indeed, far from consenting to the demolition of images, maintained, and, to do him justice, with great intrepidity, that they ought not only to be retained, but worshiped; and upon the emperor's pressing him to sign the first, an edict which so many men, no less distinguished by their learning and piety, than their rank, were ready to sign after him, he boldly told him that he attempted in vain to extort his consent to, or connivance at, so wicked an action; that he would ever oppose it to the utmost of his power; and that if they apprehended the present storm to have been raised by him, they might throw him, like another Jonas, into the sea. At these words he divested himself of his pall, delivered it to the emperor, and having thus resigned his dignity, withdrew to the house in which he was born, and there passed the remainder of his life quite undisturbed.³ Thus Theophanes, and with him agree Paulus Diaconus, Anastasius, and even

¹ Vide Ducang. Constantin. Christian. l. 2. n. 6.

² Theoph. ad Ann. Incar. secund. Alexand. 728.

³ Idem ibid.

Anastasius appointed in the room of Germanus. The pope declares him deposed, if he does not renounce his pretended heresy. Edict issued, commanding all images to be cast out of the churches and broken.

Cedrenus. But Baronius, Maimbourg, Natalis Alexander, &c. displeas'd at the moderation shown on this occasion, according to the accounts of those writers, by the emperor, as not at all suiting the character, in which they constantly paint him, of a passionate, cruel, and barbarous tyrant, of an ever-roaring and all-devouring lion, add from the legendry writers, that Germanus was soon after dragged, by the emperor's order, from the place of his retreat to a distant monastery; that he was most inhumanly used, and cruelly beaten by the soldiers who conveyed him to it; and that he had not been long there when he was, by a new order from the emperor, barbarously strangled, in the hundredth year of his age. He was descended of a patrician family. His father, Justinian, was put to death by the emperor Constantine Pogonatus, we know not for what crime; and he, for speaking on that occasion with too much freedom, made an eunuch. Being thus well qualified for the ecclesiastical order, he betook himself to the church; and, having passed through all the inferior degrees, was raised to the see of Cyzicus, and translated from thence to the see of Constantinople.¹ He is said to have applied himself chiefly to the study of the Holy Scriptures; but his maintaining the lawfulness of image worship, so often and so expressly condemned in the Holy Scriptures, is no proof of his having made any considerable progress in that study. He is now honored as a saint, and his anniversary is kept on the 12th of May.

He was succeeded by Anastasius, whose indefatigable endeavors to root out the prevailing idolatry, in conjunction with the emperor, have given occasion to the more modern Greek writers to represent him as the most wicked of men. But, with them, all, who opposed the worship of images, were the most wicked of men; and all saints of the first rate, who countenanced that worship. Had the writings of both parties reached our times, we should have, without all doubt, very different accounts of both: but the good fathers of Nice took care, that we should hear only one side. As to Anastasius, the more ancient and more credible writers were utterly unacquainted with the many enormous crimes that have been laid to his charge by the later Greek writers, and copied from them by Baronius and Maimbourg.

The new patriarch had no sooner taken possession of his see, than he wrote to the pope to acquaint him with his promotion, and beg his communion: but Gregory, finding that he did not approve of the worship of images, instead of acknowledging him for his fellow bishop, declared him deposed from his dignity, and divested of all power, if he did not, upon the receipt of his letter, re-

nounce his heresy, and embrace the catholic faith;¹ for though the worship of images had not yet been decreed, nor approved, nor so much as mentioned, in any council whatever, all, who did not worship them, were looked upon as declared heretics by those who did, and they, who worshiped them, as the only good catholics. The patriarch paid, as we may well imagine, no kind of regard to the letter, or the sentence, of the pope.

The emperor was not, it seems, at first averse to the use of images, but rather of the opinion of pope Gregory the Great, that images should neither be destroyed, nor worshiped;² and he had done all that lay in his power to prevent their being worshiped, without destroying them. He had ordered them, as we have seen, to be raised higher in all places of worship, flattering himself, that being out of the reach, and less exposed to the view of the populace, the multitude would be thus weaned, by degrees, from their superstition, or would not, at least, be so easily tempted to bow down to their images, to prostrate themselves before them, to kiss them, deck them with flowers after the manner of the Gentiles; and, as he expressed it, make them their gods, by giving them the worship that was due to God alone: but now, convinced by experience, that the use of images could not possibly be allowed, and the worship prevented, he resolved to lay the axe to the root, and cause, pursuant to the determination of the late council, all images, without distinction, to be pulled down, to be broken in pieces, and publicly burnt. And here I cannot help admiring the invincible firmness and constancy, the true Christian spirit and zeal, of this most excellent emperor, in thus pursuing undaunted so difficult an undertaking, notwithstanding the great opposition, which it had already every where met with, and the far greater, which it was likely to meet with from the more than ever provoked superstition and rage of the people. Some about the emperor, better statesmen than Christians, apprehending the dreadful consequences, which they foresaw would attend the destruction of images, took the liberty to suggest to him, that he had better suffer the ignorant multitude to worship what images they pleased, even those of Jupiter, Mars, or Apollo, than involve the empire in endless disturbances, and expose both his crown and his life by attempting to cure an evil, which they looked upon as quite incurable. But the good emperor, thinking it incumbent upon him to reform the abuses in the church as well as the state, and ready to risk all, rather than to be wanting in so essential a part of his duty, instead of hearkening to so wicked a suggestion, ordered the edict, or decree of the council, to be im-

¹ Theoph. in Constantin. Pogonatus.

² Anast. in Greg. II.

³ See p. 42.

The execution of the edict against images opposed by the populace, and the women. Several of the emperor's officers barbarously murdered. The patriarch grossly insulted by the women. Many of the rioters either killed by the soldiery, or publicly executed. None suffered on this occasion but such as were concerned in the riot.

mediately published, and put in execution. It was published accordingly; and no sooner was it published, than the officers, who were charged with the execution of it, began, in the first place, pursuant to the express order of the emperor, to pull down, break, and destroy, all the images, that were set up in the public places of the imperial city, and consequently of all others the most apt to seduce the superstitious and ignorant multitude, as being constantly exposed to their view.

Among these was an image of our Savior over the gate of the imperial palace, called the brazen gate, from the tiles of gilt brass, that covered the magnificent vestibule, or porch, before it. That statue the emperor, to begin with his own palace, ordered to be pulled down the first of all, and dashed in pieces. But they had scarce begun to execute that order, when, the report of such an attempt spreading, and it spread in an instant all over the city, the populace, ready to part with their lives rather than their images, flew to arms, and crowding from all quarters to the imperial palace, fell, in the transport of their rage, on the emperor's officers, and put many of them to death on the spot.¹ The women had hitherto never concerned themselves in religious disputes; but being naturally fond of pictures and images, and finding their children took great delight in them, and learnt by their means, before they were capable of learning by any other, the mysteries of our holy religion, they were not, in this dispute, and on the present occasion, behind hand in zeal with the men: for they too, transported with divine rage, says the deacon Stephen, and forgetful of their sex, flew to the palace, and finding there one of the officers busied on the top of a ladder in pulling down the holy image, overset the ladder, and rushing, in the heat of their zeal, on the unhappy wretch, while he lay on the ground bruised with his fall, tore him to pieces.² Thus did the impious minister of the emperor's impiety, says another writer of those blessed times,³ fall at once from the top of the ladder to the bottom of hell.

But the zeal, or the rage, of these furies was not yet satisfied. The new patriarch was thought to have suggested the late edict to the emperor; and on him chiefly they wanted to wreak their vengeance and fury. From the imperial palace therefore they flew, like so many blood-thirsty tigers, to the great church; where they were informed, that the patriarch was then performing divine service; and, laying aside all shame and mo-

desty for the sake of Christ, says one of the authors of this account,¹ entered the church, and, without any regard to the sacredness of the place, discharged a shower of stones at the patriarch, calling him wolf, thief, traitor, heretic, and all the opprobrious names, that female rage, wrought up to the highest pitch, could suggest. The patriarch received several wounds, and so did those who attended him; but nevertheless he had the good luck to escape with his life, and to reach, through by-ways, the imperial palace. He there informed the emperor of what had passed, who immediately ordered his guards to appease the tumult; and many of the rioters, women as well as men, were killed by the provoked soldiery before it was appeased. Some of the more audacious and obstinate were seized, and either publicly executed as guilty of treason, sedition, and murder, or whipt, and sent into exile. These just executions have given occasion to the more modern Greek writers, Cedrenus, Zonaras, Glycas, Constantine Manasses, and their transcribers Baronius, Maimbourg, and Natalis Alexander, to compare this good emperor to the Nero's, the Dioclesian's, and the other bloody tyrants and persecutors we read of in the annals of the church, as if he had exercised the same cruelties on the worshipers of images, that were exercised by them on the worshipers of Christ.

From their accounts one would conclude, that he had commanded a general massacre; and that all the women of Constantinople, and the greater part of the men, had by his orders been inhumanly butchered. In the Greek martyrology it is said, that nine men, who are all named, and one woman, Maria, descended of a patrician family, were thrown into different dungeons; that they there received, for the space of eight months, five hundred lashes a day; and that when they were ready, at the term of that time, to expire (and it was a great miracle that they did not expire sooner,) the emperor ordered their faces to be pricked with red hot bodkins, and then their heads to be cut off, and their bodies to be cast into the sea:² with such instances of Leo's cruelty have the later Greeks filled their histories; and their accounts, et quidquid Græcia mendax audet in historia, have been all copied by Baronius, Maimbourg, and Natalis Alexander; nay, and improved. But Theophanes, who lived near three hundred years before the earliest of the above-mentioned writers, and was as great an enemy to Leo as Baronius, or Maimbourg, and as zealous a worshiper of images as either, (for he died an exile in that cause,) supposes none to have suffered on this occasion, but such as were concerned

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. Leon. 10.

² Steph. Diac. in Vit. S. Steph. Junior. apud. Lophin. Analect. Græc. Tom. 1.

³ Constantin. Acropolit. in Encon. S. Theodosiæ.

¹ Metaphrast. apud Bar. ad Ann. 726. p. 59.

² Menæ. ad Diem 9. August.

Tale of the oecumenical master and twelve professors burnt with their college by the emperor's order.

in the riot spoken of above. For all he says is, that the populace rose in a tumultuous manner; that they killed many (not some, as Baronius has it,) of the emperor's officers attempting to pull down the image of Christ over the brazen gate of the palace; and that many of them, that is, of those, who were concerned in that riot, were punished with the loss of their limbs, (perhaps of the hands, which they had imbrued in the blood of the emperor's officers,) with stripes, with banishment, and with the forfeiture of all their effects.¹ Had the protestant subjects of Lewis XIV. been guilty of the same excesses, when required to worship images, which the subjects of Leo were guilty of when forbidden to worship them, would Maimbourg, who on this occasion exaggerates above all others the cruelty, the barbarity, the tyranny of the emperor, have thought it cruelty, barbarity, tyranny, in the grand monarch, to have treated his subjects as Leo treated his?

The above-mentioned writers, not satisfied with exaggerating, in the manner we have seen, the punishments that were justly inflicted by Leo on his rebellious subjects, and representing them as the effects of tyranny, have charged him with innumerable acts of cruelty, that have not the least appearance of truth, nor foundation in history. But of the many instances they allege of his more than brutal and infernal barbarity, to use the expression of Maimbourg, I shall only take notice of the following two, as they are thought the most authentic of all, and related most at length by the modern historians, to raise the indignation of their readers against that most religious and excellent emperor. There was, say they, in Constantinople, a kind of college, consisting of a master, styled, from his universal knowledge, the oecumenical master, and twelve professors, all chosen out of the most learned men of the empire, to instruct the youth in the different branches of literature, each of them in that particular branch, to which he had most applied, and chiefly excelled in. Their fame for learning drew crowds of disciples to them from all parts of the world; and they were so highly esteemed for their wisdom and probity by the emperors themselves, that they undertook nothing without previously advising with them. This famous college was founded, they say, and endowed, by Constantine the Great, and enriched by the succeeding emperors, with the most costly ornaments and furniture, with innumerable vessels of silver and gold, with all the valuable rarities which the then known world could afford; but, above all, with a library, consisting, according to Constantine Manasses, of thirty-three thousand,² according to Glycas, of

thirty-six thousand five hundred choice books, for the use of the professors and students. Among the other invaluable curiosities to be seen there, was that famous miracle of art in little, the Iliad and Odyssey distinctly written in letters of gold, on the great gut of a dragon. As the oecumenical master and the twelve professors were universally revered as so many oracles, and the eyes of the whole people were upon them, the emperor did not doubt but if he could gain them, their example would be followed by the rest of his subjects. He therefore sent for them to his palace, and having there alleged to them some childish and trifling reasons, and he could allege none but what were childish and trifling, against the worship of images, he spared neither caresses, nor threats, nor promises, to gain them over to his party. But he labored in vain: they were too well versed in the Scriptures and fathers, to be convinced by him, that to worship images was idolatry; and men of too much zeal for the truth, and too much firmness and constancy in the cause of truth, to yield to his caresses, to his threats, or his promises: nay, they maintained in his presence the lawfulness of image-worship, and proved it with such reasons and arguments, as nothing could have withstood, but the most invincible obstinacy.¹

Leo therefore, despairing of ever being able to convince or to gain them, resolved to exert all his cruelty, and punish their constancy in so exemplary a manner as should strike the whole empire with terror, and teach the rest of his subjects, that he was their sovereign, and would be obeyed. He ordered accordingly those innocent men to be all shut up in their college, great quantity of dry wood to be plied all around it, and fire to be set to it in the night; which soon consumed them, and, with them, that stately habitation of the muses, that so famous a library, and that inestimable treasure of rarities, which the emperors had been employed in collecting, and at an immense expence, ever since the time of Constantine the great.

him equally unacquainted with the Greek and the Latin. For he tells us, that the library consisted of three hundred and three thousand books, taking the Greek word, "trismyrias," and the Latin, "tricens millia," that signify thirty thousand, to signify three hundred thousand.—(Maimb. *Ilist. Icon.* l. i. p. 73.)

¹ If so, the reasons and arguments, which they alleged, must have been of a very different nature from any, that have been alleged since their time. And what a pity that the writers of those days all forgot to acquaint posterity with them! Had they transmitted them to us, Maimbourg would have had no occasion to recur, as he does in the long speech, which he makes for the oecumenical master, and his twelve professors, to the picture sent by our Savior to the king of Edessa, (See p. 29. note 2) to the statue of Paneas, and the miracles wrought by the herb, that grew at the foot of that statue; (See p. 31.) and much less to the distinctions and cavils, that are now used by the schoolmen to excuse the worship, which they give to images, from the idolatry, which the pagans were all charged with by the fathers.—(Maimb. *Ilist. des Iconoclast.* l. i. p. 70—81.)

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. Leon. 10.

² Maimbourg is here guilty of a mistake, that shows

The tale of the burning of the oecumenical master, &c. a mere fable. No account of it in the more ancient writers. The library consumed long before Leo's time. Such an action repugnant to the rules of policy, and common prudence. Leo charged with attempting to get Damascene put to death.

Thus Cedrenus,¹ Zonaras,² Glycas,³ and Constantine Manasses.⁴ But that the whole, from the beginning to the end, is a mere fable, without so much as the least appearance of truth, may be easily made to appear beyond all contradiction. And, 1st, of this conflagration not the least notice is taken either by the fathers of the second council of Nice, though it is supposed to have happened but forty-seven years before the meeting of that council, and consequently in the memory of some of the bishops, who composed it, nor by any of the many historians, who wrote in the present and the two succeeding centuries, though they relate, exaggerate, and even seem to have believed all the ill-natured actions they ever had heard of that good emperor. And who can believe, that so remarkable an event could have happened, and been so soon forgotten, or never been once mentioned by those who remembered it? What could have induced the historians, who lived in or near to those times, and made it their study, as appears from their writings, to paint Leo as the most wicked of men; what, I say, could have induced them to pass over in silence an act in him of so much brutal barbarity, as none could be guilty of but the most wicked of men? Is not their silence a far stronger proof of his innocence, than the assertions of writers, who lived two, three, and four hundred years after them, are of his guilt? For Cedrenus, the first, who related that tragical story, and probably invented it, wrote in the eleventh century; and from him it was copied, and notably improved, by Zonaras and Glycas, but most of all by Constantine Manasses, whom therefore Baronius and Maimbourg have chiefly followed, though he wrote so late as the middle of the twelfth century. II. That famous library, with all the books and rarities it contained, and the above-mentioned Iliad and Odyssey in particular, was consumed, according to Suidas,⁵ by accidental fire in the time of the emperor Zeno, about two hundred and fifty years before the reign of the present emperor: and Suidas is, at least, as worthy of credit as any of the authors quoted by Baronius and Maimbourg.⁶ III. Had these learn-

ed men stood up against Leo in defence of images and image-worship, might he not easily have removed them, have banished them to the most distant parts of the empire, have caused them to be privately, or even publicly executed as rebels, and appointed others in their room, who would have taught and maintained with as much zeal the unlawfulness, as they are supposed to have taught and maintained the lawfulness of that kind of worship? Why should he have chosen to destroy them in so cruel and barbarous a manner? And what could he possibly have proposed to himself in destroying together with them one of the most stately edifices and ornaments of the imperial city, with that invaluable collection of books and rarities, which it had cost his predecessors so much pains and treasure to collect, when he could not but know, that he would have thereby raised the indignation of all mankind, disgraced his undertaking, and prejudiced the whole world against it? Was that acting like a wise prince, for such his whole conduct bespeaks him, or even like a politic, crafty, and subtil prince, as he is represented by Baronius and Maimbourg, and not rather like a mad-man? IV. The imperial palace, the palace of the patriarch, and his library, the famous church of St. Sophia, that wonder of the east, were all adjoining, or very near, to the college; and therefore had fire been set to it, and to the library, containing thirty-three or thirty-six thousand volumes, the other buildings must have been all consumed, or would at least have been in great danger of being consumed by the same fire. And can any man believe, that Leo, to be revenged on a few men, whose obstinacy he might have punished a thousand different manners, would have exposed his own palace, and so many noble edifices, to so great a danger? I might add, that in the menology of the Greeks, though filled with the names of monks, and other obscure persons, who suffered in this cause, not the least mention is made of the oecumenical master, and the twelve professors; and yet, if what is said of them were true, they would have a much better title to a place among the martyrs than any, who are honored in that number. But that the whole is an invention, destitute even of the appearance of truth, is sufficiently manifest from what has already been said.

The other charge they bring against Leo is, his having attempted, by the basest artifice, and the blackest treachery, a man could be guilty of, to get the famous Damascene, or John of Damascus, put to a cruel death, though not a subject of the empire, for maintaining, in opposition to his edict, the worship of images. Damascene was, according to the author of his life, John of Jerusalem, a native of Damascus, descended

¹ Cedren. in Leon. Isaur. p. 454.

² Zonar. Hist. l. 3. ³ Glyc. Annal. Part. 4. p. 251.

⁴ Constantin. Manass. in Compend. Chron. p. 87.

⁵ Suid. in Malcho.

⁶ Maimbourg, indeed, to reconcile the testimony of Suidas with that of his authors, allows the library to have been burnt in the reign of Zeno; but at the same time supposes it to have been rebuilt, to have been filled anew with books and rarities, and the wonderful copy of the Iliad and Odyssey to have been saved out of the first fire, and consumed in the second. But that supposition has not the least foundation in history; and Suidas mentions that curious performance in particular, among the many valuable things that were consumed by fire in the reign of Zeno. But Maimbourg would rather allow it to have perished a second time, as well as the books and the library, than absolve Leo from the guilt of so barbarous and wicked an action.

Damascene highly esteemed by the caliph of the Saracens. Leo is said to have attempted his ruin, and by what means. The caliph orders his right hand to be cut off; which is miraculously restored to him.

from one of the most illustrious and wealthy families of that ancient city. His father was a most zealous Christian, but, nevertheless so highly esteemed by the Saracen princes, lords of Damascus, that, reposing in him an entire confidence, they preferred him to the first employments of the state, and undertook nothing either at home or abroad without his advice and direction. The son was no less esteemed by them for his eminent virtue, and extraordinary talents than the father; and was, therefore, upon his death, not only appointed by the caliph to succeed him in all his employments, but trusted besides, notwithstanding his known zeal for the Christian religion, with the government and defence of Damascus, at that time the metropolis of Syria, and the bulwark of the Saracen empire. But Damascene, though thus engaged in secular affairs, and affairs of state, no sooner heard of the emperor's last edict, commanding all images to be removed out of the churches, and destroyed, than, fired with zeal for the ancient doctrine and practice of the church, he undertook to oppose so wicked an attempt. He opposed it accordingly, and with such success, by the learned writings which he daily published, and his friends took care privately to disperse all over the empire, that the emperor, despairing of ever being able to establish his heresy, so long as the catholic doctrine was maintained by so able an advocate, resolved to remove him by some means or other out of the way.

With that view he forged a letter, as written to him by Damascene, to inform him, that the city of Damascus was weakly garrisoned, and very ill guarded; that he might easily surprise it; that he needed only send for that purpose a small body of troops, and that he would take care to open the gates to them, as he commanded in the place; and put them in possession of the metropolis of Syria, and the whole treasure of the caliphs, without the loss of a man. He conjured the emperor not to neglect so favorable an opportunity of delivering so flourishing a city from the tyranny of the Saracens, and enriching himself with the spoils of the enemies of the Christian name. This letter the emperor caused to be copied by one, who could perfectly counterfeit the hand-writing of Damascene, and sent it thus copied to the caliph with one of his own, wherein he assured him of the sincerity of his friendship, and his firm resolution, inviolably to observe the articles of the treaty lately concluded between the Romans and Saracens; which he said the caliph could no longer doubt of, since he had chosen rather to adhere to the terms of that treaty, than make himself, by a breach of them, master of his metropolis, and all his treasures, which the very person, in whom he chiefly confided, had by an unparalleled treachery,

offered to deliver up to him, and earnestly entreated him, as he might learn from his letter, to accept. He added, that the traitor, looking upon those as his enemies, who differed from him in religion, had thought it his duty to betray in so flagrant a manner, the trust they had reposed in him; but that as no disagreement in religion could, in his own opinion, authorize or justify treachery, instead of availing himself of the offer, that was made him, he had thought it his duty to discover the traitor who made it, though a fellow-Christian and a friend.

Upon the receipt of that letter the caliph, knowing that Damascene was a most zealous Christian, and therefore concluding him guilty, without further inquiry, of the crime, that was laid to his charge, sent for him; showed him both letters; and after many bitter reproaches ordered his right hand, the hand with which he was thought to have written so criminal a letter, to be immediately cut off, and exposed on a gibbet to the view of the whole city. Damascene withdrew, after so cruel and shameful a punishment, to his own habitation; and from thence sent in the evening, when he thought the caliph might be returned to himself, some of his friends to beg that he would cause his hand to be taken down, and restored to him, in order to be buried; the pain which he suffered, and must suffer, so long as it continued above ground, and exposed to the air, being quite insupportable.

The caliph, now coolly reflecting on what he had done, and sensible that he had, at least, acted too rashly, readily complied with the request; and Damascene prostrating himself, as soon as his hand was delivered to him, before an image of the blessed virgin, besought her by a fervent prayer to restore him to the use of it, since she well knew, that the loss of it was owing to his zeal in combating the new heresy, and maintaining, in opposition to the heresiarch Leo, the worship of her and her son in their images. He had scarce ended his prayer, when falling asleep he dreamt that the image of the virgin, appearing to him with a smiling and heavenly countenance, granted him his request, but on condition that he continued to employ his hand, as he had hitherto done, in combating, by his writings, the impiety of those, who had undertaken to abolish a worship so acceptable to her son and to her. He awaked with joy, and found his hand restored to its place, and himself to the free use of it, with only a small scar round the place, where it had been severed from the rest of his body. That mark was left, that he, by seeing it, might be kept constantly in mind of so miraculous a cure, as well as the end, for which it was wrought. Of this miracle the whole city of Damascus was an eye-witness, and the caliph himself among the rest, who, being thereupon convinced

Damascene turns monk. The whole account evidently fabulous. The imperial edict put in execution all over the east, and images everywhere destroyed.

of the innocence of his minister, begged pardon publicly for the injustice he had done him; and, unwilling to part with so faithful a servant, omitted nothing, that lay in his power, to persuade him to resume his employments, and continue in his service. But the saint, panting after a monastic life, prevailed in the end, and having made over his immense wealth, and all his possessions, partly to his relations, and partly to the church and the poor, he left the world as naked as when he first came into it (his garments excepted, as the author of his life takes care to observe;) and withdrew, no less lamented by the Saracens in Damascus than the Christians, to the famous monastery of St. Sabas in Palestine. There, mindful of his engagement, and the end for which he was, at the expense of so great a miracle, restored to the use of his hand, he continued to employ it so long as he lived in combating the new heresy, and maintaining, in opposition to the blasphemies of Leo, and his followers, the catholic and apostolic doctrine.¹

Thus John of Jerusalem, in his life of Damascene; and thus, after him, Baronius,² Maimbourg,³ and Natalis Alexander.⁴ But to convince even the most credulous, that the whole is a mere fable, I need only observe, that such an extraordinary event, so stupendous a miracle, which soon filled with its fame, says Maimbourg, the whole Christian world, is vouched by John of Jerusalem alone, an obscure writer of the ninth century; and that not the least notice is taken of it by any other author whatever, nay, not even by Damascene himself. And can even the most credulous papist imagine, that so marvellous an event, an event that filled the whole Christian world with its fame could possibly have escaped all the writers, who lived before the time of John of Jerusalem, and all who lived after it? Is not their silence an evident proof, that in the time of those, who wrote before him, this fable was not yet invented; and that it appeared to those, who wrote after him, too grossly absurd to deserve any notice? In what other manner can we account for the silence of so many writers, with respect to a fact so favorable to the cause, which they had all most zealously espoused? But though so surprising an event could have escaped all other writers, it could not surely have escaped Damascene himself; nor could he ever have forgotten so great a miracle wrought on himself: and yet not the least mention is made, nor so much as a distant hint given of it by him in all his works. He wrote three orations against the Iconoclasts, and could Baronius or Maim-

bourg think, that if he had recovered his hand in the manner we are told, he would not have there, at least, mentioned so miraculous a cure; and urged it against those, with whom he disputed, as an unanswerable proof, that the worship of images was pleasing to God? I might add, that it is highly improbable, to say no more, that the caliph of the Saracens, who, by the way, is never once named, should have trusted a Christian with the government and defence of his metropolis; a zealous Christian, nay, and a most sanguine advocate for the worship of images, to which the Saracens had all an utter abhorrence; that he should have reposed an entire confidence in Damascene, knowing him to be a Christian, and yet concluded him guilty, without farther inquiry, of the blackest treachery, because he was a Christian; that he should have been an eyewitness of so great a miracle wrought in favor of images, and yet continue a Mahometan, an enemy to images; that Leo, though convinced of the truth of the miracle, should, instead of yielding, and abjuring his former opinion, be more confirmed in it, and persecute, as he is said to have done, with more cruelty than ever, all who opposed it: but the reader will perhaps, think that I have dwelt already too long on so idle a story. And truly I should not have thought it worthy of a place in this history, though gravely related by Baronius, Natalis, and Maimbourg, had it not been to show, by so remarkable an instance, what means were employed, what absurd and improbable stories were invented, to establish among the ignorant vulgar the growing superstition.

To return to Leo, the people of Constantinople finding him unalterably determined to have his edict put, at all events, in execution, and to spare none, who opposed it, fear in the end got the better of superstition; and they tamely suffered their most revered images to be pulled down, to be cast out of the churches, to be broken, or torn in pieces, and publicly consigned to the flames. In the provinces the execution of the edict was opposed with great warmth by some bishops; namely, by Æmilianus of Cyzicum, Eudemon of Lampascus, Basilius of Parium, and Nicholas of Apollonias; but they being driven from their sees, and sent into exile with some obstinate and refractory monks, who attempted to stir up the populace to rebellion, and have been canonized on that account, the emperor, had, and in a very short time, the so much and so long wished for satisfaction, of seeing the far greater part of his empire, all the eastern provinces, cleansed, to use his expression, from the filth of idolatry.

As for the western provinces, the emperor was well apprised, that the execution of his edict would meet there with great oppo-

¹ Joan. Hier. in Vit. Joan. Damas.

² Bar. ad Ann. 728. p. 92, 93.

³ Maimb. Hist. des Iconoclast. l. 2. p. 116, 124.

⁴ Natal. Alexand. Hist. Eccles. Secl. 8. c. 2. Art. 1. p. 664.

The emperor resolves to cause the same edict to be published and observed in the west. He writes to the pope. The pope's answer to his letter filled with the grossest abuse. Arguments alleged by the pope in favor of image worship quite foreign to the purpose.

sition; that the pope, who had opposed with so much obstinacy his former edict, though only commanding images to be placed higher in the churches, would leave nothing unattempted to render this ineffectual, ordering them to be removed out of all places of worship, and destroyed; that he would, in all likelihood, not only stir up his own subjects, but all the western princes, against him as a heretic; and that thereupon a general revolt might ensue, and perhaps be attended with the loss of the provinces, that were still subject to the empire in Italy. Of all this the good emperor was well apprised; but, choosing to risk the loss of those provinces, rather than suffer them to continue unreclaimed from their idolatry, he resolved to cause his edict to be published in Italy, and to be, so far as in him lay, as punctually executed there, and as strictly complied with, as it was in all the other provinces of the empire. The pope had broken off all correspondence with the emperor ever since the year 726, when he published his first edict; had armed all his subjects in Italy against him as a heretic; had countenanced them in the many unnatural murders they committed in defence of their images; and, by the disturbances he raised, given occasion to the warlike king of the Lombards to seize on several cities, and extend his dominions at the expense of the empire. But Leo, forgetting so monstrous a conduct, and not yet, it seems, quite despairing of being able to gain him, or at least determined to do all that lay in his power to gain him, resolved to write to him on this occasion; and he wrote to him accordingly, at the same time that he sent his edict to the exarch, to be published in Italy. His letter has not been suffered to reach our times, nor indeed has any other writing whatever against the worship of images. But from the pope's answer to it, it appears, that he alleged several passages out of the Scripture, to show that it was not lawful, that it was idolatry to worship any thing that was made with hands; that he justified his casting all idols (for so he constantly called images) out of the church, by the example of king Hezekiah, who broke the brazen serpent, and cast it out of the temple, when he found that it was worshiped by the people; that he proposed the assembling of a general council, and declared himself ready to acquiesce in the decision and judgment of the bishops who composed it; that he assured the pope of his protection and favor, if he complied with his edict; but threatened, if he did not, to cause him to be seized, and carried prisoner to Constantinople, where he should meet with no better treatment from him than his predecessor pope Martin had met with from the emperor Constans; and that, in the close of his letter, he earnestly entreated the pope

not to oppose so commendable a work as that of extirpating idolatry, but rather to concur with him, with Anastasius the holy bishop of new Rome, and many other venerable prelates, in promoting it, in removing out of the sight of the people the stocks and the stones which they worshiped, and in restoring the Christian service to the purity of the primitive times.¹

As it was an act of the greatest condescension in the emperor, to write the first to the pope, after his late so criminal behavior, and so long a silence on either side, his letter deserved, on that consideration alone, had the pope been even upon the level with him, to be answered at least with common respect and civility. But, instead of that, the insolent pope, forgetting that he wrote to his liege lord, and his sovereign, answered him in a style that would be quite unbecoming in a wretch of the lowest condition to his equal. For, not satisfied with contemptuously treating him as a school-boy; with bidding him go and learn his catechism among the children at school, and take care not to let his school-fellows know that he is an enemy to images, lest they should throw their table-books at his head; he addresses him almost in every line with the epithets of "ignorant, blockish, stupid, dull;" calls him a conceited pretender to learning, but void not only of all learning, but of all judgment and sense; not able, for his stupidity and dullness, to distinguish between right and wrong, between falsehood and truth; worse than a heretic, since heretics err in points that are intricate and obscure, whereas he erred in points as clear as the light of day. This Baronius calls a letter worthy of the high pontiff.² Indeed no man upon earth, but the high pontiff, would have had the presumption to write such a letter to his lord and master.

But his holiness was better at abuse than at argument. When the infallible head of the church undertakes to prove a catholic doctrine, and confute the opposite error, one might expect to hear something uncommon, and very extraordinary, some convincing and unanswerable argument in favor of the one, and against the other. But, alas! all the reasons alleged by Gregory, to prove the lawfulness of image worship, are either quite impertinent, or foreign to the purpose, or the very same that were offered by the pagans in defence of their idolatry, and a thousand times answered by the fathers. In the first class we may rank the arguments, which he draws from the "works done in gold, in silver, and in brass;" by the two artificers Bezaleel and Aholiab,³ from the tables of stone "written with the finger of

¹ Apud Bar. ad Ann. 726. p. 65—77.

² Bar. ad Ann. 726. p. 65.

³ Exod. c. 31 : v. 4. et 6.

Arguments alleged by the pope in favor of image worship, grounded on mere fable.

God,"¹ from the ark, the cherubim upon the ark, the table of shittim-wood, and the pot of manna, which were all figures and images, says the pope, made by God's own command. But what have these images to do with the present question, whether it is lawful to worship the work of men's hands? None of these images were set up to be worshiped, nor did the Jews ever worship them. They are therefore very impertinently brought in to prove the lawfulness of image worship; and yet this is all his holiness could allege from Scripture, to countenance that kind of worship.² He adds, that images

¹ Exod. c. 31: vers. ultim.

² From these words, "Adore ye the footstool of God," (Psal. 99: ver. 5.) some have concluded, that the Jews really worshiped the ark, which they will have to be meant by the footstool. But the Chaldee Paraphrast renders these words thus, "Worship him in his sanctuary," understanding by the footstool the sanctuary, which surely was not to be worshiped; and those who think that the ark was meant by the footstool, interpret the words of the psalmist, "Worship before," or "at his footstool," agreeably to what we read in Psalm 132. "We will worship at his footstool."—(Psal. 132: ver. 7. See Sim. de Muis in loc.) Some of the fathers indeed, namely, Ambrose, Jerom, Austin, Athanasius, and Chrysostom, have thought that we are commanded to worship the footstool itself; but by the footstool they understood the humanity of Christ, and not the ark. "The Scripture," says Austin, "elsewhere (Isa. 16: 1. Matth. 5: v. 35.) calls the earth God's footstool; and does he bid us worship the earth? This throws me into great perplexity. I dare not worship the earth, lest he should damn me, who made the heaven and the earth; and dare not but worship his footstool, because he commands me to worship it. In this perplexity I turn to Christ; and in him I find relief. For his flesh was earth."—(Aug. in Psal. 99.) From this passage it is manifest, that Austin did not think the ark, or any other mere creature whatever, a proper object of worship; nay, elsewhere (Aug. de Verb. Domin. secund. Joan. Serm. 58.) he will not allow even the humanity of Christ to be otherwise worshiped, than as it is, and because it is united to the Divinity.

As for the two statues, or images of the cherubims, on which great stress is laid by some popish writers; we may in the first place give the same answer to those, who urge them in favor of images, that was given by Tertullian to those, who urged the brazen serpent: "If thou observest the same God, thou hast his law, nake no similitude: as to the command of making a likeness, do thou also imitate Moses; make no image against the law, unless God commands thee to make it."—(Tert. de Idoi. c. 5.) II. Those images were concealed from the sight of the people, and kept in the holy of holies, which the high priest entered but once a year, and none of the Jews were so much as allowed to look into; a convincing proof, that they were not set up, as the popish images are, to be worshiped; the worshiping of invisible images, or images that were never to be seen, being a thing never before heard of, and plainly repugnant to the original design or institution of images; which was, that men might have visible objects of worship, and through them worship the invisible beings. Let the church of Rome but keep her images from the sight of the people, and no protestant will quarrel with her about them. III. That the images of the cherubim were not intended for objects of worship, is allowed by many very eminent Roman catholic divines, namely, Vasquez, (Vasq. Disput. 101. c. 6.) Lorinus, (Lorin. in Acts 17. 25.) Azorius, (Azor. Institut. Moral. l. 9. c. 6.) Visorius, &c (Visor. Resp. ad Monci.) And the reason they give is, because they were not set up for their own sake, but only as appendages or ornaments to another thing, the throne of God, to whom alone worship was given: Nay, the angelic doctor Aquinas says, in express terms, that the seraphim (meaning the cherubim) were set up only as symbols of the divine presence, and were by no means to be worshiped.—(Aquin. Art. 1. 2. Quest. 102. Art. 4. ad. 6.) Indeed, there is not in Scripture the least intimation of any kind of worship having ever been paid to them.

put us in mind of the objects which they represent; that they stir us up to compunction, which he says he can attest upon his own experience, since he never entered the church of St. Peter, but at the sight of the image of that apostle his eyes became two fountains of tears; that they instruct the ignorant, and raise their stupid and dull minds from the things of this earth to those of heaven. And are they therefore to be worshiped? Ought we not rather to worship the Bible, that instructs us much better than pictures or images, and raises our minds, more than any pictures or images, from the things of this earth to those of heaven? That some advantages attended images, and the use of images, Leo knew as well as the pope, and would therefore have been glad to have retained them: and it was not till he found, by experience, that images could not be allowed, and idolatry prevented, that he undertook to destroy them.

The pope proceeds, and tells the emperor, that the fame of our Savior's preaching, and the miracles he wrought, being spread all over the world, good men flew to Jerusalem from the most distant parts of the earth, agreeably to that of St. Matthew, "Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles be gathered together;"¹ for Christ, says the pope, is the carcass, and the good men are the eagles, Christus cadaver, aquilæ religiosi sunt homines. Now these good men were all, it seems, painters; for Gregory adds, that, having seen our Lord, they painted him, such as they saw him, that we too might see him; that, in like manner, they painted James the brother of our Lord, and Stephen the protomartyr, and the other martyrs and champions of the faith; and that these images being everywhere shown, men renounced the worship of the devil throughout the world, and worshiped them: so that, according to the pope, the apostles, and first planters of the Christian religion, carried those images about with them; and it was to them that the conversion of the world was owing. It were to be wished he had named those painters, (for St. Luke was not known to have been a painter till some hundred years after,²) and let us know what authority he had for the many things he advances, which no man had ever heard of before. Gregory does not forget the picture sent by our Savior to Abgarus king of Edessa;³ but takes not the least notice of the Veronica, no less famous in our days, than the picture of Edessa was in his: he roundly asserts, that the worship of images was approved, confirmed, and established, by all the general councils held to his time; whereas it is certain, and allowed on all hands, that of images not the least mention was made in any of those councils; nor, indeed,

¹ Matth. c. 24: v. 28.

² See p. 30, note. (2)

³ See p. 29, note (2).

Arguments alleged by the pope in favor of image worship, the very same that were alleged by the pagans to justify their idolatry. In what sense we are forbidden, according to the pope, to worship the work of men's hands. The pope utterly unacquainted with the Scripture.

in any other whatever, except that of Eliberis, which condemned not only the worship, but even the use of images in all places of worship.¹ And was Gregory infallible? He was, says Baronius; for he meant no more, than that none of the general councils had condemned the worship of images: and are not to condemn, and to approve synonymous terms? By means of such explanations and comments, Baronius himself might be proved, notwithstanding all his blunders, as infallible as the pope.

As for the reasons alleged by Gregory to excuse from idolatry the worship, that was given to the images of Christ, of the virgin Mary, and of the other he and she saints, they are the very same that were alleged by the pagans, when charged with idolatry, and derided by the fathers, for the worship, which they gave to the images of Jupiter, and of their other gods, goddesses, and heroes; namely, that images were not looked upon as gods by those who worshiped them, nor worshiped as gods; that they were not worshiped for their own sake, but for the sake of those, whom they represented; that the worship given to the image, passed from the image to the original, &c.² Thus the learned pagans answered the fathers charging them with idolatry in the worship of images; and thus the pope answers the same charge, only adding, that the pagans worshiped not God in their images, but the devil; which I have shown above to be absolutely false.³ The pagans worshiped the true God as well as the pope; but were charged with idolatry by the fathers, because they worshiped images, and other creatures, together with him.

The emperor had said in his letter, that we are forbidden to worship the work of men's hands; and urged that prohibition against the worship of images. In answer to that the pope tells him, that such a prohibition was only made for the sake of the pagans, who dwelt in the land of promise, and worshiped animals of gold, of silver, and brass, and birds, and all other creatures; and said, "These are our gods, and there is no other God;" as if there ever had been such fools in the world; that such images were made in honor of the devil; and that we were therefore forbidden to worship them; but that the work of men's hands, when made for the honor of God, ought to be worshiped. Gregory I. had declared, that the work of men's hands ought by no means to be worshiped;⁴ and Gregory II. declares that the work of men's hands ought to be worshiped. And it is to be observed, that both speak of Christian images, and consequently of the work of men's hands done, as was pretended, for the honor of God: but both were infallible; Gregory I. in forbidding im-

ages to be worshiped, and Gregory II. in commanding them to be worshiped. Gregory I. spoke ex cathedra to Serenus, and Gregory II. spoke ex cathedra to Leo. What a great change was made in the doctrine and practice of the Roman church in the space of little more than a century.

Leo, to justify his casting images out of the churches, and breaking them, had alleged the example of the king, who broke the brazen serpent, and cast it out of the temple; but ascribed, it seems, to king Uziah, what was done by king Hezekiah: for the pope, repeating the words of the emperor's letter, "you have," says he, "written to us thus: Uziah, king of the Jews, cast the brazen serpent out of the temple; and I have cast the idols out of the church. The brazen serpent was broken, as is well known, not by Uziah, but his great grandson Hezekiah, who, on that account, is commended in Scripture, and said "to have done that which was right in the sight of the Lord."¹ But the pope, not perceiving the mistake, nor knowing that to break the brazen serpent "was right in the sight of the Lord," abuses at the same time the king for breaking it, and the emperor for following his example. "Uzziah," says he, "who cast the brazen serpent out of the temple, was your brother, such a man as yourself, proud, insolent, headstrong, one who offered violence, as you do, to the priests of his time;" he adds, that the brazen serpent was brought into the temple, with the ark, by the holy king David, who died, as all know, who ever dipt into the Bible, before the foundation of the temple was laid; and from thence he concludes, that it was wrong in Uziah to remove it out of the temple, and destroy it. But the pope was, as is evident, very little acquainted with the Bible; and as he was so very little acquainted with it, as to think that it was wrong in Hezekiah to cast the brazen serpent out of the temple, and break it, it is not at all to be wondered, that he should have thought it wrong in the emperor to cast images out of the churches, and break them: but, had he thought it worth his while to consult the Bible, and found there, that Hezekiah, in breaking the brazen serpent, "did that which was right in the sight of God," I should be glad to know what answer he would, in that case, have returned to the emperor, who did no more than what Hezekiah had done, and was commended for doing.²

¹ 2 Kings, c. 18. v. 3, 4.

² "The Jews," says here Bellarmine, "answering for the pope, worshiped the brazen serpent as a god; that the good king knew, and therefore destroyed it."—(Bell. de imag. Sanct. 1. 2. c. 17.) But how did the good king know, that the Jews worshiped it as a god? That he could only have concluded from their burning incense to it, the only reason alleged in Scripture for his destroying it. But, if he concluded from thence, that they worshiped it as a god; it will follow, by an undeniable consequence, that to burn incense to an

¹ See p. 39.

² See p. 43. note (2).

³ See p. 35. note (4).

⁴ See p. 44.

Gregory's answer to the proposal of assembling a general council; and to the threats of the emperor. Approves the murder of the imperial officer.

To the proposal made by the emperor of assembling a general council, the most effectual means that had been employed by his predecessors, to put an end to the disputes in the church, Gregory answers, that there was no occasion to assemble a general council; that, if he would but be silent, an end would be thereby put to all disputes, all scandals would be removed, and the world would again enjoy its former tranquillity. "But suppose," says the pope, "I should obey you, suppose bishops should assemble from all parts of the world, where could they find a pious and religious emperor to take his place among them, according to custom, in order to reward those, who speak well, and check such, as speak amiss? As for you, you are more like a barbarian than a Christian emperor; and actually engaged in a turbulent, wicked, and insolent undertaking: pursue it no further; trouble the world no longer; and the assembling of a council will be needless. But you threaten," continues the pope, "and think to frighten us, saying, I will cause even the image of St. Peter in Rome to be broken in pieces, and the pontiff Gregory to be seized, and carried in chains to Constantinople, as it happened to pope Martin in the time of the emperor Constans: but your threats make no impression upon us; the pontiff Gregory needs only retire twenty-four furlongs from Rome to be out of your reach, and bid you defiance. It is true the holy pontiff Martin was seized, was carried in chains, by tyrannical violence, to Constantinople, and, after unheard of sufferings, sent from thence into exile: but Constans, by whom he was thus inhumanly treated, was murdered in the church,¹ and died in his sin; whereas Martin is honored all over the north as a saint; and people flock from all parts to his tomb, where miraculous cures are daily performed

image, which is daily done in all the popish churches, was, in the opinion at least of that good king, to worship it as a god. Vasquez, not able to persuade himself, that the Jews were such fools and idiots, as to believe, that the brazen serpent was a god, delivers it as his opinion, that they gave no other worship to that image, than what is given, in his church, to the images of Christ, and the saints; but thinks, that the worship, which is lawful to Christians, was unlawful to the Jews.—(Vasq. in 3. Disput. 104. Art. 3. c. 5.) But who made the worship lawful to the Christians, that was unlawful to the Jews? Was it not the second commandment, that made it unlawful for a Jew to bow down to an image, and worship it? And does not that commandment bind alike the Christian, and the Jew? or who repealed it? Our Savior came not to destroy, but to fulfil the law; and who else could destroy it? Might we not as well pretend the laws, forbidding theft, murder, or adultery, to be binding only with respect to the Jews? The truth is; Hezekiah, finding that the people burned incense to that image, broke the brazen bauble, Nehushtan, (2 Kings, c. 18: ver. 4.) as he called it, in pieces, without inquiring whether they burned incense to it as a god, or only as an image or representation of God, the one and the other being, as he well knew, contrary to the law.

¹ The pope was not, it seems, better acquainted with history, than he was with the Scripture. Constans was not murdered in the church, but in the bath at Daphne, as has been related above; (See vol. I. p. 466.) and is attested by all the authors, who speak of his death.

in their favor: I should think myself happy, could I tread in his footsteps; but yet think it advisable to consult my own safety at so critical a juncture, since the eyes of the whole west are upon me; and all trust in me, and in him, whose image you threaten to have broken in pieces; nay, all the kingdoms in the west look upon him as a terrestrial God: let me therefore advise you not to meddle with his image. The people in the west are all ready to revenge, and would upon such a provocation, the cruel and undeserved treatment which their friends have met with from you in the east. And now that I have warned you, I shall be innocent of the blood that will certainly be shed, if you offer to insult, as you threaten to do, the prince of the apostles in his image." In the close of his letter he tells the emperor, that he has been invited to administer baptism to a great lord in the most distant parts of the west (perhaps a German lord converted by Boniface, who was preaching, at this time, the Gospel in Germany;) that he is preparing for the journey; but that it gave him the greatest concern to reflect, that, while the barbarians turned Christians, a Christian emperor should turn barbarian. He ends with praying God to convert him from his wicked ways; that, being sensible of his error, he may renounce it; and, adhering to truth, repair the scandal he has given to the world.¹ Thus did "the servant of servants, the successor of St. Peter," who taught subjection to kings, and to magistrates,² the vicar of the meek and humble Jesus, write to his lord and his master. A letter worthy indeed, as it was thought by Baronius, and Pagi, of the high pontiff:³ I defy all history to produce such another from a subject to his sovereign. As to the epithets of dull, ignorant, stupid, &c. which the pope so freely bestows, throughout his letter, on the emperor, I leave it to the judgment of the reader, which of the two those epithets fitted best, Gregory or Leo? Which of the two most wanted to be sent to school, the emperor to learn his catechism among the children, or the pope to read among the children the Bible?

I cannot help observing, before I dismiss this remarkable letter, that the pope there approves of the murder of the imperial officer;⁴ and commends the zeal of the women, by whom he was so inhumanly murdered, blasphemously comparing them to the women in the Gospel, who brought spices and ointments to anoint the body of our Lord in the sepulchre,⁵ "succensæ zelo, et illarum æmulæ, quæ unguenta ferebant."⁶ Why he compared those furies to these holy women, I know not, nor can I so much as conjec-

¹ Apud Bar. ad Ann. 726. p. 65—77.

² 1 Pet. c. 2: v. 13, 14.

³ Bar. ubi supra. Pagi Breviar. Rom. Pont. p. 523.

⁴ See p. 55.

⁵ Luke c. 23: v. 56. et c. 21: v. 1.

⁶ Apud Bar. ad Ann. 726. p. 71.

Gregory condemns all images of God the Father, and the Trinity. The emperor writes again to the pope. His answer. The emperor writes another letter to the pope.

ture; but from his comparing them it is manifest, that he thought the one action as meritorious as the other; the murdering the officer as meritorious as the anointing the body of our Lord in the sepulchre.

Another thing worthy of notice in that letter is, that the pope, at the same time that he pleads so earnestly for the images of Christ and the saints, disapproves and condemns all images of God the Father, and the Trinity. "We make no images," says he, "of God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, because it is impossible to paint or describe him: but if we had seen or known him, as we have seen and known his Son, we should have painted and represented him as well as his Son." The patriarch Germanus,¹ Damascene,² and Stephen the younger,³ the three most renowned champions, after the pope, in the cause of images, in like manner disapprove all representations of God the Father, and for the same reason, because he is "invisible, incorporeal, without quantity, magnitude, or form."⁴ We should err indeed," says Damascene, "should we attempt to make an image of God, who cannot be seen."⁵ This error the church of Rome has added to her other errors; and now images representing the "incorruptible God like unto a corruptible man" are not only allowed, but often seen exposed at the same time to public worship in the churches, and to public scorn on the sign-posts. When such images were first allowed we know not; but Christianus Lupus assures us, that, in the time of pope Nicholas I. raised to the chair in 858, they were not yet used in the Roman church.⁶ The only argument they allege for the lawfulness of such images is the general practice of the church, which, they say, would never suffer them to be publicly set up, as she does, if they were unlawful:⁷ but the church did not suffer them to be set up in the primitive times, nor till many ages after; and should we not from thence rather conclude them unlawful, than conclude them lawful from her suffering them to be set up in later times? If the church does not err now in allowing such images, she erred for the space of nine hundred years, at least, in not allowing them.

One would think, that Leo, upon the receipt of so abusive a letter, and so injurious to the imperial dignity, would, at least, have broken off all correspondence with Gregory, as a declared rebel and enemy. But, instead of that, the good emperor, overlooking, with a greatness of mind scarcely to be matched, the insolent and affronting behavior of the

pope, no sooner received the above-mentioned letter, than he wrote to him again: but as his letter was an answer to the pope's, care has been taken that we should only know from the pope's reply what he wrote. Gregory begins thus: "We have received your letter by Ruffinus your ambassador, and life itself is become burdensome to us; finding that, instead of abandoning, you pursue more obstinately than ever, your wicked resolution. Are they, whom you have chosen for your guides, wiser than Gregory the wonder-worker, than Gregory of Nyssa, than Gregory the divine, than Basil, and Chrysostom, than thousands of other holy and learned fathers, whom we think it needless to name." He does not produce a single passage or text out of these thousands of holy and learned fathers; but would have the emperor to take it upon his word, that they all worshiped images; whereas it is certain, that some of the very fathers he names, so far from worshipping images, though they lived after the third century, condemned even the use of them in all places of worship.¹ "You say," continues Gregory, "that you are both emperor and priest: your predecessors indeed Constantine the Great, Theodosius, Valentinian, and Constantine the father of Justinian, who built churches, enriched and embellished them, were deservedly styled both priests and emperors: but as for you, who have stript the holy places of their ornaments, who have sacrilegiously disfigured them, and left them quite naked, what right can you have, what claim or pretension, to the title of priest?" He then repeats what he had said in his former letter concerning the many advantages accruing from images; and adds, that men, women, and children, were edified by them; more especially children, while their mothers and nurses, holding them in their arms, pointed out to them, in the pictures, the sufferings of our Saviour, and the combats of the martyrs. A childish argument for the use, and quite impertinent as to the worship of images! As the children were thus pleased and edified with pictures and images, we need not wonder, that the women, who had never before interfered in religious disputes, should have so zealously taken part in this, and distinguished themselves, in the manner we have seen.

The pope had roundly asserted, in his answer to the emperor's letter, that the use and worship of images had been approved and confirmed by the six general councils: that the emperor knew to be false, being, it seems, better acquainted than the pope with the councils, as well as the Scriptures. In his reply, therefore, he told him, that he was not a little surprised at his so confidently asserting, that the six general councils had

¹ German. Ep. ad Joan. Synod. Act. 4. Concil. Nic.

² Damasc. Orat. 1, 2, et 3. de Imag.

³ Act. Steph. jun. apud Damasc.

⁴ Damasc. Orat. 1. ⁵ Idem. Orat. 2.

⁶ Lup. Not. in Constantin. c. 5.

⁷ Bellar. de Imag. l. 2. c. 8. Vasquez ad 3. Aquin. Disput. 103. c. 3. Arriag. ad 3. Aquin. Disp. 5. Tanner. t. 3. Disput. 5. Quæst. 2. Dub. 3. &c.

¹ See p. 40, &c.

That images were not mentioned by any of the general councils, is owned by the pope. He will not allow princes to concern themselves with the affairs of the church. His Christian prayer. The pope assembles a council at Rome. The reasons he alleged from Scripture, in favor of images.

all approved and confirmed the use and the worship of images, since it was very certain, and might be easily demonstrated, that images were not so much as once mentioned in any of those councils: he added, that he should be glad to know, why none of the councils had ever once mentioned them, if they were, as his holiness pretended, so useful and necessary? To that very pertinent question, the pope returned as impertinent an answer. "You ask," says he, "how it happened, that nothing was said of images in any of the six general councils: and how happened it that nothing was said of eating and drinking in any of those councils? Eating and drinking were necessary from the beginning; and so were images: for the bishops carried them with them to the councils; and no man of any religion or piety ever travelled without them." Here, in the first place, the pope tacitly owns, as is manifest, that no mention was made of images in any of the six general councils; though in his former letter, he had positively affirmed, that the use and worship of images had been approved and confirmed by them all. Had any thing at all been said of them, had they been but once mentioned in any of those councils, the pope would, as we may well imagine, for his own justification, have produced the canon or passage, in which they were mentioned, instead of alleging so silly a reason for their not being mentioned. The advocates for images pretended, from the beginning, to have all the councils, and the fathers, on their side; and, out of the fathers indeed, they quoted several passages, which I shall have occasion to examine hereafter; but, out of the councils, they could never quote one, besides the eighty-second canon of the quinisext council; and by that canon, though issued so late as the year 692, it was only enacted, that our Savior might (or should) be thenceforth, not worshiped, but painted in the figure of a man.¹ II. The pope supposes images to be, and to have ever been from the beginning, as necessary for the support and life of the soul, as meat and drink are for the support and life of the body: a doctrine repugnant to the present doctrine of the church of Rome, and of all her divines to a man. III. He ought to have alleged some authority for the bishops of the first council of Nice, for instance, carrying images with them to that council; for he could not but know, that the emperor would not take it upon his word, no more than he had taken upon his word the boasted approbation of the six general councils.

The emperor had said in his letter, that it was incumbent upon him to reform the abuses, that prevailed in the church, as well

as those that prevailed in the state, since the church was committed to his care, as well as the state. In answer to that, the pope tells him, that it is his duty to leave the church, and follow her, such as he found her; that the bishops "have the mind of Christ,"¹ and not the emperor; that the dull and stupid understanding of a soldier is not capable of judging of dogmas, or doctrines; that the emperors ought no more to concern themselves with the affairs of the church, than the bishops concerned themselves with those of the state; and that as the bishops did not take upon them to dispose of civil employments, so neither should the emperors take upon them to dispose of ecclesiastical dignities, nor at all to interfere in the elections of the clergy. He reproaches the emperor with persecuting him unjustly, and tyrannically abusing the military force, and the power, which heaven had been pleased to put into his hands; and adds, that, as for himself, he is naked and unarmed, has no earthly armies to oppose him; but prays Christ, who is above all the armies of the heavenly powers, to set the devil upon him, "invocamus Christum, ut immittat tibi dæmonem."² A very Christian prayer, and worthy of the high pontiff. He closes this, as he had done his former letter, with acquainting the emperor, that he is upon the point of setting out for the most distant parts of the west, to baptize there some converts of great distinction; and praying God to open his eyes, that he may see, and embrace again, the truth which he so shamefully abandoned.³

Gregory, not satisfied with writing thus to the emperor, or, to use the expression of F. Pagi, with such "friendly exhortations and admonitions,"⁴ assembled a council at Rome, consisting of all the neighboring bishops; not to examine, whether it was lawful to worship images, or not? but to declare, and define, that it was. Of this council we have some account in pope Adrian's first letter to Charlemagne; and there Gregory is said to have presided at it in person, and to have opened it with a speech proving from the fathers, and the Scriptures, that images ought not only to be retained, but adored. What testimonies he alleged from the fathers, Adrian has not thought fit to inform us; but tells us that, from the Scriptures, he reasoned thus. "God commanded Moses to make two cherubims, *thou shalt make two cherubims of gold.*⁵ Solomon made within the oracle two cherubims of olive trees,⁶ and he overlaid the cherubims with gold; and he carved all the walls of the house round about with carved figures of cherubims, and palm trees,⁶ &c. You see, my beloved brethren,

¹ 1 Corinth. c. 2: v. ult. ² Bar. ad Ann. 726. p. 74. 77

³ Pagi Breviar. Pont. Rom. p. 530.

⁴ Exod. c. 25: v. 18.

⁵ 1 Kings, c. 6. v. 23.

⁶ 1 Kings c. 6: v. 29.

Gregory's unlogical method of arguing. The worship of images approved and decreed. Gregory said by most writers to have excommunicated the emperor.

what Moses did, what Solomon did, the wisest of kings, by God's own appointment, and express command. And how much more ought we to worship and adore Christ our Lord, his holy mother the virgin Mary, the apostles, and all the saints, by their sacred effigies and images? It is for the sake of the Word, who took flesh for us, and for his sake alone, that we make and worship images. If the works of men's hands are all to be rejected, the ark of the covenant, and the cherubims, ought not to have been admitted: but, if they were admitted, why should not other images be so too, since they are all alike made for the honor of God? By our images many miracles have been wrought, as well as by the ark: they are, it is true, inanimate things, and the works of men's hands; and so were the cherubims, and the ark; but yet God operated, and was glorified by them.¹

Thus Gregory, and his argument, if put in due form, will run thus: God commanded Moses, and Solomon, to make two cherubims, or the images of two cherubims; ergo Christians ought not only to make, but to worship and adore, the images of Christ, and the saints. Such an argument, if I may so call it, deserves no answer; and I shall therefore only observe, that the instance of the two cherubims, far from authorizing the worship, does not so much as authorize the use or the making of images; nay, from the very passages alleged by the pope out of Scripture, we ought rather to conclude it unlawful to make any images, than lawful to worship them; and argue thus; we are forbidden, by the second commandment, to make any graven images, or the likeness of any thing in heaven, or in the earth; ergo, we ought to make no such likenesses, unless we are, as Moses and as Solomon, were, expressly commanded to make them. Thus Tertullian argued, and he was a better logician than the pope, in answer to those, who alleged the instance of the brazen serpent against the general prohibition, "thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image."² Had any of the bishops, who were present at this council, urged that prohibition, and required the pope to show such a command given to the church, with respect to the images of Christ, and the saints, as was given to Moses and Solomon concerning the cherubims, his holiness would, I believe, have been greatly at a loss how to satisfy him, and justify, notwithstanding so express a prohibition, I will not say the worshipping, but the very making of images: but no such impertinent bishop assisted at this council: they all acquiesced in the reasoning of the pope, however unlogical; and, concluding with him, that, if images were commanded to be made under

the law, they ought not only to be made, but to be worshiped, under the Gospel, issued with one consent a decree, commanding them to be worshiped accordingly; and condemning as heretics, all who did not worship them, or taught that they were not to be worshiped. What could be expected after such absurd reasoning, but as absurd a decree?

The Greek historians Theophanes, Cedrenus, Zonaras, Nicephorus, &c. write, that in this council the pope not only condemned the doctrine of the Iconoclasts, but thundered the sentence of excommunication against the emperor, as the author of that heresy, and ordered that thenceforth no tribute should be paid to him. They add, that a general revolt thereupon ensued, and the loss of all the provinces subject to the empire in the west. Thus the Greek historians; and the modern Latin writers have almost all copied them, the friends as well as the enemies of Rome, but with very different views; the friends, to prove from thence the temporal as well as the spiritual power, which they vest in the pope, over the greatest of princes; and the enemies, to take occasion, from the monstrous behavior of the pope to his lord and sovereign, to inveigh against him as a traitor and rebel, as an incendiary, as the chief author of the ruin and downfall of the empire in the west. "Gregory," says Baronius, "restrained the people from revolting, so long as he entertained any hopes of the emperor's revoking his impious edict. But finding, that, in spite of all his endeavors, he continued obstinate, and grew hardened in his wickedness, he thought it was high time to lay the axe to the root of the unhappy tree; and he gave accordingly, in virtue of his apostolic authority, the signal for cutting it down. The signal" (that is, the sentence of excommunication) "roused all the faithful in the west; and they renounced their allegiance to Leo, and adhered to the pope. Thus did Gregory leave a worthy example to posterity, that heretical princes should not be suffered to reign in the church of Christ, if, being often admonished, they nevertheless obstinately persist in their error."¹ The same thing, namely, that Gregory excommunicated Leo, that he forbade the people of Italy to pay him any tribute, is affirmed by Bellarmine,² by Sigonius,³ by Leo Allatius,⁴ De Fresne,⁵ Spanheim,⁶ Mezerai,⁷ &c. "Gregory," says Bellarmine, "having excommunicated Leo, ordered that no tribute should be thenceforth paid to him by his subjects in

¹ Bar. ad Ann. 730. p. 99.

² Bellar. ad Rom. Pont. l. 5. c. 8.

³ Sigon. de Regn. Ital. l. 3.

⁴ Leo Allat. de perpet. Orient. Consens. l. 3. c. 11.

⁵ De Fresne in Famil. Orient. Isaur. Hist. Byzantin. Part. 1. p. 124.

⁶ Spelman. Hist. Inag. Restitut. p. 53. et seq.

⁷ Mez. l. 8. p. 326.

¹ Concil. Nic. Act. 2

² See p. 33.

Gregory did not excommunicate the emperor; but contented himself with only exhorting him to change his opinion. He stirs up the people against the emperor, and forbids any tribute to be paid to him; but therein guilty of high treason.

Italy; and thus deprived him of that part of the empire; nay, and if some authors are to be credited, of the whole empire.²¹ From thence he concludes, that the pope is vested with a temporal as well as a spiritual power over all kingdoms and empires; and consequently that he may in many cases, more especially in cases of heresy, pull down both kings and emperors from their thrones, and set others up in their room; obliging the people, by his apostolic authority, to swear allegiance to those, whom he has been pleased to set up, and renounce their allegiance to those, whom he has been pleased to pull down.²

But in the first place; as to Gregory's excommunicating the emperor, I cannot help questioning the fact. It is indeed attested, as Baronius and Bellarmine have observed, by Theophanes, Cedrenus, Zonaras, Nicephorus, and the Greek historians in general. But, on the other hand, the Latin historians are all silent about it, even those, who have given us the minutest accounts of the present dispute between the pope and the emperor. Now to me it appears far more probable, that the Greek historians (or rather that Theophanes, for of him all the rest borrowed what they relate,) who lived at a great distance from Rome, should have been misinformed, than that the Latin historians, who lived in Italy, nay, and in Rome, should have been either utterly unacquainted with so remarkable a transaction, or, being acquainted with it, should have all passed it over in silence. In the life of Gregory, the bibliothecarian has taken care to let us know, that the holy pontiff, exerting his authority, declared the patriarch Anastasius excommunicated, divested of the priesthood, and degraded, if, renouncing his heresy, he did not return to the catholic faith.³ And is it at all probable, that if the pontiff had exerted his authority in excommunicating the emperor, as well as the patriarch, the bibliothecarian would not have acquainted us with it? Could he have known, that the pope excommunicated the patriarch, and not have known that he excommunicated the emperor? Or did he think the excommunicating of the emperor an event less worthy of notice, or less worthy of a place in the history of the pope, by whom he was excommunicated, than the excommunicating of the patriarch? The same historian, after acquainting us with the sentence pronounced by the pope against the patriarch, continues thus: "He gave at the same time wholesome advice to the emperor, exhorting him by letters to renounce so execrable a doctrine."⁴ And would he have written thus, had he known that the pope had excommunicated the em-

peror as well as the patriarch, or rather had he not known, that the pope did not excommunicate the emperor, but contented himself with only exhorting him to change his opinion, and his conduct? And it is to be observed, that the bibliothecarian wrote in Rome; that he copied what he wrote, as he himself witnesses, from the authentic records lodged in the archives of the Roman church, and committed to his care; and consequently that he must have been better informed of all that passed in this famous dispute, than Theophanes, who wrote at Constantinople, and had no such helps. Paulus Diaconus, who flourished scarce fifty years after the pontificate of Gregory, and relates the most material incidents of those unhappy times, takes no more notice of the pretended excommunication than the bibliothecarian; nor indeed does any other Latin writer whatever. And did they all agree, though they wrote at different times, and in different places, to pass it over in silence? Or was it unknown to them? If it was, it is the first, and I believe the only instance of a fact known where it did not happen, and utterly unknown where it did.

As to Gregory's forbidding the people of Italy to pay thenceforth any tribute to the emperor, or obey him, and depriving him, by that means, of part of his dominions; it is certain, as appears from what already has been said, that he stirred up the people of Italy to rebel, and encouraged them in their rebellion. But are we to conclude from thence, with Baronius and Bellarmine, that he had a right, or was empowered by his apostolic authority so to do; and that the popes, in general, are empowered by the same authority, in similar cases, that is, in cases of heresy, or what they think heresy, to arm subjects against their sovereigns, to forbid them to "render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's,"⁵ or "tribute to whom tribute is due;" and deprive, by that means, lawful princes of their just rights and dominions? And why should we not, upon finding a pope guilty of murder or adultery, (and we shall find some guilty of both,) as well conclude, that he had, and all popes have, a right to commit those crimes? Are not treason and rebellion as expressly forbidden, and to all, the pope not excepted, as murder and adultery? "Every soul," says the famous Bernard in a letter to pope Eugene, "is commanded to be subject to the higher powers, as to God's ministers; if every soul, yours too; and if any man (a Baronius, or a Bellarmine,) attempts to except you, he attempts to deceive you."⁶ But of the temporal power usurped by the popes over crowned heads, I shall have occasion to discourse at length, in the ever memorable

¹ Bellar. ubi supra.
² Anasl. in Greg. II.

³ Idem ibid.
⁴ Idem ibid.

⁵ Matth. 22: v. 21.

⁶ Bernard. Ep. 42.

The popes did not at this time commence princes. The emperor confiscates the patrimonies of the Roman church, and subjects east Illyricum to the see of Constantinople.

pontificate of pope Hildebrand, or Gregory VIIIth; and shall therefore only observe here, that in history more instances occur, and much earlier instances, one as early as the fourth century,¹ of popes deposed by the emperors, than of emperors deposed by the popes; and consequently, that if instances are arguments of right, as Baronius and Bellarmine pretend, arguing from the supposed deposition of Leo by Gregory, a power in the popes of deposing the emperors, the emperors had, even according to them, and their method of arguing, a much better claim to the power of deposing popes, than the popes ever had to the power of deposing emperors. But the truth is; the exercising of a power argues in no person whatever, and least of all in a pope, a right to that power; ambitious men being but too apt, as daily experience teaches us, to exceed the bounds of their lawful power and authority. I said least of all in a pope, the popes having, from the beginning, made it their study to extend by all means, even by the basest, their jurisdiction and power; in-somuch that the history of the popes may be justly styled a history of papal usurpation, and encroachments on the liberties and rights of mankind.

Some Roman catholic writers, and great friends to the pope, tell us, that the Romans, revolting from Leo, upon his being excommunicated by Gregory, (for that he was excommunicated by him, they take for granted,) proclaimed the pope in his room, and would thenceforth acknowledge no other sovereign. "Then at last," says the Jesuit Gianettasius, in his late History of Naples, "the Romans shook off the yoke of the eastern empire, saluted Gregory their lord, and took an oath of allegiance to him. Gregory accepted the sovereignty, which they of their own accord offered him. And thus was he happily raised, not by arms, armies, or intrigues, but by the free choice and affection of the people, to the station and rank of a prince."² That is, in other words, the Romans rebelled against their lawful sovereign; offered the sovereignty to their bishop and fellow subject the pope; he (ill imitating our Savior who fled from the multitude when they would have made him a king)³ accepted the offer; and thus was the priest, not by armies, or by arms, but by the rebellion of his fellow subjects and his own, happily raised to the state and rank of a prince. If that was not a barefaced usurpation, if the pope was not, according to that account, an usurper, I should be glad to know the meaning of these terms. But that the popes did not commence princes in the time of Gregory; that his two immediate successors acknowledged Leo, and his son Constantine,

for their lawful sovereigns, and lords of Rome; that the temporal dominion of the Roman see had its rise not in Rome, nor in the dukedom of that city, but in the exarchate, and the Pentapolis, now Marca d'Ancona, will undeniably appear in the sequel of this history: and it is quite surprising, that Gianettasius should have been thus grossly mistaken with respect to facts, which none can be unacquainted with, who have but dipt into the writings of those times.

The emperor was soon informed of what had passed at Rome; and being highly provoked at the arrogance and presumption of the pope, in writing to him in the manner we have seen, but still more at his establishing in a council the superstition, which he was taking so much pains to abolish, he seized on the rich patrimonies of the Roman church in Sicily and Calabria; and at the same time, to prevent the popes from introducing the same superstition into the provinces of East Illyricum, which were then subject to the see of Rome, and had been subject to it ever since the time of Damasus, he dismembered them from the Roman patriarchate, and subjected them, with Sicily and Calabria, to the patriarch of Constantinople. This was wounding the pope in the most tender and sensible part; and the successors of Gregory left nothing unattempted to prevail on the succeeding emperors to restore what they said Leo had unjustly taken from them. Pope Nicholas I. even pretended, in a letter which he wrote on that subject to the emperor Michael, that the archbishops of Syracuse had been all ordained by his predecessors, ever since the times of the apostles. Indeed the island of Sicily, and consequently the city of Syracuse, had been immediately subject, as well as Calabria, to the see of Rome, not since the times of the apostles, but ever since the establishing of the ecclesiastical hierarchy in the reign of Constantine the Great.¹ But as to East Illyricum, it appearing, on occasion of the claim which the popes laid to those provinces, in order to recover them, that they did not originally belong to their see; that the jurisdiction which they had so long exercised over them, was usurped by pope Damasus; and that the bishops of Constantinople had frequently protested against it; none of the emperors, to whom the popes applied, could ever be persuaded to hearken to their demands with respect to Illyricum, though some of them showed themselves inclined to re-annex (which they never did) Sicily and Calabria to the Roman patriarchate.²

Thus was the power of the popes greatly curtailed, and the revenues of their church

¹ See vol. I. p. 50.

² Epist. Adriani Papæ ad Carol. Mag. et Nicol. I. ad Michael. Imp. Vid. Allat. l. 2. de perpet. Cons. Eccles. Occident. et Orient. c. 1.

¹ See vol. I. p. 61. ² Gianet. Hist. Neap. l. 5. p. 94.

³ John, c. 6: v. 15.

The unpardonable partiality of the historians of those times. Gregory dies;—[Year of Christ, 732.] Gregory III. chosen. Declares for the worship of images, and sends a legation to Constantinople.

considerably lessened. Indeed the emperor, whose authority was now quite precarious in Italy, had no other means of wreaking his just vengeance on one, who, presuming on the zeal which his fellow rebels showed for his safety, had in a most arrogant and insulting manner, bid him open defiance, and told him, that he needed only retire but a few miles from Rome to be out of his reach, and laugh at his menaces.

And here I cannot help observing the unpardonable partiality of Theophanes, and the other historians of those times, whose works have been suffered to reach ours, in charging the emperor, as they do, with tyranny, in thus depriving the pope of a jurisdiction, which his predecessors had so long enjoyed, and withholding the revenues that were due to St. Peter, when the pope had, according to them, deprived the emperor of a great part of his dominions, and withheld his subjects from paying him any tribute. Had the pope a better right to the provinces of Illyricum, than the emperor had to the provinces of Italy? or St. Peter a better right to the revenues of the confiscated patrimonies, than Leo had (and would have had, according to the doctrine of the Gospel, had he even been a pagan, or an atheist) to the tribute, that was paid to him by his subjects? An impartial historian would rather have commended Leo for his Christian moderation and temper, in forbearing so long to resent the insolent behavior of the pope, than charged him with tyranny for resenting it at last in the manner he did.

In the beginning of the following year died Gregory; and his death happened, according to Anastasius, on the 20th of February, 732, after he had governed the Roman church from the 19th of May, 705, when he was ordained, to that time; that is, fifteen years, eight months, and twenty-three days.¹ I need say nothing of his character, it being sufficiently manifest from what has already been said, that he was, of all the popes, who had yet sat in the chair, the most assuming and arrogant. Other popes had quarrelled with the emperors as well as he: but he was the first, to use the expression of Baronius, "who left the worthy example to posterity, that heretical princes should not be suffered to reign;"² in other words, that subjects may lawfully rebel against their princes, as Gregory rebelled against Leo, if they presume to countenance doctrines, which the pope has thought fit to condemn as heretical. So worthy an example has procured him a place in the calendar; and he is now honored as a saint for having maintained (not by reasons and arguments, but by rebellion and treason) the worship of images, against the wicked and Iconoclast emperor Leo.³ Gregory is said to have repaired, embellished, and endowed several churches and monasteries, and among the rest, the famous monastery of Monte Casino, which had been plundered and laid in ashes by Zoto, first duke of Benevento, one hundred and thirty years before, and had, ever since that time, been abandoned by the monks.³

GREGORY III., EIGHTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO ISAUERICUS, CONSTANTINE.—LUITPRAND, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 732.] Gregory II. was succeeded by Gregory III. of that name, presbyter of the Roman church, a native of Syria, and the son of one John. He was chosen by the whole Roman people, says Anastasius, who, being moved by a sudden inspiration of the Holy Ghost, took him by force, while he was assisting at the obsequies of his deceased predecessor, and placed him in the chair.¹ However, he was not ordained till the 18th of March, when the decree of his election, confirmed by the exarch, was brought back from Ravenna to Rome.² And he was the last, whose election the exarchs confirmed. He had no sooner taken possession of the see, than, treading in the footsteps of his predecessor, and loudly declaring for the worship of images, he wrote to the emperors Leo, and his son Con-

stantine (for Leo had taken Constantine for his partner in the empire ever since the year

¹ Anast. in Greg. II. ² Martyr. Roman. 13 Feb.

Anastasius confirms the sanctity of Gregory with the following account. Eudo, duke of Aquitain, finding that the Saracens, at this time masters of the far greater part of Spain, were preparing to break into his territories, sent to Rome to crave the pope's blessing, before he engaged in so perilous a war. The pope, not satisfied with sending him his blessing, sent him along with it three sponges, that served to wipe his holiness' table, sponges being, it seems, still used, as they were in Martial's (Mar. l. 14. Epigr. 149.) time, for that purpose. These sponges Eudo caused to be divided among, and eaten by his soldiers; who, finding themselves thereby delivered at once from all apprehensions of danger, and sure of victory, fell on the enemy, threw them, at the first onset, into the utmost confusion, and killed three hundred and seventy-five thousand of them on the spot, with the loss of one thousand five hundred men only on their side; and among these there was not a man, nor indeed among the wounded, who had the least share of the sponges.—(Anast. in Greg. II.) Of this victory, and the sponges, to which it was said to be owing, mention is likewise made by Frodoard.—(Frod. de Pont.

³ Anast. in Greg. II.

¹ Anast. in Greg. III.

² Idem ibid.

The cowardly behavior of the legate. He is arrested in fact come to Rome, to consult the pope in his name. &c. to be null; which is now rank heresy.

720.) exhorting them, says Anastasius, with all the vigor and energy of the apostolic see, to renounce the error, which they had unadvisedly espoused, and return, like dutiful children, to the bosom of their mother the catholic church. With this letter was dispatched to Constantinople, Gregory, presbyter of the Roman church, named to that legation by the pope, as a man on whose knowledge, firmness, and zeal, he could entirely depend. But the presbyter had no vocation to be either a martyr, or a confessor; and therefore finding, on his arrival in the imperial city, that both emperors were unalterably determined to extirpate the new superstition (for so was called at Constantinople what was styled at Rome the ancient and primitive doctrine of the catholic church;) and spared none, who, in opposition to their edicts, presumed to defend it; he thought it advisable, as matters then stood, to check his zeal, and reserve it till an opportunity offered of exerting it with better success than he could promise himself from it at present. He left Constantinople accordingly, and, with the pope's letter, returned in great haste to Rome, without so much as acquainting the emperors, or any of their ministers, with his arrival. His return to Rome was quite unexpected; and the pope, provoked beyond measure at so cowardly a behavior in a legate of the apostolic see, who ought to have joyfully laid down his life in so good a cause, immediately summoned a council to deliberate, with his clergy, and the neighboring bishops, what punishment he should inflict on one, who had thus betrayed the cause of God, and his church; and, what was worse, disgraced, by a criminal pusillanimity, the character of a legate from the see of St. Peter. The pope was for deposing the unhappy presbyter; but the other members of the council, as well as the nobility, all interposing in his favor, and he himself acknowledging his crime, and offering to atone for it in what manner soever his holiness and the council should judge proper, the anger of the pope was somewhat assuaged; and by all it was agreed, that he should return with the same letter to Constantinople, and deliver it into the emperor's own hands. With this resolution Gregory cheerfully complied; and he set out a second time for the imperial city, which however he never reached: for, landing in Sicily, he was stopt there by the officers of the emperor, the letter was taken from him, and he, by an order from the

Rom. in Greg. II.) But to waive the objections, that might be reasonably made to the probability of the fact itself; history tells us of several no less remarkable victories gained, under the greatest disadvantages, and without the help of any relics, by men, who were persuaded they should conquer before they engaged. And to that persuasion the present victory ought to be ascribed, rather than to any extraordinary virtue in the sponges, or the blessing of Gregory.

Sicily, and sent into exile. Deputies sent from Boniface declare baptism administered by pagans,

imperial court, sent into exile.¹ Such was the issue of the first legation of the new pope.

In the mean time arrived at Rome deputies sent by Boniface, the apostle of Germany, to promise, in his name, all subjection and obedience to the new pope, to acquaint him with the extraordinary success of his mission, and have several doubts or difficulties solved by him, Boniface choosing to be guided by his judgment, rather than his own. Gregory received the deputies with the greatest marks of respect and esteem; and sent by them, on their return to Germany, a pall for Boniface, to be used by him only in performing divine service, or in consecrating a new bishop. By the same legates he wrote to Boniface, answered his doubts, and gave him some particular instructions concerning the erecting of new bishoprics. The direction of the letter was, "to the most reverend, and most holy brother, and fellow-bishop Boniface, sent by this apostolic see, to give light to the nations of Germany, and the nations round about, that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death." One of Boniface's doubts was, whether they, who had been baptized by pagans, or by priests, who had sacrificed to Jupiter, or eaten meats offered to idols, should be rebaptized, or not? And the pope answered, that they should; which is now rank heresy in the church of Rome, baptism being valid, according to the present doctrine of that church, by whomsoever administered; and consequently not to be reiterated, provided the intention be not wanting,² without a sacrilege. What Baronius says here, to excuse the pope, is scarce worthy of notice; namely, that he only declared baptism to be null, when administered by a pagan, or a priest, who had sacrificed to Jupiter, if they did not administer it in the name of the Trinity;³ as if the apostle of Germany had been so ignorant as not to have known, without consulting the pope, that baptism was null, by whomsoever administered, if it was not administered in the name of the Trinity: that he certainly knew; and therefore could only have doubted, whether baptism, administered in due form by an apostate priest, or a pagan, was valid, or not; and that doubt the pope resolved in the manner we have seen. In the same letter Gregory forbids the eating of horse-flesh, and requires Boniface to impose severe penances on all, who eat it, because it is unclean; not remembering the saying of our Savior, "not that, which goeth into the mouth, defileth the soul;"⁴ nor the doctrine of St. Paul, agreeing therewith, that, under the Gospel, "there is nothing unclean of itself."⁵ In the remaining part of the letter,

¹ Anast. in Greg. III.

² See vol. I. p. 45. note (*).

³ Bar. ad Ann. 731. p. 104.

⁴ Matth. c. 15: v. 11.

⁵ Ad Rom. c. 14: v. 14.

The worship of images established in a council held at Rome. A second legation sent to Constantinople, but without success. The pope fills the churches of Rome with pictures and images. Third legation sent to the emperor, but attended with no better success :—[Year of Christ, 733.]

the pope forbids marriages among relations to the seventh generation; excludes parricides from the eucharist, except at the point of death, enjoining them to abstain, so long as they live, from flesh, and from wine, and to fast three days in the week; imposes the same penance on such as sold their slaves to be immolated by the pagans, the barbarous custom of immolating slaves still obtaining among the pagans in Germany; and requires Boniface to prevent men, so far as in him lies, from marrying more than twice.¹

The legates of Boniface had scarce left Rome, when the pope was informed, by his friends in Sicily, of the detention of his legate in that island, and the treatment he had met with there. Upon that intelligence, to be revenged on the emperor, and, at the same time, engage in his interest, as his predecessor had done, the rebel and fanatic people of Rome, he assembled a council, in great haste, at the pretended tomb of St. Peter. At that council assisted, with all the Roman clergy, even those of the lowest rank, ninety-three bishops, among whom were Antony archbishop of Grado, and John bishop of Ravenna; and the whole Roman people, the populace as well as the nobility, were allowed to be present. By that assembly was issued a decree, or constitution, as the bibliothecarian styles it, establishing the worship of images, “agreeably to the ancient practice of the apostolic church,” (that is, to a practice at this time of about seventy years standing;) and the sentence of excommunication was thundered against all, “who should thenceforth presume to pull down, destroy, profane, or blaspheme, the sacred images; namely, the images of our Lord God Jesus Christ, of his ever immaculate and glorious mother the virgin Mary, of the holy apostles, and other saints.” This decree passed without opposition, no one daring to offer any; and was received by the rabble with loud acclamations, as establishing the doctrine, which had been taught by the apostles, for so they were made to believe, had been defined by the councils, and recommended by the fathers.²

In the same council it was resolved, that the salvation of the emperor should not be despaired of, but a new attempt should be made towards his conversion. The pope therefore wrote a second letter to him, and dispatched with it Constantine, defender of the Roman church. But he too was stopt, before he reached the imperial city, by the officers of the emperor, who took the letter from him, threw him into jail, and, having kept him there closely confined nearly a whole twelvemonth, sent him back

to Rome, to acquaint the pope with the success of his legation.¹

The pope finding the emperor thus unalterably bent on the extirpation of images, resolved, in opposition to him, and in defiance of his edict, to fill the churches of Rome with them, while they were all cast out of the churches of Constantinople. Agreeably to that resolution, he laid out the whole wealth of his church, the patrimony of the widows, the orphans, and the poor, on pictures and statues, crowding them chiefly into the churches of St. Peter, St. Mary ad Præsepe, and St. Andrew, whither the people flocked daily to worship them. As Leo was for suppressing the worship of saints, and of relics, as well as of images, the pope caused relics to be everywhere sought for, and conveyed, says Anastasius, from all parts of the world, to Rome; where he built a magnificent oratory for their reception and worship, appointing them a proper service, and monks, who were maintained at the expense of his see, to perform it. In these pious works, the pope is said to have expended seventy-three pounds weight of gold, and three hundred and seventy-six pounds weight of silver;² while, the treasure of the church being thus exhausted, the poor were left to shift for themselves.

The pope might, one would think, by this time, have been fully satisfied, that the emperor was not to be diverted from the resolution he had taken. However, that he might not be thought to be wanting in his duty, he resolved to make one effort more towards his conversion, as he styled it. With that view he persuaded the people of Italy to write a letter, or rather a memorial, in common, representing to the emperor the dreadful disturbances, which his edict had occasioned in the west, and earnestly entreating him to give over an undertaking, which they thought themselves bound in conscience to oppose, and ever would oppose, as evidently repugnant to the doctrine of the fathers, and the practice, in all times, of the catholic church. With this memorial, and two letters from the pope, the one to the emperor, and the other to the patriarch, were dispatched to Constantinople some of the chief men of the Roman church, and the city of Rome. But, on their landing in Sicily, they were stopt by the patrician Sergius, commander of the imperial troops in that island, who took all their papers from them, kept them eight months closely confined, and then caused them to be conveyed back to Italy, threatening to treat them as sowers of sedition, as rebels, as enemies of the emperor and the empire, if they ever again set foot in the island of Sicily.³ From this time forward Gregory sent no more legates into

¹ Concil. Tom. 6. p. 1458. et apud Bar. ad Ann. 731. 104.

² Anast. in Greg. III.

¹ Anast. in Greg. III. ² Idem ibid. ³ Idem ibid.

A fleet sent against the pope and the other rebels in Italy;—[Year of Christ, 734;]—which is wrecked. Rome, at this time, a kind of republic. Boniface comes the third time to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 738.] The following year, Bavaria is divided into four dioceses. The dukedom of Rome invaded by the king of the Lombards;—[Year of Christ, 740.] Rome besieged;—[Year of Christ, 741.]

the east, nor did he henceforth concern himself at all with the affairs of those churches.

In the mean time the emperor, on the one hand highly provoked against the people of Italy, and most of all against the pope and the Romans, and determined on the other to restore, at all events, the Christian worship to its primitive purity in the west, as well as in the east, caused a mighty fleet to be equipped, in order to bring the pope and the other rebels back to their duty, and oblige them to renounce their idolatry, and comply with his edict. The fleet put to sea in the spring of the present year, under the command of Manes, one of the most experienced officers in the whole empire; but, a violent storm arising as they entered the Adriatic gulph, most of the ships were either swallowed up by the waves, or dashed to pieces against the shore; insomuch that the whole coast of Calabria, as well as the sea between Italy and Epirus, was covered with the wreck.¹ From this time the emperor concerned himself no more with the affairs of the west, than the pope concerned himself with those of the east. The exarch continued still to reside at Ravenna; but was not in a condition to cause the imperial edict against images to be observed even in that city, and much less to undertake any thing against the pope, or the Romans: for the people of Rome, having, at the instigation of the pope, withdrawn themselves from all subjection to the emperor, were governed, at this time, by their own magistrates, or by magistrates, whom they had appointed by their own authority; and they formed a kind of republic under the pope, not yet as their prince, but only as their head.

We hear no more of Gregory till the year 738, when he received at Rome, Boniface, the apostle of Germany, come to consult him about the government of the churches he had founded, and to visit, for the third time, the tombs of the apostles. The pope received and entertained him, during his stay in that city, with the greatest friendship and kindness; and loaded him, at his departure, with relics, to establish, by his means, in Germany, the superstition, which the emperor was striving to abolish in the empire. On this occasion the pope wrote three letters, namely, one to all bishops, abbots, and presbyters; another to the Christians in Germany, converted by Boniface; and the third to the bishops of Bavaria, and Germany. The purport of these letters was to recommend Boniface, and exhort those, to whom they were addressed, to hearken to his instructions, and obey him as legate of the apostolic see.² Boniface, on his re-

turn to Germany, divided Bavaria into four dioceses, or bishoprics, namely, of Saltzburg, Freisinghen, Ratisbone, and Passaw; and that division the pope approved and confirmed by a letter dated the 29th of October, 739.¹

But to return to the affairs of Italy; the pope and the Romans had enjoyed, ever since the loss of the imperial fleet in 734, a profound peace and tranquillity, without the least apprehension of any further attempts being made by the emperor towards reducing them, or obliging them to comply with his edict. But, in the year 740, the peace, which they had so long enjoyed, was greatly disturbed, and they found themselves unexpectedly involved in new troubles on the following occasion: the two dukes of Spoleti and Benevento, who had revolted a few years before from Luitprand, and been by him generously forgiven, and even restored to their dukedoms, having revolted anew, and, upon their being defeated by the king, taken refuge in Rome, Luitprand sent to demand them of the pope and the Romans, threatening to turn his arms against them, if they did not deliver up the two rebels, or at least drive them out of their city. Gregory, jealous, as his predecessors ever had been, of the growing power of the Lombards, had perhaps, as some have surmised, privately stirred up the dukes to rebel, in order to keep the king, who was a prince of an unbounded ambition, of a most warlike and enterprising genius, employed at home, and divert him, by that means, from attempting the conquest of the dukedom and city of Rome. However that be, the pope took the rebels into his protection; nor could he, by any means, be prevailed upon to deliver them up, or oblige them to withdraw from the city. Luitprand therefore, highly provoked, and perhaps only wanting a plausible pretence to invade the Roman territories, and make himself master of Rome, drew his forces together; put himself at their head, and, entering the Roman dukedom in a hostile manner, possessed himself there of four cities; namely, Ameria, Hortas, Polimartium, and Blera. Upon his retreat (for, the season being this year uncommonly hot, he retired in the beginning of August with his army to Pavia,) Thrasimund, duke of Spoleti, quitting his asylum, took the field, and, with the assistance of the Romans, who readily joined him, recovered, in a very short time, most of the cities of his dukedom, and, among the rest, the capital itself.

War being thus declared between the Romans and Luitprand, and hostilities begun on both sides, the king assembled his forces early in the spring, and marching with them

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. Leon. 17.

² Othlon. in Vit. Bonifac. l. 1. c. 28. vide Bar. ad Ann. 738. p. 120. et seq.

¹ Willibald. in Vit. Bonif. c. 3. et Othlon. ibid. c. 31.

The pope and the Romans in the utmost distress. The pope resolves to apply to Charles Martel. Sends a solemn legation into France. Charles declines to assist the pope against the Lombards. The pope's letter to him.

straight to Rome, laid waste the whole neighboring country; gave up even the church of St. Peter, that stood without the walls, to be plundered by his men; and laid close siege to the city. The consternation, which the approach of so formidable an enemy occasioned in Rome, can hardly be expressed. The Romans well knew, that they could not hold out long unassisted, against the whole strength of the kingdom of the Lombards; and were, at the same time, entirely at a loss to whom they should apply for assistance. The emperor was no less provoked against them, and more justly, than the king; and his resentment they dreaded more than the king's. The Venetians, though already a respectable republic, and greatly attached to the pope, were not however, yet able to match the warlike nation of the Lombards. As for Spain, it was at this time overrun, most miserably harassed, and almost entirely possessed by the Saracens. The French therefore were the only nation at this time capable of assisting the pope and the Romans, and effectually rescuing them out of the imminent danger they were in of being obliged to submit to the yoke of the Lombards, which the popes had of all things ever most dreaded. The French had been now governed twenty-six years by the celebrated Charles Martel, who, contenting himself with the title of mayor of the palace, ruled the kingdom with an absolute sway. He had signalized himself by a thousand warlike exploits in France, and in Germany; had gained a few years before, a most remarkable victory over the Saracens in the neighborhood of Tours; and was, at this time, universally reputed the best commander, and the hero of the age.¹

To him therefore the pope resolved to apply in his present distress; and that resolution he had no sooner taken, than he sent, without loss of time, and indeed no time was to be lost, a solemn legation by sea into France, with the keys of the tomb of St. Peter, at this time in great request, with some small pieces or filings of the chain, with which the apostle was supposed to have been bound while prisoner in Rome, and many other valuable presents, probably of the same kind, "cum magnis et infinitis muneribus," says the historian.² These very valuable presents the two legates, Anastasius, bishop, and Sergius, presbyter, were to deliver to Charles, and, laying before him the deplorable condition to which his holiness was reduced, earnestly to entreat him, in the name of St. Peter, to undertake the protection of that apostle, of his church, and his people, against the wicked nation of the Lombards, by whom they were most cruelly harassed and oppressed. Charles received

the legates with the greatest marks of respect and esteem; made them many valuable presents in his turn, more valuable than those he had received; and entertained them, so long as they continued at his court, with all the splendor and magnificence of a great prince. But he lived at this time, and ever had, in great friendship and amity with the king of the Lombards; had been powerfully assisted by him, even in person, against the Saracens, and the rebels of Provence; and he thought the bonds of friendship and gratitude too sacred to be broken, at the request of the pope himself, without the greatest provocation. Besides, he well knew, that Luitprand, his friend and ally, was justly provoked against the pope and the Romans, since they had not only harbored and protected, but openly joined his rebel vassals, and, in defiance of him, restored one of them, the duke of Spoleti, to his forfeited dukedom. Upon these considerations, Charles withstood all the solicitations of the legates, determined not to break with the king, but suffer him to pursue his just revenge. Of this the legates gave immediate notice to the pope, who thereupon, trusting more to his own eloquence than to that of his legates, wrote the following letter to Charles, and dispatched, in all haste, a messenger with it into France.

"Pope Gregory to his most excellent son Charles, viceroy, *Carolo Subregulo*. We are overwhelmed with grief, and tears stream night and day from our eyes, in beholding the holy church of God (himself and the rebellious populace of Rome) abandoned by all her children, even by those, in whom she had most reason to confide. Can we see without sighs and groans, without the deepest concern and affliction, the little that remained, after the last year's devastations, in the territories of Ravenna, for the support of the poor, and the necessary charge of the lights in the church of St. Peter, now entirely destroyed with fire and sword by Luitprand and Hildebrand, kings of the Lombards?" There would not have been wanting wherewithal to support the poor, notwithstanding all these devastations, and even to defray the unnecessary expense of the lights, had the pope been less extravagant, and not squandered away, as he did, the treasures of his church on statues and pictures. "They have pursued," continues the pope, "and at this very time still pursue the like ravages in the neighborhood of Rome, whither they have sent armies, that lay the whole country waste, that burn and destroy all the houses belonging to St. Peter, after having stripped them of every thing they found in them. In the midst of these tribulations we have recurred to you, our most excellent son; but have yet received no comfort or relief from

¹ Anast. in Greg. III. Continuat. Fredegar. c. 110.

² Continuat. Fredegar. ibid.

The pope's letter makes no impression on Charles; nor a second, which he wrote soon after.

you. But we are not unapprised why you suffer these kings to insult thus with impunity. You give more credit to their lying suggestions, than to the truths that are told you by us; and I fear you will, on that score, be one day found guilty. O could you but hear the insulting and reproachful language, with which they revile us, or rather you! Where is that mighty Charles, say they, whose protection you have implored? Where those formidable French armies? Let them come, and deliver you, if they dare, out of our hands. What grief pierces my heart in hearing such reproaches, and finding that none of the children of the holy church stir to defend their spiritual mother, and her peculiar people! (namely, the mob of Rome.) My dear son, St. Peter is able, by the power which God has granted him, to defend his own house and his people, and to revenge them on all their enemies without the assistance of any mortal man; and it is only to know who are his true children, and to try their zeal, that he permits them to be thus oppressed. Suffer not yourself, my dear son, to be imposed upon by the crafty and false suggestions of the Lombard kings. They loudly complain of the dukes of Spoleti and Benevento; they charge them with high treason and rebellion. But this is all a barefaced lie. They would not last year join the kings against us; they would not, in conjunction with them, lay waste, burn, and destroy the goods of the holy apostles, nor make war on the church of God, and his peculiar people. This is their only crime; it is on this account, and this alone, that they are persecuted by the kings, being ready to obey them in every thing else, according to the laws and the custom of their nation. But, my most Christian son, that you may be convinced of the truth of what I say, send some person hither, on whose integrity and veracity you can rely, that, being an eye witness of the calamities which we suffer, of the ravages committed by the kings, of the tears of the pilgrims, and the deplorable condition of the church, he may give you a true and full account of the whole. We therefore exhort you, as you tender the salvation of your soul, to hasten to the relief of the church of St. Peter and his people, to oblige the kings to forbear all hostilities, to withdraw their troops, and peaceably retire to their own dominions. Shut not your ears, my most Christian son, to our prayers, lest the prince of the apostles should, in his turn, shut the gates of the kingdom of heaven upon you. Prefer not, I conjure you by the living God, and the most sacred keys of the tomb of St. Peter, which I send you, the friendship of the Lombard kings to the regard that you owe to the prince of the apostles. Let us soon feel, my dear son, for in you we place all our trust after God, the wished-for effects of your protection and favor; that we may say

with the prophet, "the Lord hear thee in the day of trouble, the name of the God of Jacob defend thee."¹ Ancard, the bearer of this letter, and your faithful servant, will acquaint your excellency by word of mouth, as we have directed him, with what he himself has seen. All is at stake; upon your answer depend our safety and happiness; and we therefore conjure you anew, in the presence of God, our witness and our judge, to afford us some relief, and afford it without delay, that being delivered, by your means, from the evils that surround us on all sides, we may pray night and day, before the tombs of the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul for your safety, and the safety of all your subjects.²

From this letter it appears, that while the pope was thus striving to engage Charles in his cause, the Lombard kings were using their utmost endeavors, to persuade him to stand neuter; and that, with respect to the cause of the present quarrel, Charles gave more credit to them than to the pope. Indeed the historians of those times, all to a man, tell us, that the two dukes rebelled a second time, that they took refuge in Rome, and that it was because the pope and the Romans refused to deliver them up, that Luitprand broke into the Roman territories, and committed the ravages, which the pope complains of in his letter. Be that as it will, the letter of the pope made no impression upon Charles; he continued firm in the resolution, which it seems, he had taken, not to concern himself at all in the quarrel between the Romans and the Lombards. The pope, however, wrote a second letter to him, filled with new complaints against the Lombards, who had, it seems, retired from before Rome; but committed most dreadful ravages in the neighborhood, and on the lands of the Roman church in Campania, being chiefly provoked against the pope, by whose counsels they knew the Romans were entirely governed. In that letter the pope omitted nothing he could think of to provoke Charles against the Lombards, telling him, that they had not only pillaged the lands, but the church of St. Peter; that they had sacrilegiously seized and carried off the many valuable gifts, which his ancestors had offered to that apostle; that they now raged with more cruelty than ever, for no other reason, but because the people of Rome had applied to him in their distress, and in him had placed their confidence, as if he were able to rescue them out of their hands, &c. With this letter, though perhaps more moving and pathetic than the former, Charles was no more affected than he was with the former; and he still kept to the resolution he had taken, not to break with the Lombard kings.

¹ Psalm 20.

² Greg. III. ep. 5. t. 6. Concil. p. 1471. et apud Bar. ad Ann. 740. p. 133, 134.

Gregory sends a second legation into France. Proposals made by him. Charles hearkens to them, and a treaty concluded between him and the pope. The Lombards withdraw their troops out of the dukedom of Rome. Gregory dies. His writings. He had sent a pall to Egbert of York.

But the pope did not yet despair of being able to gain him. He found that pious motives were of no weight with him; that he made but little or no account of the favor or protection of the prince of the apostles, and the great reward which he was to receive hereafter for protecting his peculiar people, and his church. Gregory therefore, to leave nothing unattempted, resolved to recur to motives of a different nature, and try whether he might not be attended with better success by applying to his ambition, than he had hitherto been by applying to his piety and devotion. He sent accordingly a second legation into France, no less solemn than the first, with proposals, which he knew would be acceptable to Charles, as they flattered his ambition, and would incline him, if any thing could, to undertake his defence, and the defence of the Roman church and the Romans. The proposals were, that the pope and the Roman people should solemnly renounce their allegiance to the emperor, as an avowed heretic and persecutor of the church; that they should put themselves under the protection of Charles, acknowledge him for their protector, and confer on him the consular dignity, as it had been formerly (in 508,) conferred by the emperor Anastasius on Clovis the first Christian king of France, after he had defeated the Visigoths, and killed their king: on the other hand, Charles was to engage, on his side, to defend and protect the pope, the Roman church, and the people of Rome, against the Lombards; and likewise against the emperor, should they by either be attacked or molested. These reasonable proposals were well received and readily agreed to by Charles, resolved, no doubt, to improve to his advantage the authority which the title of protector, and the consular dignity, would give him in Rome. He had therefore no sooner dismissed the legates, whom he loaded with rich presents at their departure, than he dispatched Grimon, abbot of Corbie, and Sigebert, monk of St. Denys, to Rome, to confirm the treaty, and take, in his name, the pope and the Roman people into his protection. As soon after their arrival in that city, the Lombard kings put an end to all hostilities, withdrew their troops out of the Roman dukedom, and retired to their own dominions; it is generally taken for granted, though not expressly affirmed by any ancient writer, that Charles threatened them with war by his ambassadors, if they did not return. They kept, however, the four cities belonging to the Roman dukedom, which they had taken the year before.¹

The pope did not live to reap the fruit of his treason. He died, and so did Charles, soon after the conclusion of the above-men-

tioned treaty. Charles died on the 22d of October of the present year, and the pope on the 27th of November, having governed the Roman church ten years, eight months, and eleven days. The zeal, which he exerted in the defence of images and image-worship, has, however treasonable, procured him a place in the calendar; and he is now honored as a saint of the first rate. He is said to have been a man, in those days, of uncommon learning: for he knew all the Psalms by heart, which was then looked upon, says Walfrid, as a new thing, as a thing that had never before been heard of, *tanquam novum quiddam et inauditum*.¹ Indeed the Scripture was, at that time, a book which very few, if any, were at all acquainted with, or concerned themselves about. Gregory wrote, as Anastasius informs us, three books to prove the lawfulness of image-worship which he addressed to the emperors Leo and Constantine, and one book of letters. But none of these pieces even reached the time of Anastasius, who flourished about the middle of the following century; and I do not find them once quoted by any, who in those days defended the same cause; a plain proof that they were held in no great esteem.

By this pope a pall was sent in 735, to Egbert, who was descended of the royal family of Northumberland, and had in 732, succeeded Wilfrid the younger in the see of York. As he was the first bishop of York after Paulinus, whom the popes had honored with that mark of distinction, our historians all tell us, that the church of York was governed only by bishops, from the time of Paulinus to that of Egbert, when York, they say, was restored, by the pall sent from Rome, to his former rank, or the archiepiscopal dignity.² But it is certain, that in the time of Gregory III. the pall was not yet looked upon, nor given as a badge of the metropolitan or archiepiscopal dignity; but only as an acknowledgment of some extraordinary merit in the person, to whom it was given. The historians, whom I have quoted above, flourished in times, when the pall was become a badge of the archiepiscopal dignity, nay, and was thought to confer the power and authority annexed to that dignity; and they spoke of the transactions of the more ancient times, according to the notions that obtained in their own.³ Gregory is said to have changed, some time before his death, the solemnity, which Boniface IV. had appointed to be kept on the 13th of May, in honor of the Virgin Mary and all the martyrs,⁴ into that of all saints, ordering it to be annually observed on the 1st of November;⁵

¹ Walfrid. c. 25.

² Malmes. de Pontif. l. 3. Hoved. ad Ann. 735. Continuat. Epit. Bed. ad eund. Ann.

³ See vol. I. p. 430. note (f). ⁴ See vol. I. p. 423.

⁵ Annast. in Greg. III.

¹ Annast. in Greg. III. Continuat. Fredegar. c. 110. Annales Metenses ad Ann. 741.

The emperor Leo dies—[Year of Christ, 741.] His character. Zachary chosen, and ordained before his election was confirmed by the exarch, or the emperor.

and on the 1st of November it is observed to this day.

In the same year 741, died the emperor Leo, after he had reigned twenty-four years, two months, and twenty days. During that time he restored the decayed military discipline, defended the empire with great bravery against the barbarians, entirely destroyed the naval power of the Saracens, and obliged that warlike, and till his time, victorious people, who, in the beginning of his reign, had even had the boldness to besiege him in his capital, to court his friendship, and sue for a peace. He was, on the other hand, as appears from his whole conduct, a prince of great temper, moderation, and clemency, of uncommon penetration and discernment, a strict observer of the six preceding general councils, with which he seems to have been better acquainted than most men of his time, and a most zealous asserter of the catholic doctrine, as it was taught and practised in the primitive ages. As for vices, he was charged with none; but, on the contrary, commended by the pope himself, pope Gregory II., as the best of princes, and said to have reigned without blame,¹ till he published his edict against images; insomuch that had he either never concerned himself with matters of religion, or as zealously promoted, as he opposed the superstitions, that began to prevail in his time, it is not at all to be doubted but that he would have been ranked by the writers of those times amongst the greatest princes, as well as the best, who had yet filled the imperial throne, and be

now even honored by the church of Rome as a saint. But his zeal for the purity of the Christian worship, and unrelenting endeavors to suppress the superstitious worship of images, which he thought inconsistent with it, provoked the ignorant and bigotted monks of those days against him; and they have spared no pains nor lies to blacken his character, and represent him to posterity as the most wicked of men. But the many fables invented by them for that purpose, and gravely related by the more modern historians, especially by Baronius, Maimbourg, and Natalis Alexander, have been all unanswerably confuted by the learned Spanheim;¹ and to him I refer the reader, only observing here, that though the menology of the Greeks is filled with the names both of men and of women, who are there said to have been put to most cruel deaths for maintaining the catholic doctrine, that is, the worship of images, against the impious Iconoclast, emperor Leo, it does not appear from the more credible historians of those times, that a single person suffered death on that score, during the whole time of that emperor's reign. Upon his death his son Constantine, surnamed Copronymus,² whom he had taken for his partner in the empire ever since the year 720, reigned alone. Of him, as he most zealously pursued the great work, which his father had begun, of extirpating idolatry, and restoring the Christian worship to its primitive purity, we shall have frequent occasion to speak in the sequel.

ZACHARY, NINETIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE.—LUITPRAND, HILDEBRAND, RACHIS, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 741.] Gregory died on the 27th of November; and the third day after his death Zachary, a native of Greece, and the son of one Polychronius, was chosen in his room.² From the shortness of the vacancy it is manifest, that the new pope, knowing how precarious the power of the emperor was at this time in Italy, neither waited for the confirmation of the exarch, nor asked it: and he was the first pope thus chosen and ordained, without the approbation of the prince, or his ministers, ever since the year 483, when Odoacer, then master of Italy, issued his edict (and he issued it at the request of Pope Simplicius while on his death-bed,) forbidding the pope to be thenceforth ordained, till his election was confirmed by him, or by those, whom

he should appoint to confirm it.³ The law of Odoacer was adopted by the Gothic kings,

¹ Spanh. *Hist. Imag. Restitut.* Sect. 2.

² He was surnamed Copronymus from his having been said to have bewrayed the sacred font at his baptism. "Dum baptizaretur, dirum quiddam et fœdum parvulus Constantinus exhibit argumentum, stercus emittens in sanctum lavacrum," says the author of the *Miscella*. He adds, that the holy patriarch Germanus, who baptized him, alarmed at what had happened (at an accident that was quite natural, and must have happened to many other infants, as they were all baptized, agreeably to the practice of the eastern church, by immersion,) prophetically declared, that the child would one day prove a great enemy and persecutor of the church. But as neither of that prediction, nor of the accident, that is supposed to have given occasion to it, the least mention is made by Theophanes, the patriarch Nicephorus, Paulus Diaconus, Anastasius, though they all wrote long before the time of the author of the *Miscella*; and were, as is manifest from their writings, no less prejudiced against Constantine than the compiler of that work; we may well conclude the whole to be a mere invention, or one of the many fables that were invented by the

¹ *Concil. i. 7. p. 7. et apud. Bar. ad Ann. 726. p. 66.*

² *Anast. in Zach.*

³ See vol. I. p. 271.

Zachary sends a solemn legation to the king of the Lombards;—[Year of Christ, 742.]—Who grants a peace to the Romans, but obliges them to join him against the duke of Spoleti. The pope leaves Rome, and repairs to the king's camp at Terni. How received by the king. Persuades the king to restore the four cities he had taken.

his successors in the kingdom of Italy; and likewise by the emperors, who, having driven out the Goths, took care to have it strictly observed, as we have seen, from the time they became again masters of Italy to the present, when their power being at a very low ebb in the west, they were no longer able to curb the growing power of the popes, or restrain them from encroaching on the just rights of their crown.

Zachary was raised to the see in the most difficult times the popes had yet seen. The king of the Lombards had, at the persuasion or menaces of Charles Martel, withdrawn his troops out of the dukedom of Rome, as has been related above. But Charles being dead, he not only kept the four cities he had taken, but was preparing to invade, with a numerous army, that dukedom anew, and attempt the reduction of Rome itself. The Romans, who had openly revolted from their lawful sovereign, and formed themselves into a kind of republic, with the pope at their head, were not able to withstand so powerful an enemy alone. On the other hand, the domestic troubles, that reigned at this time in France, and the revolt of the German nations subject to that crown, kept the arms of Carloman and Pepin, the sons of Charles, so wholly employed, that they could not pretend to undertake their defence, agreeably to the treaty lately concluded between Gregory III. and their father; nor even to lend them the least assistance in their present distress. As for the emperor, the pope well knew, that he looked both upon him and the Romans as traitors and rebels; that he would rather join the Lombards against them, than join them against the Lombards; and was therefore no less afraid of him, than he was of the Lombards themselves. Zachary, finding himself and the Romans thus left to the mercy of their enemies, resolved to recur to motives of religion, since he had nothing else to recur to; and try whether he could not thus appease the wrath of the provoked king, and divert him from his intended expedition against the city and dukedom of Rome. With that view he sent a solemn legation to Luitprand, who not only received the legates with extraordinary marks of respect and esteem, but, moved by the motives

lying monks, to revile the memory of that excellent prince, when the worship of images, which he had spared no pains to suppress, was, by the second council of Nice, universally established in the east. He was likewise surnamed Caballinus, probably from his being a great lover of horses; at least more probably from thence, than from his frequently covering his whole body with their dung, and obliging his favorites to follow therein his example, as by the later Greeks he is gravely said to have done, and after them by Baronius (*Bar. ad Ann. 775. p. 336.*) and Maimbourg, (*Maimb. Hist. des Iconoclast. l. 2. p. 179.*) not ashamed to adopt every absurd, ridiculous, and improbable story, that the Greeks have invented to render the memory of that prince odious or contemptible to posterity.

they alleged, granted a peace to the pope and the Romans; and even promised to restore to them, in token of an entire reconciliation, the four cities he had taken. However, he insisted on the pope's not only abandoning the duke of Spoleti, whom his predecessor had taken into his protection, and assisted in the recovery of his dukedom, but on his obliging the Romans to join him with all the forces they could raise against that rebel. The pope chose rather to abandon the duke, than disoblige the king; who, being joined by a considerable body of Romans, entered the dukedom of Spoleti, in order to lay siege to that city: but Trasi-mund, trusting more in the mercy of the king, than in his own strength, went out to meet him as he approached; and delivered himself up into his hands. The king granted him his life, but deprived him of his dukedom; and, appointing another duke in his room, obliged him to spend the remainder of his days in a monastery.¹

The pope had performed whatever the king had required of him: but the king still delayed the execution of the promise he had made to restore the four cities. Zachary therefore, impatient to see those places evacuated by the Lombards, and united again to the dukedom of Rome, instead of sending a new legation for that purpose to the king, resolved to wait on him in person, being thereunto chiefly encouraged by the kind reception which his predecessor Gregory II. had met with, when he went to wait on him in his camp before Rome.² Agreeably to that resolution he set out from the Lateran palace, attended by several bishops, and a great number of other ecclesiastics; and arriving at Ortona, in his way to the king's camp, in the neighborhood of Interamna, now Terni, he was there met by Grimoald, one of the great officers of state, sent by the king, upon the first notice of his journey, to receive him. From Ortona he was conducted by Grimoald to Narni, and there received with extraordinary honors by the king, who attended him from thence with all the nobility, and almost the whole army, to Terni. The two following days, Friday and Saturday, the pope and the king met in the church of St. Valentine; and, in these two interviews, the pope, by representing to the king, with great energy and eloquence, the shortness and vanity of all temporal grandeur; by putting him in mind of the strict account he was one day to give, and perhaps very soon, for all the human blood, which he had caused to be shed to gratify his ambition; and threatening him with eternal damnation, if he did not restore the four above-mentioned cities; softened the

¹ Anast in Zach.

² See p. 51.

Peace concluded between the Romans and the Lombards. Germany divided into three bishoprics. The debauched lives of the French clergy. Pagan ceremonies still prevail in Rome. [Year of Christ, 743;]—the pope sends a solemn legation into the east.

mind of that warlike prince to such a degree, that he immediately yielded those cities, declaring, in the presence of all, that they no longer belonged to him, but to the apostle St. Peter; the emperor, who alone had an unquestionable right to them, being quite out of the question. At the same time the king ordered the wealthy patrimony of the Roman church in the country of the Sabines, which the Lombards had seized thirty years before, to be forthwith restored, and with it the patrimonies of that church in the territories of Narni, of Osimo, of Ancona, and Polimartium.

He likewise released, at the request of the pope, without ransom, all the prisoners he had taken in his wars with the Romans, among whom were four consular men; and concluded a peace for twenty years with the dukedom of Rome. As the see of Terni was at this time vacant by the death of Constantine, bishop of that city; the following Sunday the pope ordained, at the desire of the king, a new bishop in his room, the king assisting at the ceremony, with all the chief officers both of the court and the army, and likewise at divine service, which was performed by the pope with extraordinary pomp and solemnity. When the service was over, the pope gave an entertainment to the king and his attendants, the most splendid and sumptuous, as all declared, they ever had seen. Indeed the Christian pontiffs soon rivalled the pagan in banquets and luxury. The next day the pope, taking leave of the king, set out on his return to Rome, attended by Aldeprand, the king's grandson, and several other persons of the first rank, whom the king had appointed to conduct him to the four cities, and deliver them up to him; which was accordingly done. The pope, having thus obtained of the king whatever he had asked, entered Rome in a kind of triumph, and the next day ordered, by way of thanksgiving, a solemn procession from the church of St. Mary ad Martyres, the ancient Pantheon, to that of St. Peter.

Zachary, on his return to Rome, received a letter from Boniface, the apostle of Germany, congratulating him on his promotion, and assuring him of his entire subjection to the apostolic see. In the same letter Boniface acquainted the pope with his having divided the province of Germany into three bishoprics, namely, of Wirtzburg, Buraburg, and Erphesfurt; begged his holiness to confirm them; consulted him concerning certain points relating to discipline; and desired leave to assemble a council in the dominions of Carloman: the pope in his answer, approved what he had done, declared the three cities episcopal sees, and readily consenting to his assembling a council, and presiding at it as legate of the apostolic see. From

the letter of Boniface, and the pope's answer to it, it appears, that in France the clergy from the highest to the lowest, the bishops as well as the presbyters and deacons, led, at this time, most debauched and dissolute lives; that incest, fornication, concubinage, and adultery, were common among them; that some of them kept four, five, and more concubines; the blessed effects of a forced celibacy! that they bore arms, served in war against the Christians as well as the Saracens, and distinguished themselves from the laity only by their lewdness and debauchery.¹ The pope, in his answer, empowered Boniface to suspend from their office, and from all the functions of their ministry, not only such bishops, presbyters, and deacons, as should be found guilty of the above-mentioned excesses, but those too who had been twice married, or who continued to cohabit with the wives they had married before their ordination.²

From the same letters it appears, that the pagan ceremonies were not yet, in 742, nor had been but very lately, quite abolished in Rome: for Boniface in his letter, desires the pope to inform him, whether what he had been told by some persons, come lately from Rome, was true or not; namely, that there New-year's day was still kept after the pagan manner; that all the profane and superstitious ceremonies, formerly practised on that day by the pagans, were still practised on the same day by the Christians; that charms, amulets, and phylacteries, or preservatives against all dangers and distempers, were still worn by the women on their legs and arms, and publicly sold.³ The pope in his answer, owns many pagan superstitions, and superstitious practices, to have obtained in Rome even to the time of his predecessor, and his own, notwithstanding all the pains that had been taken to suppress them: but adds, that they were now, he hoped, utterly abolished, in virtue of a decree, which Gregory, his immediate predecessor, had issued for that purpose, and he had confirmed.⁴ As the people of Rome were so fond of the customs and manners of their pagan ancestors, it is not to be wondered, that they distinguished themselves, in the manner we have seen, by their zeal for the worship of images.

Zachary had sent, as soon as ordained, a solemn legation into the east, with a letter to the emperor, and a confession of his faith, addressed, not to the patriarch, as was customary, since he had been excommunicated

¹ Concil. t. 6. p. 1494. Epist. Bonif. 122.

² Concil. ibid. et apud Bar. ad Ann. 742. p. 146.

³ Phylacteries were amulets made of ribbands, with a text of Scripture, or some other charm of words written upon them, and hung about the neck, to cure diseases, and preserve men from dangers. And thence they were called phylacteries or preservatives.

⁴ Concil. t. 6. p. 1494. apud Bar. ad Ann. 742. p. 146.

The legates find the usurper Artabasus in possession of the throne.

by his predecessor Gregory II. but to the church of Constantinople. The legates, on their arrival in the imperial city, found all there in the utmost confusion; and not Constantine, to whom the letter was addressed, but the usurper Artabasus, in possession of the throne.¹ As his usurpation had divided

both the people and the army, some siding with him, and some with Constantine, the

¹ Of this revolution the historians of those times give us the following account. Constantine, being informed that the Saracens had, upon the news of the death of his father Leo, made an irruption into Asia, and committed dreadful ravages there, left Constantinople, and taking with him the flower of his troops, marched against them in person. In his absence, Artabasus, who had married his sister, taking advantage of the hatred the populace bore him on account of his aversion to images (for he insisted on the strict observance of the edicts, which his father had issued against them), caused himself to be proclaimed emperor by the troops, which he had, as governor of Phrygia and Bithynia, under his command. At the same time, he dispatched one Thalasis to acquaint Theophanes, whom Constantine had trusted with the government of Constantinople, that both the soldiery and the people of the two above-mentioned provinces had readily acknowledged him for emperor; and persuaded him to espouse his cause, and dispose the garrison, as well as the inhabitants, to receive him into the city. Theophanes, not doubting but that Artabasus would prevail in the end, the superstitious multitude being everywhere ready to rise in defence of their images, not only declared for the usurper, but, to prevent the friends of Constantine from raising disturbances in the city, assured the people, whom he assembled for that purpose in the great church, that the emperor was killed; and that, upon his death, the legions had all proclaimed Artabasus in his room. The news of Constantine's death was believed, and Artabasus thereupon acknowledged by all, without the least opposition, for lawful emperor. In the mean time Nicephorus, the son of Artabasus, and governor of Thrace, having assembled in great haste the troops, that were quartered in that province, entered the imperial city at their head, and seizing on such as he knew, or only suspected to be well affected to Constantine, caused some of them to be cruelly beaten, deprived others of their sight, and commanded the rest to be thrown into dungeons, and kept there closely confined. Nicephorus was soon followed by Artabasus himself, who entered the city amidst the loud acclamations of the populace; and was, the very next day, solemnly crowned by the patriarch Anastasius, whom Theophanes had persuaded to declare in his favor. As the report, that had been industriously spread, of Constantine's death, was, by this time, found to be groundless, the time-serving patriarch, to keep the people nevertheless steady in the allegiance they had sworn to the usurper, assembled them at his persuasion, in the great church; and there, after painting Constantine to them as the most wicked of men, he assured them, that, as to his belief, he was an Arian in his heart; that he held Christ to be but a mere man; and that he himself heard him one day utter the following blasphemy, "I do not believe him to be the Son of God, who was born of Mary, and is called Christ, but a mere man; for Mary was delivered of him after the same manner as Mary, my mother, was delivered of me." This the patriarch confirmed with a solemn oath, holding a cross in his hand, and swearing by him, who died on it to redeem mankind, that he had advanced nothing, but what he himself knew to be true. The whole was, as will hereafter be made to appear, a barefaced calumny, invented by the patriarch, to prejudice the populace still more against Constantine; and to make his court, by that means, to the usurper. However, as it was so solemnly attested by him, it made so deep an impression on the stupid and credulous multitude, that, loading Constantine with a thousand curses, they declared, with one voice, that they would stand by Artabasus to the last; and maintain him, at the expense of their fortunes and their lives, on the throne.

Artabasus well knew, that the hatred, which the populace and the monks, who stirred them up, bore to Constantine, was merely owing to his zeal against the superstitious use and worship of images; and therefore, to rivet himself, by a contrary zeal, in their favor, he no sooner found himself placed on the throne, than

reversing the edicts of Leo, commanding all images to be pulled down, he ordered them by a new edict, to be set up again; approved the worship, that was given them, agreeably to the practice, as he pretended, of the catholic church, ever since the apostolic times; and forbid, on the pain of death, or exile, any person whatever to question or dispute the lawfulness of that worship. Thus were images once more restored, to the unspeakable joy of the monks, of the populace, and the women; and at the same time, all the superstitious practices revived, which the good emperor Leo had taken so much pains to suppress and abolish. Many, however, were not wanting, among the laity as well as the clergy, who refused with great firmness and constancy, to bow the knee to Baal: But superstition now reigned without restraint or control; and they were either most grossly insulted by the populace, or driven by the usurper into exile. As for the patriarch Anastasius he had, from the beginning, espoused the cause of the usurper; had, by the lies and calumnies he invented, redoubled the prejudices of the multitude against their lawful sovereign; and was now as busy in setting up images, as he had been busy under Leo in pulling them down. The new emperor therefore not only confirmed him in his dignity, the only object of his zeal, but, reposing an entire confidence in him, governed himself, in all matters of moment, wholly by his advice.

While these things passed at Constantinople, Constantine, though at this time only in the twenty-first year of his age, was carrying on the war with surprising success against the Saracens in Asia. He had defeated them in several engagements; had driven them quite out of the territories of the empire, and was preparing to attack them in their own. But receiving, in the mean time, intelligence of the revolt of Artabasus, of the defection of great part of the army, and the reception the usurper had met with from the people of Constantinople, he concluded a truce with the Saracens; and, bending his march straight to Constantinople, arrived, in the latter end of the autumn at Chrysopolis, on the Bosphorus, over against that city, and encamped there with his whole army. He hoped, that his friends in the city, encouraged by his unexpected arrival, would all take up arms in his favor; and, by keeping the people and the garrison awed and employed within, give him an opportunity of attacking, amidst that confusion the place from without, and putting an end at once to the war. But he found to his great disappointment, that, notwithstanding his approach at the head of a powerful and victorious army, all continued quiet in the city, his friends being either disarmed, or kept closely confined in the dungeons; that the place was defended by a very numerous garrison; and that the citizens, looking upon the cause of the usurper as the cause of the faith and the church, were determined to hold out to the last. Instead therefore of making, at present, any attempt on the city, or engaging, as the season was already far advanced, in a siege, he withdrew into Phrygia, and there put his troops into winter quarters, in the neighborhood of Arriorium.

Early in the spring the two competitors took the field. Artabasus, leaving his eldest son, Nicephorus, whom he had taken for his partner in the empire, with a strong garrison in Constantinople, passed over into Asia; and, giving out there, that he had taken up arms with no other design, but to defend the catholic faith against one, who had undertaken to establish the blasphemous doctrine of the Mahometans and the Jews in his room, he not only met with no opposition in that province, but was everywhere received by the populace with the greatest demonstrations of joy, and his army plentifully supplied with all sorts of provisions. From Asia he advanced into Lydia; but in that province, he was unexpectedly met by Constantine, who had hitherto pretended to fly before him. An engagement thereupon ensued, which, as it was likely to prove decisive, long continued doubtful, victory inclining some times to one side, and sometimes to the other. The two competitors, as they fought not for a city, or a province, but for the empire, distinguished themselves even above the bravest of their respective armies. But Constantine prevailed in the end; the army of the usurper was utterly defeated, and he obliged to give over the fight, and fly, when he found none, who would stand and fight with him. He was closely pursued, but nevertheless got safe to Cyzicus

The emperor grants certain lands to the pope: who pretends great zeal for his service. The king of the Lombards breaks into the exarchate.

legates continued a whole year in Constantinople waiting till the one or the other

on the Propontis, and from thence passed over in a small vessel to Constantinople.

Nicetas, the usurper's younger son, commanded an army in Bithynia, no less powerful and numerous, than that of his father; and had already reduced with it the far greater part of that province. Against him Constantine marched without loss of time; and coming up with him when least expected, engaged him, cut most of his men to pieces, and obliged him to save himself with the rest by a disorderly flight. He did not pursue him, but led his victorious army straight to Constantinople, and invested the place by sea and by land. As they had within a numerous army, rather than a garrison, of regular and well disciplined troops, commanded by the usurper himself; and the people were determined, as they declared, to part with their lives rather than their images, which they knew they must part with, should Constantine prevail; the siege lasted two whole months; and, during that time, great numbers were killed on both sides in the daily sallies of the one, or the repeated attacks of the other. Artabasus often attempted, as provisions began to be very scarce in the city, to open himself a way, sword in hand, through the enemy's camp, and return into Asia. But he was as often repulsed, and driven back, with great loss, the governor Theophanes being killed among the rest in one of these desperate attempts. Nicetas had by this time, raised a new army, and amassed an incredible quantity of provisions for the relief of the city, where a dreadful famine now raged. But, as he approached Constantinople, he was, by Constantine, a second time defeated, and taken. Constantine, on his return before the city, showed him loaded with chains, to his father and the citizens on the walls; and, ordering a general assault before they could recover from the consternation, which his defeat and such a sight had occasioned, made himself, with a very inconsiderable loss, master of the place, and gave it up, as it was taken by storm, to be plundered for some hours by the soldiery. Artabasus and his son Nicophorus attempted to make their escape; but were taken and delivered up to the emperor, who spared the lives both of the father and his two sons; but, to prevent their raising new disturbances, ordered their eyes to be put out, and showed them, in that condition, to the multitude assembled in the Hippodrome. The other ringleaders, and heads of the rebellion, he either put to death, deprived of their sight, a punishment common at this time in the east, or sent into exile. As for the patriarch Anastasius, the most guilty of all, he was, by the emperor's order, first publicly whipped, and then deprived of his sight, and carried in that condition, through the circus, on an ass, with his face to the tail. However, as he owned the justice of his punishment, and bore it with resignation and patience, the emperor, pitying his condition, reinstated him in his dignity; and he continued to govern the church of Constantinople to the year 753, when he died.

Constantine, having thus by his conduct and valor recovered his crown, and punished, in the manner we have seen, the chief authors of the rebellion, generously forgave all the rest, and even entertained the populace, forgetting their late conduct, with public sports and diversions. As he was resolved to leave the city again, and march against the Saracens, who had broken the truce, and were now at war among themselves, he did all that lay in his power to win the affections of the people, lest they should raise new disturbances in his absence. Unwilling however to court their favor at the expense of his conscience, he caused all the images which the usurper had set up, to be taken down again and destroyed, assuring the people, that he would take care, as soon as he was disengaged from his wars, and had settled the empire in peace, to have the subject of the present fatal dispute thoroughly examined, and finally determined, by a general council. He added, that, as his father had, by repeated edicts, proscribed both the use and worship of images, he would suffer none, in the mean time, to be worshipped, or to be set up in the places of worship, but would punish with the utmost severity all, who should be found guilty of either.

Such is the account the two most credible historians of those times, Theophanes, (Theoph. ad. Ann. Constantin. 3.) and the patriarch Nicophorus, (Niceph. in Breviar. ad Ann. 2.) have given us of the present re-

should prevail. Constantine prevailed in the end; and he was no sooner seated again quietly on the throne, than he sent for them, and received them with the greatest marks of kindness and esteem. It does not appear, that of the controversy about images any mention was made either by the legates in the audience they had, or by the pope in his letter. For all Anastasius, the only writer who speaks of that legation, says of it is, that the legates were well received by the emperor; and that "he granted, agreeably to the request of his holiness pope Zachary, certain crown lands, called Nymphas and Nornias, to be for ever held and possessed by the said most holy pope, and the holy Roman see." And here it is to be observed, that, though the late pope Gregory III., depending on the protection of Charles Martel, had openly withdrawn himself, with the city and dukedom of Rome, from all subjection to the emperor Leo; his successor Zachary, who had no such protector, to amuse Constantine, and divert him from sending an army, as he had threatened to do, against the rebels in Rome, not only pretended to acknowledge him for his lawful sovereign, but found means to persuade him, that he had nothing so much at heart as the re-establishing of his authority in the provinces, that remained to the empire in Italy. Constantine therefore, wholly intent on improving to the advantage of the empire the intestine broils, that reigned, at this time, among the Saracens, left the care of his affairs in the west entirely to the pope, whose interest it was, as he well knew, to prevent the Lombards, the only enemy the empire had in those parts, from enlarging their dominions, and becoming more powerful. The legates brought with them, on their return to Rome, and delivered to the pope, a grant of the above-mentioned lands signed by the emperor himself.

In the mean time the king of the Lombards, taking advantage of the disturbances, that reigned in the east, broke unexpectedly into the exarchate, made himself master of the castle of Cesena, a place of great strength and importance, and was preparing to lay siege to Ravenna itself. As neither that nor the other cities of the exarchate were any-ways in a condition to withstand so powerful an enemy, and no succors could be sent, or, though sent, could arrive in

—
volution; an account very different from that, which the reader will find in the more modern Greek writers, representing Constantine as acting, on the present occasion, with an unheard of barbarity; as unpeopling the city with executions; as sparing none, but racking, maiming, or putting to the most cruel deaths, all, who were any ways concerned, or only suspected to have been any ways concerned in the revolt. But, as the facts they relate were either utterly unknown to the above-mentioned historians, and other contemporary writers, or looked upon by them as fabulous, we too may well be allowed to look upon them in that, and no other light.

¹ Anast. in Zach.

The exarch and the people apply to the pope; who sends a solemn legation to the king. The pope undertakes a journey to Pavia, to treat in person with the king. Is well received, and obtains of him whatever he asked. Council assembled in Rome, to restore the decayed discipline.

time from the east, Eutychius, at this time exarch, having no other resource, resolved to recur to the pope. And to him was sent accordingly a solemn deputation in the name of the exarch, of John, archbishop of Ravenna, and of all the inhabitants of the exarchate, for they all joined, earnestly entreating his holiness to interpose his good offices, in their behalf, with the king. Zachary, jealous, as his predecessors ever had been, of the growing power of the Lombards; and well apprised, that, should they once become masters of the exarchate, they would be thereby both tempted and enabled to make themselves masters of the city and dukedom of Rome; wanted no entreaties to exert all his credit and interest with the king on such an occasion. He therefore dispatched in great haste, before the king took the field, the bishop Benedict, his major domo, and Ambrose, the chief of the notaries, to represent to him the crying injustice of which he was guilty; and the strict account he must one day give for all the blood, that should be shed in a war, which his ambition had wantonly kindled: but Luitprand, instead of hearkening to their representations, ordered his army, while they were still at Pavia, to assemble in that neighborhood, determined to march at their head, as soon as they were assembled, straight to Ravenna.

Of this the pope was no sooner informed, than, apprehending the whole exarchate, as well as the city of Ravenna, to be in imminent danger of becoming soon a prey to the Lombards, he resolved to repair in person to Pavia, and try a second time what effect his presence might have on the king. He set out accordingly without delay, and, taking Ravenna in his way, he entered that city attended by the exarch, who had gone a whole day's journey to meet him, and by all the nobility, as well as the officers, both civil and military, and amidst the loud acclamations of the people, who looked upon him as their deliverer, and their only refuge in their present distress. From Ravenna he dispatched Stephen, the presbyter, and Ambrose, the chief of the notaries, to acquaint the king with his arrival in that city, and his design of advancing to Pavia to confer with him in person. The king, unwilling to be diverted from his intended expedition, would not hear the legates, nor admit them to his presence: but the pope, who had followed them, arriving in the mean time in the neighborhood, the king sent out all the chief men of his court to receive him, and attend him into the city. The next day, the festival of St. Peter, the pope performed divine service with great solemnity in the church of that apostle, standing without the walls of the city; and returning with the king, who had assisted at

the service, to the palace, he was there, by him magnificently entertained, with all the ecclesiastics who attended him.

The day after, the pope and the king had a private conference; and, in that conference, the king, after having withstood, for a long while, all the reasons, remonstrances, entreaties, of the pope, yielded at last, and was persuaded, post multam duritiam, says Anastasius, not only to conclude a peace with the exarch, and the people of Ravenna, but to restore Cesena, and all the other places he had taken. He attended the pope, at his departure, to the banks of the Po, and there, taking leave of him with the warmest expressions of friendship, appointed some of his chief lords to deliver up to him the places he had seized, and wait on him to the borders of his kingdom.¹ Zachary must surely have been a man of great parts, as well as great eloquence, else he could never thus have persuaded so warlike a prince as Luitprand to lay down his arms, and live in peace, when he had good reason to promise himself the greatest advantages from a war. Baronius² and Pagi³ observe here, after De Marca,⁴ that the preservation of the imperial dominions in Italy was entirely owing to the popes; and consequently, that the loss of those provinces has, by the modern Greek writers, with the utmost injustice been laid to their charge. Indeed, the popes, it must be owned, prevented the Lombards from making themselves masters of the few provinces, that still remained to the empire in Italy; and, in that sense, they may be said to have preserved them: but that they acted for themselves, while they pretended to act for the emperors, that they preserved them for themselves, and not for the emperors, will appear in the sequel.

As several abuses prevailed at this time in the churches of Italy, especially in the churches immediately subject to the Roman see, the two preceding popes having suffered their attention to be entirely engrossed by the dispute about images; Zachary, on his return to Rome, after celebrating anew the festival of St. Peter, and returning public thanks for the success of his negotiations, assembled a council, to restore the decayed discipline, and enforce the observance of the canons. The council met in the church of St. Peter, and consisted of forty bishops, all of Italy, twenty-two presbyters, six deacons, and all the clergy of Rome. By them were issued thirteen canons, most of them tending to restrain the bishops, presbyters, and deacons from all intercourse with women, from suffering any to dwell with them besides their mothers, their sisters, and their nearest relations. How many canons have

¹ Anast. in Zach.

² Bar. ad Ann. 743. p. 156.

³ Anton. Pagi ad Ann. 743. n. 14.

⁴ Marca de Concord. l. 3. c. 11. n. 5.

Zachary receives a letter from Boniface :—[Year of Christ, 744.] The churches of France and Germany disturbed by two impostors :—[Year of Christ, 745.] The errors of Adalbert.

been made for that purpose since celibacy was first introduced! What trouble would not the bishops, the popes, and the councils, have saved themselves—what scandals would they not have prevented, by allowing the clergy to marry! By the same council marriage was declared incestuous, and forbidden on pain of excommunication, between a man and his niece, his step-mother, his brother's widow, his cousin-german,¹ or any nearly related to him; that is, within the seventh degree of consanguinity or affinity.² In the church of Rome such marriages are still deemed incestuous, and are forbidden to the poor, who cannot purchase dispensations; but are free from all incest, and allowed to the rich, who can.

The following year Zachary received a letter from Boniface, charging him, to his great surprise, with simony, in taking money for the palls, which he had, at his request, sent to some of the German bishops. The letter of Boniface has not reached our times, but the pope's answer to it has: and it is observable, that Zachary does not, in his answer, recur to any of the distinctions used by the modern popes and divines, to excuse from simony the receiving of money on such an occasion; but supposing that it was simony to exact or receive any, he denies the charge, and finds fault with Boniface for giving credit to so scandalous a report. "Far be it from us," says he, "to take or exact any thing whatever for the palls we bestow. We neither require, receive, nor even expect any thing for them, but freely give what we have freely received, anathematizing all, who presume to sell the gifts of the Holy Ghost."³ Thus Zachary; and yet the pall, for which it was, in the opinion of this great pope, simony to exact or receive

any thing whatever, is now, and has long been, one of the chief funds of the papal see.¹ We must therefore either allow Zachary to have erred in his notion of simony, or his successors to be notoriously guilty of that crime, or, as he calls it, heresy.

At this time the churches of Germany, which Boniface had founded, and those of France, were greatly disturbed by two notorious impostors and heretics, as Boniface styles them, Adalbert, and Clement, the former a native of France, and the latter of Scotland. Adalbert pretended to have been sanctified in the womb, to have been chosen by God, and sent into the world to reform the manners of mankind, and retrieve them from their wickedness. Having persuaded, or, as Boniface writes to the pope, bribed some bishops to ordain him bishop, he gave out, that God had vested him with greater power than any of the apostles, and raised him to a degree of sanctity above them all; and therefore scorning to consecrate churches to St. Peter, to St. Paul, or to any other apostle or martyr, he consecrated them only to St. Adalbert, that is, to himself. As Boniface had introduced into Germany the worship of relics, Adalbert, to humor the superstition of the populace, pretended to have some of an extraordinary virtue, brought to him by an angel from the most distant parts of the world; nay, and distributed among his followers his own hair, and the parings of his nails, as relics no less worthy of worship than any that were worshiped at the tombs of the apostles. When the people came to confess their sins to him, he would not hear them; saying, they might save themselves the trouble of telling their sins to him, since he knew better than they what sins they were guilty of; nothing being concealed from him, not even their most private thoughts and intentions. He wrote his own life under the following title; "The Life of the holy and blessed Bishop Adalbert, the elect of God;" filled with most absurd, ridiculous, and incredible stories, though none of them more absurd, more ridiculous and incredible, than many we read in the approved legends. In his life he pretended to have received a letter from our Savior, who, he said, had dispatched an angel with it from heaven. He had probably heard of our Savior's letter to Abgarus, king of Edessa, and thought that the one tale might be believed as well as the other. He scorned to pray to saints, looking upon himself as superior to them all; but nevertheless, invoked the angels under the names of Uriel, Raguel, Tubuel, Michael, Incar, Tubicas, Sabaoc, Simiel. He did not continue long in one place, but traveling from town to town, was everywhere followed, notwithstanding the gross absurdities he ad-

¹ Till the time of Theodosius there was no law, civil or ecclesiastical, against the marriage of cousin-germans; but that emperor, by an express law, forbid cousin-germans to marry, on pain of having their goods confiscated, and being themselves burnt alive.—(Cod. Theodos. 1. 3. tit. 10.) His law Arcadius confirmed, but mitigated the punishment, only rendering all intestable, who contracted such marriages, and their children illegitimate.—(Cod. tit. 12. leg. 3.) Not satisfied with mitigating the punishment, he afterwards revoked the law; allowed cousin-germans to marry; forbid any action or accusation to be brought against them, on account of their marriage; and declared their children, whether they themselves were the children of two brothers or two sisters, or of a sister and a brother, legitimate, or lawfully begotten.—(Cod. Justin. 1. 5. tit. 4. leg. 19.) This law Justinian inserted both in his code and his institutions; (Cod. Justin. *ibid.* et Institut. 1. 1. tit. 10.) and thus it became the standing law of the empire. The church however kept, and still keeps, to the antiquated law of Theodosius, in opposition to some of her most eminent teachers, or fathers, declaring such marriages in themselves absolutely lawful.—(Athan. Synops. Scriptur. Lib. Numeror. T. 2. p. 70. et Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 15. c. 16.)

² Till the fourth Lateran council, held under Innocent III., in 1215, marriages were forbidden by the canons, within the seventh degree of affinity, as well as consanguinity. But by that council the prohibition was restrained to the fourth degree.—(Concil. Lateran. 4. Can. 50.)

³ Zach. ep. 5.

¹ See vol. I. p. 430. note (†).

The errors of Clement. Adalbert and Clement condemned in a council held at Rome. Carloman arrives at Rome;—[Year of Christ, 746;]—and there embraces a monastic life;—[Year of Christ, 747.]

vanced, by such multitudes of the seduced populace, that no church being capable of holding them, he was obliged, like the strolling impostors and fanatics of our days, to preach in the fields, and the fields were filled, as Boniface complained in his letter to the pope, while the churches were left quite empty.

As for Clement, he rejected the authority of the canons; understood the Scriptures in a different sense from that in which they were understood by the fathers; maintained, that though he had two children begotten in adultery, yet he was still a true bishop; thought it lawful for a man to marry his brother's widow; taught that Christ, on his descent into hell, delivered all who were detained there, the believers as well as the unbelievers, the worshippers of the true God as well as the worshipers of images; and held several heterodox opinions concerning predestination.¹

Boniface had condemned and deposed both Adalbert and Clement, in a council held under Carloman; nay, and had persuaded that prince to cause them to be apprehended, and closely confined. But of that severity, the populace, ever fond of new doctrines, however absurd, and new preachers, loudly complained; and even threatened Boniface for depriving them of their holy apostle, meaning Adalbert, of their great preacher, of one, whom they themselves had seen work no less stupendous miracles, than any that are said to have been wrought by the apostles. Boniface therefore, thinking they might acquiesce in his judgment, were it confirmed by the pope, dispatched to Rome the presbyter Deneard, with a copy of the acts of his council, and the original pieces, that had been produced against the two impostors, and for which they had both been condemned. Zachary, upon the receipt of those papers, and the letter, which Boniface wrote to him on that occasion, entreating his holiness to confirm the judgment he had given, assembled a council to re-examine the cause. The council consisted of seven bishops, and seventeen presbyters; and by them the judgment of Boniface was approved and confirmed, and the two heretics condemned anew, excommunicated, and anathematized with all their followers. The life of Adalbert, written by himself, the letter which he pretended to have received from our Savior, and a prayer he had composed to the angels mentioned above, were, by the council, declared blasphemous, and condemned to the flames: but the pope relieved them, and ordered them to be lodged in the archives of his church.²

The following year arrived at Rome, with a great retinue, and many rich presents for

the pope and St. Peter, Carloman, the eldest son of Charles Martel, and brother of Pepin. He had governed, with great glory, the kingdom of Austrasia ever since the death of his father, and gained, by several remarkable victories, the reputation of a brave and able commander: but he was, at the same time, a prince of great religion and piety, according to the notion men then entertained of religion and piety; and therefore resolved, when at the height of his glory, to abandon the world, and retire to a monastery, the monastic profession being universally looked upon, not only as of all others the most pleasing to God, but as the only safe and sure way to heaven. Pursuant to that resolution he resigned the dominions he governed to his brother, who, it seems, took no great pains to divert him from so godly a design; and, to the great surprise of all France, retired to Rome, to receive there the monastic habit at the hands of the pope. As he had countenanced and assisted Boniface to the utmost of his power, in the conversion of Germany, most of the nations to which that missionary preached, being subject to France; and had spared no pains to restore, in the dominions he governed, the ecclesiastical discipline entirely neglected, and reform the manners of the monks and the clergy, distinguished, at that time, only by their vices, and more debauched lives, from the laity;¹ the pope received him with most extraordinary marks of respect and esteem, and entertained him in a manner quite suitable to his rank, during the short time he continued at Rome. He had no sooner visited the tombs of the apostles, and the other reputed holy places of that city, than, dismissing his retinue, and putting on the monastic habit, delivered to him with the usual ceremony by the pope, he withdrew to mount Soracte, now mount St. Sylvester, and there built a monastery. But as that place was distant only a few miles from Rome, he soon quitted it to avoid the frequent visits of the French, who came to that city; and retiring, by the advice of the pope, to the more remote monastery of Monte Cassino, spent there the remaining part of his life. He is said to have chosen and discharged, with

¹ He had assembled three councils for that purpose, one in 742, another in 743, and a third in 745, and assisted at them all in person. That of 743, was held at Estines, the palace of the kings of Austrasia, in the neighborhood of Cambrai. Where the other two were held we know not. At these councils Carloman is said to have presided, and Boniface to have held, as legate of the apostolic see, the first place among the bishops. Among the other regulations they made for the reformation of the manners of the clergy, it was ordained by the sixth canon of the first council, that such priests, as were found guilty of fornication, should be whipped to bleeding, should be imprisoned for two years, and, besides, undergo what other penance the bishop should think fit to impose on them; and that the inferior clergy, the monks, and the nuns, *nonna*, if guilty of the same crime, should be thrice whipped in the same manner, and imprisoned for a twelvemonth.

² Epist. Bonifac. 138.

³ Concil. t. 6. p. 1556.

The death and character of Luitprand, king of the Lombards. Rachis chosen in his room. He invades the Roman dukedom, and besieges Perugia;—[Year of Christ, 748.] The pope repairs to his camp.

great cheerfulness, the meanest offices of the monastery, to have even served in the kitchen, to have kept the sheep of the monastery, and to have worked, like a day-laborer, in the garden.¹ Superstition will soon prevail, if men once give way to it, and extinguish, if not withstood in time, all reason, and even common sense. It was no unusual thing, in these superstitious and dark ages, for a king to exchange the royal diadem for the cowl of a monk. Ceolwlf, king of Northumberland, had lately (in 737,) made that exchange, and he was the eighth Anglo-Saxon king that had made it.

In the mean time died Luitprand, king of the Lombards, after he had governed, with great glory, that warlike nation thirty-one years and seven months. The contemporary writers all bestow on him the highest commendations, and paint him as a prince endowed with every good quality becoming a prince. He was a man, says Paulus Diaconus, of great wisdom, sagacity, and religion; formidable in war, but a lover of peace; merciful to delinquents, generous to the poor, free from all pride, an enemy to all ostentation and pomp, chaste, just, moderate in the exercise of his power, beneficent even to his enemies, the father of his people, a wise lawgiver, and, though ignorant of letters, equal in wisdom to the greatest philosophers. He built and endowed a great number of churches and monasteries, and appointed, what no king had done before him, priests, and other ecclesiastics, to sing daily divine service to him in a chapel, which he built for that purpose in his palace.² Thus Paulus Diaconus, who closes his history of the Lombards with the death of this king. Luitprand left the kingdom of the Lombards in a most flourishing condition, and considerably enlarged with the addition of several cities of the Pentapolis, and the greater part of Æmilia, which he seized, improving to his advantage the disturbances that were raised by the pope and the Romans in Italy. He had it in his power, during those disturbances, to have made himself, and almost without opposition, master of all Italy: but hearkening to the exhortations and remonstrances of the popes, he suffered himself, out of the great regard he had for them, though he knew them to be the avowed enemies of the whole Lombard nation, to be diverted from pursuing his conquests, and extending his kingdom.³ Upon his death, Hildebrand, his

grandson, whom he had taken for his partner in the kingdom ever since the year 736, governed alone.¹ But the Lombards, finding him quite unequal to so great a charge, and besides, of a cruel, savage, and intractable temper, deposed him, after a short reign of seven months, and raised Rachis, duke of Friuli, a person highly esteemed for his wisdom, his piety, and experience in war, to the throne in his room.²

Zachary was no sooner informed of the promotion of Rachis, than he sent a solemn legation to the new king, to confirm the twenty years' peace, which his predecessor had granted to him and the Romans. That peace Rachis readily confirmed, out of the great veneration which he had and professed, says Anastasius, for the prince of the apostles. The cause of the pope was now become the cause of the prince of the apostles; and the favors or injuries, done to the pope, were done to the prince of the apostles. However, Rachis had no sooner settled, to his satisfaction, the affairs of his kingdom, than, forgetting the peace he had confirmed, and thinking he might, without offending St. Peter, seize on the territories, that neither belonged to him nor the pope, but to the emperor, he broke suddenly into the dukedom of Rome, made himself master of several strong places there, and advancing to Perugia, laid close siege to that city: but he had been only a few days before it, when news was brought him of the arrival of the pope in that neighborhood, attended by the chief men of his clergy, and of the Roman nobility. For Zachary, leaving Rome upon the first intelligence of that unexpected invasion, had set out in great haste for the king's camp at Perugia, not doubting, as he was well acquainted with the character of that prince, but his presence, his entreaties, exhortations, remonstrances, would have the same effect upon him, as they had had, on two different occasions, upon his warlike predecessor, and work the same change in the one, as they had wrought in the other. And truly, Rachis no sooner heard of his

he was told it had wrought, that it was the true body of that great saint. He therefore caused it to be translated, with great pomp and solemnity, from Sardinia to Pavia, the metropolis of his kingdom, and to be deposited there in a most magnificent church, which he built, at an immense expense, for its reception.—(Bed. l. de Sex Ætat. Paul. Diac. l. 6. c. 48.) The anniversary of that translation is kept to this day; (Martyr. Rom. prid. Kalend. Martii.) and as we read of no other translation, the body is supposed still to remain in the same church, the church of St. Peter, in *calo aureo*, though nobody can tell in what place. The letter, which Baronius produces, containing a distinct account of this translation, is now by all rejected as spurious.—(Vide Pagi ad Ann. 725. n. 11.)

¹ Luitprand being seized that year with a dangerous malady, and thought past recovery, the Lombards, without waiting for his death, proclaimed Hildebrand king. This Luitprand took very much amiss; but yet, upon his recovery, allowed Hildebrand to keep the title of king, and to reign together with him.—(Paul. Diac. l. 6. c. 55.)

² Paul. Diac. l. 9. c. 55. Sigebert. ad Ann. 743.

¹ Continuat. Fredegar. c. 110. Eginard in Annal. ad Ann. 746. Chron. Cassin. l. 1. c. 7.

² Paul. Diac. l. 6. c. 57, 58.

³ The reign of Luitprand is for nothing more remarkable in the annals of the church, than for the discovery and translation of the body of St. Austin, or of a body said and believed to be his. It was discovered in Sardinia; and though nobody knew how, when, or by whom, it was conveyed from Africa to that Island. Luitprand was convinced, by the many miracles which

The pope persuades Rachis to raise the siege, and restore the places he had taken. He resigns his kingdom, and retires to a monastery;—[Year of Christ, 749.] Aistulphus, his brother, chosen in his room. Pepin of France forms the design of seizing on the crown;—[Year of Christ, 752.]

arrival, than, suspending all hostile operations, and interrupting the siege, he detached great part of the army to attend him to the camp, went out, as he approached, in person to receive him, and paid him the same honors he would have paid to St. Peter himself. The pope had brought with him, as Anastasius informs us,¹ many valuable presents; (probably some filings of the chains of St. Peter, the key of his tomb, or the supposed bone of some supposed saint, for these were the valuable presents, which the popes now commonly dealt in,) and having with them gained the good will, and engaged the attention of the king, he represented to him, with such force and energy, the injustice and violence of which he was guilty, in thus making war without the least provocation, in causing the innocent blood of so many Christians to be shed merely to gratify a criminal ambition, and in seizing, by a breach of the peace, which he had solemnly confirmed and sworn to observe, what he knew it was a crime only to covet; he represented, I say, that injustice and violence with such force and energy, that the king, affected beyond all expression with his speech, ordered the siege to be immediately raised, and, confirming anew the twenty years' peace, caused it to be proclaimed at the head of the army. At the same time he gave up the places he had taken, and solemnly renouncing all right to them, left the pope in possession of Perugia, and returned another man, says Leo Ostiensis, to Pavia. He had been there but a very short time, Anastasius says only a few days, when seriously reflecting on the shortness and vanity of all human grandeur, on the many almost irresistible temptations which the pope had represented to him as unavoidably attending the station in which he was placed, and the danger to which his eternal salvation was thereby exposed, he resolved to lay down his crown, which he now looked upon only as a burden, and bidding adieu to the world, and all its allurements, retire to a monastery. This resolution, as he apprehended it would meet with great opposition from his people, who not only loved, but, in a manner, adored him, he imparted to none but to Thesia his queen, and his daughter Ratruda: and with them he set out for Rome, as if he only intended to gratify his curiosity, in seeing that once so famous mistress of the world, and at the same time his devotion in visiting the holy places there, especially the tombs of the apostles. But soon after his arrival in that city, he declared to the Lombard lords who attended him, that he came to Rome with a design to resign the crown; that he resigned it accordingly, and that, the throne being now empty,

they were at liberty to place in it whom they pleased in his room. The Lombard lords, greatly surprised, and no less concerned at so sudden and unexpected a resolution, alleged all the motives, to divert the king from it, that their zeal for the welfare of their country could suggest. But he persisted in his resolution, received the monastic habit from the pope, and retired, as soon as he received it, to Monte Cassino, whither Charoloman had retired but two years before.¹ Some years after his zeal cooled, as we shall see, and he would have resumed the crown as willingly as he resigned it, notwithstanding the many temptations and dangers to which it exposed him. But he found, when it was too late, that it is not so easy a thing to recover a crown as to quit it. Upon his resignation, his wife and his daughter, who had attended him to Rome, attended him from thence to Monte Cassino; and there, following his example, retired into a monastery of virgins, built and richly endowed by them in that neighborhood.²

The Lombards were no sooner informed of the resignation of Rachis, than, assembling in Pavia, they chose his brother Aistulphus, or Astulphus, in his room, a man of a warlike genius, and one, who delighted in nothing so much as in war. His promotion gave no small uneasiness to the pope and the Romans; but nevertheless Zachary took care, upon the first notice he had of it, to congratulate the new king, by a solemn legation, in his own name, and in the name of the Romans, the peculiar people of the prince of the apostles, on his being raised by the suffrages of his people, to the high station, of which his eminent virtues had rendered him of all the most worthy. The legates were well received by the king, who, at their request, confirmed the peace which his two immediate predecessors had granted; but observed it, as we shall see, a very short time.

Of Zachary nothing else occurs in history worthy of notice, till the year 752, a year memorable in the annals of France for the revolution, that happened then in that kingdom; and no less memorable in the annals of the Roman church for the part, that Zachary acted on that occasion, and the advantages, that accrued, from the part he acted, to his successors (for he did not live to enjoy them himself,) and his see. Of this revolution the contemporary historians give us the following account. Pepin, the son of the famous Charles Martel, governed, at this time, the whole French monarchy under Childeric III. with an absolute power, but only with the title of mayor of the palace. With that title, or the titles of majordomos,

¹ Anast. in Zach. Leo Ostien. in Chron. Casin. c. 8. Sigebert in Chron.

² Leo Ostien. Anast. *ibid.*

¹ Anast. in Zach.

Pepin imparts his design to the pope, who approves it. He is chosen king in the assembly of the states. Childeric deposed, and confined to a monastery.

of dukes, or princes of the French, or viceroy, his family had exercised, for almost a whole century, the sovereign power; leaving nothing to the kings, whom they took care to divert, with all manner of pleasures, from attending to the affairs of their kingdom, beside the bare name of kings. But the ambition of Pepin was not satisfied with the power alone. He was still a subject; and, as such, still acted with a borrowed power; nay, with a power, that was, however king-like, only precarious, so long as disjoined from the title of king. Being therefore become, by the resignation of his brother, sole mayor of the palace, and regent of the kingdom, without either a rival or a partner in the power, he began to think of adding the title to the power; of settling the one in his own family, as well as the other; and being in name what he already was in effect. As most of the leading men, in the church as well as the state, were his creatures, and owed their rank and preferments to him, or his family, he did not doubt but they would readily concur with him in all his measures. But the people, the far greater part of the nation, were still zealously attached to the family on the throne, the family of the great Clovis, the founder of their monarchy; and had shown on several occasions, that they thought themselves bound, in justice and conscience, to maintain his posterity, however degenerate, in the possession of a title, which they had so long enjoyed (for the space of near three hundred years,) and they alone had a right to enjoy. This Pepin well knew; and therefore, not thinking it advisable to attempt the execution of his design till the minds of the people were, in some degree, reconciled to it; till their consciences were quieted, and their scruples removed; he resolved to apply, for that purpose to the pope, and get his intended usurpation approved and recommended by him.

As the pope stood, at this time, in great need of a powerful protector against the warlike king of the Lombards, who he knew would not long observe the peace he had made, Pepin did not at all doubt but his holiness would approve his design; nay, and embrace, with great joy, so favorable an opportunity of earning the protection of one, who alone was powerful enough to protect him. He therefore dispatched to Rome, Burchard, bishop of Wirtzburg, and his first chaplain Fulrad, abbot of St. Denys, to propose the following question to the pope, and desire his holiness, in his name, to resolve it; namely, "Who best deserved to be styled king; he, who was possessed of the power, or he, who was only possessed of the title?" The crafty pope well understood the true meaning of that question; and therefore solved it, we may be sure, in favor of Pepin, declaring that, "in his opinion, he ought rather

to be styled king, who possessed the power, than he who possessed only the title."

With this answer the deputies no sooner arrived in France, than Pepin, finding it entirely agreeable to his expectation and wishes, assembled, according to annual custom, the states of the realm in the city of Soissons. As the greater part of the members, who composed that assembly, were his creatures, and had by him been made privy to his design, they took occasion, from the happy state of the nation, and the many blessings they enjoyed under the mild administration of Pepin, to extol his many eminent virtues, and extraordinary qualifications, his wisdom, his courage, his application to business, his zeal for the public welfare, and the indefatigable pains he had taken to procure the happiness of the people, and enhance the fame and glory of the nation. While some thus magnified the many good qualities of Pepin, others took care to exaggerate, as it were by way of contrast, the opposite qualities of the unhappy Childeric; his sloth and indolence, his love of pleasures, his cowardice, his aversion to business, his weakness, and total want of every qualification that was necessary to direct in council, or head in the field so great and warlike a nation. They added, that the only means of ensuring to themselves the many invaluable blessings they enjoyed, and for which they were indebted to Pepin alone, was to ensure to him the power, that had enabled him to procure them, by adding to it the title of king; that as it was not fit that the royal title should be separated from the power, nor the royal power from the title, they were now to determine which was most for the advantage of the nation, that the power should be united to the title in Childeric, or the title to the power in Pepin. Here they urged the opinion of the pope, whom, they said, they had consulted, as they thought it their duty, in an affair of such moment; and his holiness had not only approved, but recommended to the assembly, the proposal they now made, as in the present circumstances, absolutely necessary for the safety and welfare both of the church and the state.

They had scarce done speaking, when the other friends of Pepin, who were privy to the secret, lifting him up on a shield, according to the ancient custom of the nation, proclaimed him king; and not allowing the rest time to deliberate, acknowledged him, with loud acclamations, for their lord and their sovereign. In the whole assembly not one was found who had the courage to espouse the cause of the unhappy Childeric, or to utter a single word in his favor. He was, it seems, kept quite ignorant of what was transacting, till notice was brought him, that he was no longer king; that another

What share the pope had in that revolution. The French consulted him only as a divine; and he acted no other part.

was placed on the throne in his room; and that he must take the monkish habit, and spend the rest of his life in a monastery. He was accordingly immediately conducted to the monastery of Sithieu, now the abbey of St. Bertin, where he died, about four years after, probably of grief. From history it appears that he had a son, named Theodoric; but he too, to make room for Pepin, was excluded from the throne, though nothing was, nor could be alleged, to justify such an exclusion, and confined, as well as his father, for life to a monastery.¹

Such, in the main, is the account the contemporary historians give us of that famous revolution, and of the share pope Zachary had in it. They disagree, indeed, in some particulars; but in this they all agree to a man; namely, that the two deputies, Burchard and Fulrad, were sent to Rome (whether by the assembly of the states, as some write, or by Pepin, as others will have it, before the assembly of the states was convened, it matters little,) only "to consult pope Zachary,² to know his opinions,³ to beg he would declare what he thought should be done;⁴ to advise with him whether Childeric should be suffered to continue on the throne, or Pepin should be raised to it in his room?"⁵ From these testimonies, and to them many more might be added,⁶ it is manifest that the French, in transferring the monarchy from the Merovingian to the Carolingian line, had recourse to the pope only as a divine, or a casuist; that the only part he was required to act, whatever part he may have acted, was that of a divine, no other than what any divine, whom they had been pleased to consult, might have acted. I say, whatever part he may have acted; for, by several historians he is said not only to have advised, but to have commanded the French by his apostolic authority, by the authority of St. Peter, to depose Childeric, and choose Pepin in his room; and by the same writers Pepin is said to have been raised to the throne by the command, by the authority, by a decree of pope Zachary.⁷ These, and such-like expressions of the contemporary writers, which Bellarmine has taken a great deal of pains to collect,⁸ have given occasion to the popish historians to ascribe to the pope the transferring of the French monarchy from one family to the other, and supplied, at the same time, the popish divines

with what Bellarmine thinks an unanswerable argument in favor of the power which he vests in the pope over temporal princes and kingdoms. But, in the first place, we may well suppose those historians to have meant nothing else by the command, authority, and decree, of the pope, but his approbation, advice, or opinion; since Pepin asked nothing else, even according to them, of the pope; and what is said by those, whom Bellarmine quotes, to have been done by the authority of the pope, is said by others (which it was not Bellarmine's business to take notice of,) to have been done by his advice, or with his approbation.¹ Indeed nothing is more common than to ascribe the doing of a thing to the person, by whose advice, and with whose approbation, it was done. "Zachary," says John of Paris, "deposed Childeric; that is, concurred, by his advice, with them who deposed him. II. From the conduct of the French on this occasion, it is evident, that they were yet, notwithstanding their long and, at this time, we may say, daily intercourse with Rome, utterly unacquainted with the boasted power of the popes over kings and their kingdoms. For who can believe that, if they had had the least notion of such a power, they would have contented themselves, as they certainly did, with only begging Zachary to deliver his opinion, whether Pepin or Childeric best deserved the title of king, and not rather desired him at once to take the kingdom from the one, and give it to the other? Should we therefore even allow Zachary, not satisfied with acting, on so remarkable an occasion, the humble part of a divine, to have interposed his authority, to have not only advised, but commanded the French to depose Childeric, and choose Pepin in his room, and to have issued a decree for that purpose; yet Childeric could not be properly said to have been deposed, nor Pepin to have been chosen by the authority of the pope; since they, by whom the one was deposed, and the other was chosen, were altogether strangers to such an authority. III. In the diet or assembly of the states, that was convened upon the return of the ambassadors from Rome, was urged indeed by the friends of Pepin, the opinion or approbation of the pope; but not the least mention was made, or notice was taken, of any command or decree. A plain proof that no such decree or command was issued by the pope; or, if it was, that no account was made of it by the French; and either sufficiently shows that it was not by the command, by the authority, by a decree of the pope that Childeric was deposed, and Pepin was made king in his room. To conclude, from the account the contemporary histo-

¹ Iperius in Chron. Sithiu. Chron. Fontenel. Duchesn. Script. Hist. Franc. l. 1. Fredegar. Continuat. c. 117.

² Blond. Flav. l. 10. Decad. 1.

³ Regin. Prum. Chron. l. 2. ad Ann. Incar. 749.

⁴ Marian. Scot. Chronic. l. 3. c. 750.

⁵ Ado Viennens. Chron. Etat. 62.

⁶ Vide Dupin. de antiqua Eccles. Discipl. Dissert. 7. p. 513. & seq.

⁷ Annal. Franc. Eginard in vit. Carol. Mag. Regn. Chron. l. 2. Marian. Scot. Chron. l. 3. Aimon. de Gest. Franc. l. 4. Sigebert Chron. ad Ann. 752. Herman. Contract. Chron. &c.

⁸ Bellar. de Translat. Imp. Rom. l. 2. c. 2.

¹ Blond. Flavius Decad. l. 1. 10. Ado Vienn. ubi supra.

The pope's answer to the French consulting him, highly absurd. Zachary dies, and is canonized.

rians give us of this revolution, it plainly appears, that it was not in truth to know of the pope, whether the design, that Pepin had formed, of seizing on the crown, was or was not agreeable to the rules of justice and conscience, rules little regarded where ambition prevails, that the French, or rather that Pepin sent to consult him; but only to engage Zachary in his cause, and render the attempt he meditated less odious, by that means, in the eyes of the nation. In short it was, as F. Daniel expresses it, to remove the scruples of the people, to surprise them into his measures, to impose upon them, and blind them, that Pepin had recourse to the pope.¹

I shall not examine here whether the advice given by the pope was right or not. Whether he has been justly or unjustly charged by Calvin,² and the Magdeburgenses,³ with prostituting his conscience to the interest of his see; but only observe, that Childeric had, by his birth, an unquestionable right both to the power and the title of king; and that Pepin, though actually possessed of the power, had no kind of right to it, no more than any other man in the kingdom would have had, who had been ambitious enough to have usurped it; so that the answer or opinion of the pope, namely, "that he deserved to be styled king, who was possessed of the power, and not he who was only possessed of the title," was, in effect, in the present circumstances, that the king had forfeited all right to the title of king, because another had usurped the power; and that he who had usurped the power, had thereby acquired a right to the title. As to the sloth, indolence, love of pleasures, and neglect of all public affairs, both ecclesiastic and civil, which the later kings of the Merovingian race are charged with by the contemporary historians, all partial to Pepin and his family, it is well known, that they were entirely owing to the mayors of the palace, who, having gained the ascendant over those unhappy princes, kept them shut up in their royal villas quite ignorant of all public affairs, suffered none to approach them who could give them the least information, and only took care to supply them with all manner of pleasures, to divert them, by that means, from attempting to recover their ancient authority. To judge them therefore unworthy of the crown on account of their pretended sloth, indolence, love of pleasures, &c. was judging them unworthy of the crown for faults, which it was not in their power to prevent; for minding only their pleasures, when they were not suffered to mind any thing else; and for not attending, as they ought, to the affairs of the state, when they were not allowed to attend to them at all, nor to concern themselves any-

ways with them. They had indeed degenerated, as the writers of those times take care to observe, from the worth of their ancestors; but that too was chiefly, if not wholly, owing to their wicked ministers indulging them in sloth, in idleness, in all kinds of pleasures, with a design to enervate their minds, and render them incapable, by that means, of emancipating themselves, or obliging them to part with their ill-gotten power. Sigonius, though a great friend to the popes, could not help thinking that Zachary, in advising, or, as he will have it, in commanding Childeric to be deposed, and Pepin to be chosen king in his room, betrayed a greater regard for the interest of his see than was consistent with the laws of true religion and piety; and that, by his sacred authority, he made just and lawful what would have been otherwise unjust and unlawful.¹ F. Daniel bestows, and very deservedly, the greatest commendations on Pepin; but, at the same time, owns him, in the softest terms indeed he could have used, to have been an usurper.² If he was an usurper, what was Zachary, who approved of his usurpation, and seconded him, in so unjust an attempt, with all the authority of his see?³

Zachary did not live to reap any advantage himself from his partiality to Pepin, nay, scarce to congratulate him on his promotion; for Pepin was chosen and proclaimed king in the assembly of the states convened at Soissons on the first of March, according to custom; and the pope died on the 14th of the same month, having presided in the Roman church ten years three months and fourteen days.⁴ He is commonly reckoned amongst the greatest popes; and indeed his whole conduct bespeaks him a man of uncommon parts, of great penetration, resolution, and address. But why he should have been allowed a place amongst the canonized popes, I know not, unless it were, as it probably was, for his having earned, in the manner we have seen, the protection and favor of Pepin, to whose protection and favor was owing, as will appear in the sequel, the temporal grandeur of the popes and their see. As the successors of Zachary were therefore, in great measure, indebted to him for the rank of princes, to which we shall soon see them raised, they could not do less than to place him among the saints of heaven, who had procured a place for

¹ Sigon. de regn. Ital. l. 4.

² Daniel ubi supra, p. 510. & 550.

³ Calvin compares Pepin and Zachary to two robbers dividing the booty between them; Pepin helping Zachary to the spiritual, and Zachary, Pepin to the temporal power.—(Calvin. l. 4. c. 7. n. 17.) Indeed Zachary contended, to the utmost of his apostolic power, the usurpation of Pepin; and Pepin, in his turn, encouraged Boniface to exercise, under the character of the pope's legate, an authority unknown, till his time, in the Gallican church.

⁴ Anast. in Zach.

¹ Daniel Hist. de Franc. l. 1. c. 1. p. 510.

² Calvin. l. 4. c. 7. n. 17. ³ Magdeb. Centur. 8. c. 10.

The writings of Zachary. His answer to Boniface concerning the sacrament of baptism ungrammatically administered. Not easily reconciled with the present doctrine of the church of Rome. Virgilius ignorantly charged by Boniface with teaching a plurality of worlds. The pope orders him to be deposed, if guilty of teaching such a doctrine.

them among the princes of the earth ; and probably procured it at the expense of his conscience.

Besides the letters of Zachary already taken notice of, several others have reached our times ; most of them answers to the doubts of Boniface, concerning the functions of his ministry, or points of discipline. One among the rest he wrote to that missionary in 744, on the following occasion. Boniface, desirous of bringing the churches he had founded in Germany to an entire uniformity with the Roman church, had not only introduced amongst the Germans all the Romish ceremonies, but together with them the use of the Latin tongue in the service. As that language was not then understood in Germany by the priests themselves, a priest in Bavaria had administered the sacrament of baptism in the following words ; " baptizo in nomine Patria, et Filia, et Spiritua Sancta." This gave occasion to a warm dispute between Boniface and two of his disciples, Virgilius and Sidonius ; Boniface maintaining, that the sacrament thus administered was not valid ; and his two disciples, that it was. Virgilius, who was, it seems, a man of some learning, strove to convince Boniface, that the ignorance of the minister, or a solecism in the language, could by no means affect a sacrament, or prevent its operation. But the apostle of Germany was not a man to be convinced by, or to yield to, one of his disciples ; and therefore, instead of hearkening to the arguments and reasons of Virgilius, he was for re-baptizing all whom the ignorant priest had baptized against the rules of the grammar. Hereupon Virgilius, despairing of being able to overcome his obstinacy by any other means, resolved to propose the question to the pope, who, he was well apprised, would decide it in his favor, and whose judgment he knew Boniface would not presume to contradict. He proposed it accordingly ; and the answer of the pope was, that if the priest had administered baptism in the words mentioned above out of ignorance of the Latin tongue, and not with a design to introduce a new heresy, the sacrament thus administered was good and valid ; and that such as had been thus baptized, should by no means be baptized anew, but be only purified by the imposition of hands.¹ As of this dispute no further mention is made, it is not at all to be doubted but that Boniface acquiesced without reply in the decision of the pope. However, it would, perhaps, puzzle Baronius himself to reconcile that decision, that " divine oracle," as he styles it, " of the apostolic see," with the present doctrine of that church. The pope, in his answer, declared baptism, though ungram-

matically administered, to be valid, provided he who administered it, erred not against the faith, but only against the grammar ; which evidently implies, that if he had erred against the faith, his baptism would not, in that case, have been valid. But that no heresy in the minister, nor even atheism, can invalidate the sacrament of baptism, that baptism is no more to be reiterated when conferred by a Jew, by a Gentile, by an atheist, than when conferred by the pope himself, provided it be conferred in the name of the Trinity, is now an established doctrine in the church of Rome, and the contrary opinion a damnable heresy.

Boniface acquiesced, as we have seen, in the judgment of the pope ; but bearing thenceforth a secret grudge to Virgilius, and jealous of the growing reputation of his disciple, which he apprehended might eclipse his own, he laid hold of the following opportunity, the first that offered, of being revenged on him, and discrediting him in the opinion of the pope. Virgilius had asserted, on what occasion we are not told, that the figure of the earth was globular ; that it was inhabited all round ; and that the parts of it diametrically opposite to each other had, in like manner, their inhabitants diametrically opposite to each other. This Boniface could not comprehend ; and therefore concluding, as he had no notion of the figure of the earth, or the antipodes, that Virgilius could have meant nothing else by his strange assertion, but that there was another world under this, inhabited by other men, and enlightened by another sun and another moon, it appearing impossible to him that the same sun and moon should enlighten this and another world under it, he wrote to the pope, charging Virgilius, as if he actually believed, and had actually taught, a plurality of worlds. This Zachary looked upon as a dangerous heresy ; as from thence it would follow, that all men were not descended from Adam, that all men had not sinned in Adam, that Christ did not die for all men, &c., which appeared to the pope plainly repugnant to the holy Scriptures. He therefore no sooner received the letter of Boniface, than apprehending the authority of the sacred books, and with it the whole of the Christian religion, to be at stake, he wrote, without loss of time, to his most reverend brother, and fellow-bishop, as he styled Boniface, commanding him to assemble a council forthwith, to make a strict search, together with his fellow bishops, into the life and doctrine of Virgilius ; and, if he should be found to have taught such an execrable heresy against God, and his own soul, and did not publicly adjure it, to degrade him, and cut him off, as a rotten member, from the body of the faithful. The

¹ Zach. Ep. 6. et vii. Bonif. l. 2. c. 3.

The conduct of Boniface on this occasion, inexcusable. Virgilius not condemned for asserting the antipodes. Mentz made the metropolitan see of Boniface, with an extensive jurisdiction. Zachary's public works. A great treasure discovered at Rome in his time. Stephen II. chosen, but dies before his ordination.

pope wrote, at the same time, two other letters; one to Odilo, or Otilo, duke of Bavaria, entreating him, as he tendered the welfare of his people, to send the presbyter Virgilius to Rome, charged with teaching in his dominions strange and antichristian doctrines; and another to Virgilius himself, summoning him to clear himself at the tribunal of the apostolic see, from the heresy, with which he was charged.¹ Thus much we learn from Zachary's answer to the letter of Boniface. But what was the issue of that affair, we are no where told. However, as Virgilius continued to preach, and indeed with great success, the Gospel, in Bavaria and Carinthia, and was, some years after preferred to the see of Saltzburgh, nay, and is now honored by the church of Rome as a saint, it is not at all to be doubted but that he cleared himself from all suspicion of heresy, to the full satisfaction of the pope, and the great mortification and confusion of his ignorant rival and accuser.

Some, to excuse the ignorance of Boniface, tell us, that the sentiments of Virgilius were misrepresented to him; and that it was upon the false reports of ignorant people, who did not understand them, that he condemned them;² not aware, that while they thus excuse his ignorance, which, after all, was no crime, they make him guilty of a crime altogether inexcusable, that of arraigning of heresy at the tribunal of the pope, of discrediting, and bringing into great trouble, an apostolic man, his disciple and fellow laborer, and that upon the false reports of ignorant people, without inquiring whether they were false or not, or allowing the person thus accused an opportunity of vindicating his character. Was that acting like an apostle? Zachary, I know, is commonly said, by the protestant writers, to have persecuted Virgilius for asserting the antipodes; and that they frequently allege, as an instance of the gross ignorance of that pope, and the age he lived in.³ But that he was persecuted, not for asserting the antipodes, but because he was charged, through the ignorance of

Boniface, with holding, that under this there was another world, another sun and moon; an hypothesis very different from that of the antipodes, sufficiently appears from what has been said.

Zachary approved, the year before he died, the choice, which Pepin had made of the city of Mentz for the metropolitan see of Boniface, and his successors; subjecting to that new metropolis the city of Tongress, Cologne, Worms, Spire, and Utrecht, with all the bishoprics which Boniface had erected, and those that had, till that time, been subject to the see of Worms; namely, the sees of Strasburgh, Ausburgh, Burburgh, Erford, Eichstat, Constance, and Coire.¹ Thus was the jurisdiction of the see of Mentz extended, in favor of Boniface, over all Germany; but, a few years after, the cities of Tongress and Cologne, and, in process of time, several others, were exempted from all subjection to that metropolis.

Zachary is said by Anastasius to have built, repaired, and adorned, several churches and oratories; to have been more generous than most of his predecessors to the clergy, and the poor; to have embellished the city with divers stately buildings; and to have been no less beloved by the laity of Rome, than he was by the clergy.² The same writer tells us of a great treasure discovered in the time of this pope at Rome; namely, the head of the famous champion and martyr St. George, who fought and killed the dragon. As the Greek inscription on the shrine, in which the venerable skull was inclosed, left no room to question its authenticity, the pope, transported with joy at the discovery of so authentic and valuable a relic, assembled immediately the people and the clergy, and, with great pomp and solemnity, translated it from the place in which it was found, to the church of St. George ad Velum Aureum; where it long continued to attract the veneration of the whole city, by the many stupendous miracles which it daily wrought.³

STEPHEN II., NINETY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, LEO.—AISTULPHUS, DESIDERIUS, *kings of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 752.] In the room of Zachary was chosen, a few days after his decease, a presbyter named Stephen; but as he did not live to be ordained, (for he died of an apoplexy the fourth day after his elec-

tion,) he has not been reckoned by the more ancient writers in the number of the popes; and therefore the following pope, who bore the same name, is called by them Stephen II., another pope of that name having been

¹ Zach. Ep. 12. ² Marc. Valser. rer. Boic. l. 5.
³ Kepler. Ep. ante lib. 4. Epitom. Origan. Ep. ad Elect. Brandenb. &c.

¹ Zach. Ep. 13. apud Othlon.

² Anast. in Zach.

³ Idem ibid.

Stephen II. counted by the moderns, but not by the ancients, among the popes. The pope formerly not thought true pope till ordained. Another Stephen chosen in the room of the former. He the first who was carried, as they all are now, on men's shoulders. Stephen gets the peace with Aistulphus, king of the Lombards, confirmed;—[Year of Christ, 753.] Aistulphus breaks suddenly into the exarchate.

raised to the see in 253.¹ However, the more modern writers, to establish this point, that the pope receives all his authority from his election alone, have allowed to this presbyter a place in the catalogue of the popes; altering, by that means, the number of the subsequent Stephens, and calling the second in the ancient catalogues the third in theirs; the third the fourth; and so the rest to the ninth, whom they count the tenth; which has occasioned a great disagreement between the ancients and the moderns, and no small confusion in the history of the popes. But that the person elected was not true pope till ordained; that his election gave him no kind of authority; that he had no right to issue bulls before his ordination; are truths, that, for the space of a thousand years and upwards, were never once called in question. In the year 1059, pope Nicholas II. issued a decree, declaring, that if the ordination of the person elected should, by war, or any other means, be prevented, he might, nevertheless, exercise his authority, as true and lawful pope, in governing the Roman church, and disposing of the goods of the holy see:² a plain proof that it was then thought he could not exercise such an authority, or at least disputed whether he could or not. And it was, two hundred and fifty years after the time of Nicholas II., still disputed whether the pope had a right to issue bulls before his ordination. But to that dispute Clement V. soon put an end; for with him the right was contested; forbidding, on pain of excommunication, by a bull issued for that purpose in 1306, any such question to be brought into debate.³ But, notwithstanding that prohibition, Stephen, who died before his ordination, was excluded out of the number of the popes, and the Stephen, who was chosen in his room, called Stephen II. in all the catalogues of the popes, from the time of Clement to the beginning of the seventeenth century; when Stephen, though never ordained, and consequently no bishop, was first honored by Onuphrius Panvinius, a writer wholly devoted to the see of Rome, with a place among the Roman bishops. Panvinius has been followed by all, who have written since his time; and it is at present, a settled point in the church of Rome, which no man dares to call in question, though contrary to the opinion of all antiquity, that Stephen, though never ordained, was a true pope; and, consequently, that the pope receives all papal power and authority from his election alone. I shall, however, adhere to the more ancient writers, and call, with them, the succeeding pope Stephen the second of that name.

He was a native of Rome, and the son of one Constantine; but his father dying while he was yet very young, and he being left, by his death, quite destitute, the popes charged themselves with the care of his education, and brought him up in the Lateran palace. He entered himself very early among the clergy; and having discharged all the inferior offices with great reputation, he was preferred to the dignity of deacon of the Roman church; and from that station raised, upon the death of Stephen, the presbyter elect, with one consent by the people and the clergy, to the see.¹ The new pope was chosen in the church of St. Mary ad Præsepe, now Santa Maria Maggiore, and carried from thence, on men's shoulders, to the Lateran. And this is the first instance, as has been observed by Polydore Virgil, that appears of this ceremony in the history of the popes, or rather of this kind of pageantry, so contrary to the humility of Christ and his apostles.

As temporal affairs, and the preserving of the imperial dominions in Italy for the emperors, as they pretended, but in truth for themselves, had now engrossed the whole attention of the popes, the first care of the new pontiff was to get the peace confirmed, which Aistulphus had lately granted to his predecessor Zachary. With that view he dispatched, soon after his ordination, his brother Paul, and Ambrose the primicerius, or chief of the notaries, with rich presents to the king of the Lombards; who received the legates with the greatest marks of respect and esteem; and not only ratified the peace he had granted to the late pope, but extended it to forty years more. This he did with no other view but to divert the pope, by that means, from thwarting the design he had upon the exarchate, which he was resolved to invade; the emperor Constantine being engaged, at this time, in war with the Saracens, and all Asia and Greece miserably wasted by a dreadful plague. The warlike king, therefore, not to let pass unimproved so favorable an opportunity of enlarging his dominions at the expense of the empire, had no sooner concluded a peace with the pope and the Romans, than, breaking unexpectedly into the exarchate, he marched straight to the city of Ravenna, and closely besieged it. Eutychius, at this time exarch, defended the place for some time

¹ He was ordained when the see had been vacant, according to Anastasius, twelve days, (Anast. in Steph. II.) and, consequently, on the 26th of March, which, in the year 752, fell on a Sunday. For that Anastasius reckoned those twelve days from the death of Zachary, which happened on the 14th of March, and did not therefore acknowledge Stephen the presbyter for true pope, is manifest from his allotting five years and twenty-nine days to the pontificate of pope Stephen, who died, according to him on the 29th of April, 757.

¹ See vol. I. p. 20.

² Apud Gratian. Dist. 23. Canon. in *Nomine Domini*.

³ Extravagant. Common. l. 5. c. 4. tit. 10.

Aistulphus reduces Ravenna, and the Pentapolis. An end of the exarchate. The king summons the Romans to submit to him. Marches towards Rome. The pope sends two abbots to treat with him. The king orders them to return to their monasteries. The emperor sends an ambassador to the king, who will hearken to no terms; but, to amuse the emperor, sends an ambassador to the imperial court.

with great resolution and intrepidity; but finding his men quite tired out, as the garrison was but small, by the repeated attacks of the enemy, and despairing of relief, he abandoned it at last, and returned, carrying with him what men and effects he could, by sea to Constantinople. Aistulphus, become thus master of the metropolis of the exarchate, reduced, almost without opposition, the other cities, and all the Pentapolis, which he added to his kingdom; and raised, by that addition, the power of the Lombards to the highest pitch it had yet attained to since the time they first entered Italy.¹ Thus ended the exarchate of Ravenna, and, with the exarchate, the splendor of that ancient city; which had been, ever since the time of Valentinian, the seat of the emperors of the west, as it was afterwards of the Gothic kings, and, upon their expulsion, of the exarchs, who, residing there, had, for the space of one hundred and eighty-seven years, maintained the power and authority of the emperors in the west. It is now, as are all the once famous cities, that have had the misfortune to fall under a priestly government, reduced to a most deplorable condition; and scarce are the vestiges left of its ancient grandeur.

Aistulphus, now master of the exarchate, thought he had a just title to all the places depending on it, and, among the rest, to the Roman dukedom, and to Rome itself. He therefore dispatched a messenger to that city, requiring the inhabitants to acknowledge him for their sovereign; alleging, that the exarchate, which was his by right of conquest, gave him all the power the exarchs had over Rome, and the other cities, that were subject to them in Italy. At the same time he marched his army towards Rome; and having taken Narnia, then a place of great strength, in the Roman dukedom, he dispatched from thence a second messenger to Rome, threatening to plunder the city, and put all the inhabitants, without distinction, to the sword, if they did not acknowledge him for their lord and master, and solemnly engage to pay yearly to him, as such, a solidus of gold a head. This message from the king, who was then encamped with his whole army at Narni, but twenty-eight miles from Rome, threw the whole city into the utmost confusion, and they expected hourly to see him with all his forces at their gates. The citizens all flew to arms, resolved to die on the walls rather than to submit, or be thought capable of submitting tamely, to so heavy and shameful a tribute. The pope, to gain time, instead of returning, as the king had required him, a positive answer to his demand, sent a solemn legation to him; at the head of

which were the abbots of the two famous monasteries of Monte Cassino and St. Vincent; charging them to put him in mind of the peace he had but very lately concluded with the Romans, and endeavor to persuade him, by all the reasons and arguments their zeal for the honor of St. Peter could suggest, to observe the promise he had made to that apostle, and solemnly sworn to observe. The king admitted the abbots to his presence; but it was only to reproach them for concerning themselves with worldly affairs, after they had renounced the world, and command them to repair, without returning any answer to those, who had sent them on such an errand, straight to their monasteries; and there only mind their prayers and devotions. They had brought rich presents with them for the king; but he would not receive them, nor so much as see them.

The pope had, upon the first irruption of the Lombards into the exarchate, acquainted the emperor therewith. But Constantine, who had already gained great advantages over the Saracens, had recovered from them most of the cities of Syria, Armenia, and Assyria, and was, at this very time, carrying on his conquests with surprising success beyond the Euphrates, loth to weaken his victorious army, contented himself, for the present, with sending John, one of his chief officers, into Italy, with the character of his ambassador to the king of the Lombards. John arrived at Rome soon after the unsuccessful legation of the two abbots, and brought with him letters from the emperor to the pope; commanding him (*deferens pontifici jussionem*) to act in concert with his ambassador, and persuade the king to send a minister to Constantinople, to treat there of an accommodation between the Lombards and empire; and to forbear, in the mean time, all hostilities. The pope, in obedience to that command, sent his brother Paul with the emperor's minister to Ravenna; where the king received and treated them with great politeness, and even consented to send an ambassador to the imperial city; but could by no means be prevailed upon to restore any of the places he had taken, or agree to a cessation of arms during the negotiations. From Ravenna the imperial minister returned to Rome with the king's ambassador; and from Rome both repaired to Constantinople, with a nuncio sent by the pope to assure the emperor that the king of the Lombards only amused him; that he would agree to no terms; and that if a powerful army were not sent forthwith into Italy, Rome, and the poor remains of the Roman empire in that country, would be, in a very short time, irreparably lost.¹

Soon after the departure of the ambassa-

¹ Anast. in Steph. II.

² Anast. in Steph. II.

The king enters the Roman dukedom, and blocks up Rome itself. The pope recurs to prayers, processions, litanies, &c.; but with better success to Pepin and the French nation. His letter to Pepin. Pepin assures him of his protection. He resolves to retire to France. Pepin, acquainted with his design, sends two persons of distinction to attend him. The pope commanded by the emperor to repair in person to the court of Aistulphus.

dors, the king sent a third messenger to the pope and the Romans; peremptorily requiring them to pay the same homage to him, as he was now master of Ravenna, which they had paid to the emperor while he was master of that city. This request the Romans rejected with great indignation; and the king thereupon declaring, that he looked both upon them, and the pope, as rebels, entered, in great wrath, the Roman dukedom, took several cities by storm, laid waste the country with fire and sword, carried off the inhabitants, and, by the reduction of the castles in the neighborhood of Rome, blocked up the city on all sides. In this distress the pope, to keep the spirited people from sinking into despair, took care to amuse them with public prayers, litanies, processions, &c. assuring them that heaven would, in the end, interpose in their behalf. In one of these processions the whole Roman people, the clergy, and the pope himself, walked barefoot with ashes on their heads. The pope carried on his shoulders an image of our Savior, that was not made with men's hands, but had, like the image of Pallas in old Troy, or that of the great Diana of the Ephesians, fallen down from heaven. At the head of the procession was carried a cross with the treaty of peace fixed on the top of it, which the king of the Lombards had lately concluded with the pope and the Roman people.¹

Besides this, other processions were daily made to one church or another; and in them were carried images of the virgin Mary, of the apostles saint Peter and saint Paul, and of many other saints. But the saints appearing all alike deaf to the prayers of the distressed people, as deaf as their images, the pope, despairing of relief from them, resolved to apply to one, who he flattered himself would, if the saints would not, hear him. Pope Zachary had, as we have seen, countenanced, so far as in him lay, the usurpation of Pepin; and thereby not a little contributed to the settling of the crown of France upon him, and his posterity. This good turn Stephen did not doubt but the most religious king would readily requite with another; and therefore resolved to apply to him, and implore his protection against the attempts of the most wicked king of the Lombards. As for the emperor, the pope well knew, even when he wrote to him to send troops into Italy, that he could spare none; and, in truth, dreaded the Greeks as much as he did the Lombards; Constantine as much as Aistulphus. He therefore wrote, pursuant to the resolution he had taken, a most pressing letter to Pepin to acquaint him with the deplorable condition, to which he

and the peculiar people of St. Peter were reduced by the perfidious king of the Lombards, and earnestly entreat him to take them into his protection; since in him alone, after God, they had placed all their confidence.

This letter the pope sent by a pilgrim, or by a person in the disguise of a pilgrim, who, not being suspected by the Lombards, masters of the passes, arrived safe with it in France. Pepin, upon the receipt of the pope's letter, immediately dispatched an abbot named Droctegangus, to Rome, to assure the pope of his protection; and by him, on his return to France, the pope, who knew the Lombards would not dare to stop him, wrote anew to Pepin, and, at the same time, to the French nobility in general. He had resolved to consult his own safety, whatever became of the peculiar people of St. Peter, and withdraw from Rome into France; and with this resolution he acquainted Pepin in his letter; begging him to send some persons of distinction to conduct him safe into his dominions. In his letter to the nobility he conjured them to join their most excellent king in the defence he had generously undertaken of their common protector the apostle St. Peter, and his favorite people.¹ Pepin had no sooner received the pope's letter, than, in compliance with his request, he appointed Chrodigangus, bishop of Metz, and Autcharius, a lord of great distinction, to attend his holiness into France; ordering them to repair, for that purpose, without loss of time, to Rome. They set out immediately; and, on their arrival at Rome, found there John, the imperial envoy, the ambassador of the king of the Lombards, and the pope's nuncio, returned, a few days before, from Constantinople. As nothing had been concluded in the conferences held in that city, the emperor, remembering with what success pope Zachary had negotiated in person with the two kings of the Lombards, Luitprand and Rachis,² sent an order by his ambassador to Stephen to repair in person to Pavia, and press Aistulphus to restore Ravenna, and the other places he had taken by a breach of the most solemn treaties. In obedience to this order the pope set out on the 14th of October of the present year, for Pavia, attended by the envoy of the emperor, and the two French envoys, Chrodigangus and Autcharius; of whom the latter went before, as they approached Pavia, to acquaint the king that the pope was coming to treat with him of an accommodation, and let him know, that his master would not fail to resent any evil treatment his holiness might meet with. The king assured the envoy, that his holiness had no reason to be under the least apprehension of any ill treat-

¹ Anast. in Steph. II.

¹ Cod. Carolin. Num. 10, et 11. ² See p. 77. 81. 84, 85.

The pope's negotiations at the court of Aistulphus quite unsuccessful. From the king's court, the pope sets out for France. Pepin sends two persons of distinction to congratulate him on his safe arrival in his dominions. How received by Pepin himself. Pepin promises, upon oath, to cause the exarchate to be restored, and to protect the Roman church;—[Year of Christ, 754.]

ment at his court; and that, had he even come alone, he should have met with none. However he sent one privately to warn him against urging, or so much as mentioning to him the restitution of Ravenna, and the other cities of the exarchate. To this message the pope returned answer, that he feared nothing, and would acquit himself, as he ought, of the commission, which he was charged with; and accordingly not only mentioned the restitution of the said cities in the audience he had, but represented to the king, with great liberty (trusting, no doubt, in his French friends,) the injustice he was guilty of, in not restoring what he had no right to keep. This liberty the king highly resented; but, dissembling his resentment, he told the pope, that he possessed those cities by right of conquest; that the emperors themselves possessed them originally by no other right; and that he was resolved to maintain, as they had done, that right, so long as he had power and strength enough to maintain it. The same answer he returned to the emperor's ambassador, who had brought a letter to him from the emperor.¹

The two French envoys, who were present at this interview, finding the king would hearken to no terms of peace, told him, that as it was no longer safe for the pope to continue in Rome, they had been ordered by their master to attend him into France, and entreat him not to molest or stop his holiness on his journey. This demand surprised, and at the same time alarmed the king; not doubting but Stephen, treading in the footsteps of his predecessor Gregory III., would strive, and probably with success, to engage Pepin in his cause, and stir up the whole French nation against him. Aistulphus, therefore, taking him aside, asked him, whether he was really resolved to abandon Rome, and retire into France? And the pope answering that he was, the king immediately dismissed him; but sent privately the next day some of his friends to divert him from such a resolution, and assure him, in his name, that he had nothing to fear; and that he should ever be treated with all the respect that was due to his sacred character. But the pope persisted in the resolution he had taken; and the king, unwilling to quarrel with Pepin, told him, in the next audience, that if he continued in the same mind, and was still determined to retire to France, he should meet with no hindrance from him; but might set out, if he pleased, that very day. The pope did not delay his departure; but apprehending the king might, under some pretence or other, change his mind, he left Pavia early the next day (the 16th of November), attended by the two French envoys, some bishops,

and other ecclesiastics; and, traveling with great expedition, to get quickly out of the territories of the Lombards, arrived in a few days at the monastery of St. Mauricius, on the Rhone, a little above the lake of Geneva. As that monastery stood in the French dominions, the pope, now out of all danger, and tired with his journey, rested there a few days; and, in the mean time, came the abbot Fulrad, first chaplain of the palace, and duke Rotard, sent by Pepin to congratulate his holiness, in his name, on his safe arrival, and attend him to Pontyon, a royal castle in the neighborhood of Langres, where the king then was with all the royal family. Pepin no sooner heard of the pope's leaving the monastery of St. Mauricius, than he sent his son Charles, and some of the chief lords of his court, to meet him; and went out himself with his queen Bertrade, his other son Carloman, and most of the French nobility, three miles to receive him. As he approached, the king, quitting his horse, fell prostrate on the ground, not suffering the pope to dismount, and attended him part of the way on foot; performing, says Anastasius, the office of his groom or equerry.¹ St. Peter would not have suffered himself to be thus honored; but probably rejected such extraordinary marks of veneration rather than respect, with as much indignation as Paul and Barnabas rejected the honors that the people of Lystra would have paid to them.² But the pretended successor of St. Peter, the servant of servants, was very patient on the occasion; nay, we shall see his successors arrived, in process of time, to such an height of antichristian pride and presumption, as to exact the like honors of the greatest princes of the earth.

The pope arrived at Poynton on the 6th of January, 754; and the very next day he took care to acquaint Pepin with the motives of his journey, to lay before him the deplorable condition, to which the city of Rome, and the unhappy people, were reduced, and entreat him, by the merits of St. Peter, to undertake the defence of that apostle against the wicked and perfidious nation of the Lombards, his sworn enemies. Some writers tell us, that he threw himself at Pepin's feet, and would not rise till the king had promised to espouse his cause, and employ, if necessary, the whole strength of his kingdom in his defence. However that be, certain it is, that the king not only promised, but bound himself by a solemn oath, since nothing less would satisfy his holiness, to protect the church of St. Peter, and cause Ravenna to be restored with the other cities, that had been unjustly seized by the Lombards. Anastasius says, that he promised upon oath to do whatever the pope should

¹ Anast. in Steph. II.

² Anast. in Steph. II.

³ Acts, c. 19: v. 11—19.

The pope taken dangerously ill. Pepin anointed by him on his recovery. Pepin promises to give to St. Peter the places he should take from the Lombards.

require or advise him to do. Indeed his conduct would incline one to think that he had taken such an oath. From the castle of Pontyon Pepin repaired with the royal family, and the pope, to Paris; and from thence Stephen, highly pleased with the reception he had met with, retired to the monastery of St. Denis to pass the winter there.¹

In that monastery the pope was taken dangerously ill, but recovered; and his unexpected recovery was ascribed by him to the intercession of the martyr St. Denis, protector of the monastery.² Pepin was now upon the point of setting out from Paris; but hearing the pope was entirely recovered, he would be anointed by him king of France before he left that city. He had been anointed by Boniface at Soissons soon after his election; but thinking that the same ceremony, if performed by the pope, would recommend him more to the respect of his subjects, and greatly contribute to the securing of the crown to himself and his posterity, he desired to be anointed anew by his holiness. Stephen, we may be sure, readily complied with his desire; and the ceremony was performed, with the greatest solemnity, in the church of St. Denis. Bertrade the

queen, and the two young princes Charles and Carloman, received the royal unction at the same time;³ and, on that occasion, the pope bestowed, in the name of the Roman republic and his own, the title of Roman patricians on Pepin and his two sons; a title, which Stephen, and his successors, ever afterwards gave them in all the letters they wrote to them. When the ceremony was over, the pope gave a solemn blessing to the French nobility, who had assisted at it; conjuring them, Anastasius says binding them, and their posterity, in virtue of the authority of St. Peter vested in him, to maintain the royal dignity in the family of Pepin, and to raise no other, so long as any of that family remained, to the throne.² But that the French did not think the pope had any power of binding them and their posterity, or that he was to interfere at all in the election of their kings, appeared two hundred and thirty-five years after, when they deposed Charles of Lorraine, though descended from Pepin, and chose Hugh Capet in his room, without so much as consulting the pope, as they had done, only with a political view, in the election of Pepin.

From St. Denis, Pepin repaired to Carasiacum, now Chiersi, a royal palace on the Oise, at some distance from Noion, whither he was soon followed by the pope. There the pope had frequent opportunities of conferring with the king; and in one of these conferences it was agreed, that Pepin, whom

¹ Anast. in Steph. II. *Annal. Metens.* ad Ann. 743. *Continuat. Fredeg.* c. 19.

² I will not quarrel with Baronius about the pope's miraculous recovery; since it is attested, as the annalist observes, by his holiness himself; but only relate it in his holiness's own words: "Being given over by the physicians, says the pope, in one of his letters, (Apud Hilduin. in *Areopagitici*; et tom. 6. *Concil.* p. 1649.) I thought I was praying in the church of the blessed martyr Denis; and there I saw the good shepherd Peter, and Paul the apostle of the Gentiles, standing before the altar. I knew them both perfectly well by their pictures. With them was the thrice blessed St. Denis; and he stood at the right hand of St. Peter. He is a tall thin man, with a comely countenance, and gray hair, and was clad in white; but had a scarlet mantle, seeded with stars, over his white garment. They conversed among themselves; the good shepherd said 'this sick brother of ours begs to be restored to his health.' Paul answered, 'he shall be cured this moment;' and, approaching Denis, he laid his hand in a friendly manner on his breast, and looked at Peter. Peter turned to Denis, and with a cheerful countenance, 'your favor,' said he to him, 'is his health.' At these words Denis, holding a censer in the one hand, and the branch of a palm tree (the badge of a martyr) in the other, drew near to me, attended by a priest and a deacon, who had hitherto kept at a distance; saying, as he approached me, 'peace be to you, brother; do not fear, you shall not die before you return prosperously to your see. Rise up, and consecrate this altar to the honor of God, and his two apostles, whom you see.' I rose; and finding myself entirely restored to my health and my strength, was for consecrating the altar that moment: but they, who attended me, thinking I raved, would not allow me to undertake it, till I had related to them, and likewise to the king, all that had happened." Thus far the pope himself. They about him thought he raved, when he was for undertaking the consecration of the altar; but whether they had not more reason to think so, when he gave them this account of his recovery, I leave the reader to judge, if we should not suppose the whole to have been invented, as it most probably was, by the pope, with a political view. To this day it is to be seen, in the abbey of St. Denis, a pall, supposed to be the pall of pope Stephen, left by him on the altar he consecrated, to perpetuate the memory of his miraculous recovery.

³ Though Pepin, says here Baronius, had been anointed king two years before by Boniface, he did not reckon the years of his reign from the time of that unction, but from the year, in which he was anointed by the pope, as appears from the ancient monuments of the French nation.—(Bar. ad Ann. 752. n. 6.) But that Pepin reckoned the years of his reign from the time of his election, that is, from the year 752, and not from the year 754, when he was anointed king by the pope, is undeniably evident from several of his diplomas produced by F. Pagi, (F. Pagi, *critic.* in *Annal.* Bar. ad Ann. 752. n. 2, 3.) and utterly unknown to Baronius. As for the ancient monuments of the French nation, to which the annalist appeals, not one historian or annalist of that nation ever computed the years of Pepin from his unction in the monastery of St. Denis. Indeed Charles and Carloman, who were anointed together with their father, counted, so long as he lived, the years of their reign from the time of that unction; but, when he died, they thenceforth reckoned them only from the time of his death.

Pepin is the first king of France said by any credible historian to have received the sacred unction. His predecessors had been all proclaimed by being lifted up on a shield, according to the ancient custom of the Franks. The anointing a king is a mere ceremony, and gives no kind of right to the person anointed. But Pepin thought it would, in great measure, authorize his usurpation, and render his person sacred and respectable in the eyes of the multitude. The reader will find a very particular and curious account of this ceremony in Edmundus Martene, who shows that it had obtained long before Pepin's time in the ancient kingdom of Scotland, and in Spain.—(Edmund. Marten. de *Antiq. Eccles. Ritib.* tom. 3. c. 10.) As for the famous holy vial of Rheims, which, we are told, was, by a dove, brought from heaven with oil for the anointing of king Clovis, and in which is kept the oil the kings of France are anointed with to this day, whatever has been said of it by Hincmar, (Hincmar. in *vit. S. Remig.*) and others after him, is now universally looked upon as fabulous.

² Anast. in Steph. II.

Pepin resolves to make war on the Lombards. His brother Carloman sent by Aistulphus to divert him from it. New terms proposed, but not agreed to by Pepin.

the pope had already persuaded to make war on the Lombards, should not restore the places, that might be taken from them, to the emperor, who alone had a right to them, but should, for the good of his soul, and the remission of his sins, give them for ever to be freely possessed by St. Peter, and his successors. Whether this article, the giving to St. Peter what belonged to the emperor, and enriching the pope with the spoils of the empire, was first proposed by Pepin, as some suppose, or, as others will have it, by the pope, history has not informed us; but certain it is, that if the pope did not propose that article, he readily agreed to it; that he extolled, and with the most flattering commendations, the truly royal and truly Christian generosity of Pepin to St. Peter and his successors; namely, his Christian generosity in giving to them what was not his own, and what he had no right to give; and that, not satisfied with Pepin signing the agreement, or donation, as some writers call it, he required his two sons, Charles and Carloman, likewise to sign it.¹ Thus after the popes had exclaimed and inveighed, for the space of near two hundred years, against the Lombards, as the most wicked of men, as freebooters, robbers, and thieves, for robbing their most religious sons, the emperors, of their dominions, did this holy pope encourage and countenance others, nay, and make it a work of great merit, to rob them of those very dominions, when he and his successors were to profit by the robbery. In this ended their boasted zeal for the welfare of the empire, and the indefatigable pains they took, and cried up as so meritorious, to preserve the dominions, that still remained to the emperors in the west.

Pepin had already sent a solemn embassy to Aistulphus, conjuring him, by their mutual friendship, and the regard he had for St. Peter, to put an end to the unjust war, in which he was engaged, and restore the cities he had taken in the exarchate and the Pentapolis. But that embassy, and another, which Pepin is said to have sent soon after, proving ineffectual, he resolved to recur to arms, and make good, by that means, since he could by no other, his engagement with the pope. Pursuant to that resolution he assembled the states of the realm at Chiersi, where he still was, to acquaint them with the design he had formed of making war on the king of the Lombards, in defence of the pope and the Roman people, no less grievously than unjustly oppressed by that king and his nation. But while the states were yet sitting, Carloman, the brother of Pepin, who had embraced a monastic life in the monastery of Monte Cassino, seven years before,² arrived at Chiersi, sent by Aistulphus, as the most proper person he could have

chosen to defeat the machinations of the pope, and divert the king his brother from undertaking, out of complaisance to him, a war, in which, whether the Lombards prevailed in the end, or the French, much Christian blood would be shed on either side. Carloman, who had renounced the world, undertook this embassy, says Eginhardus,¹ much against his will; but he could not disobey his abbot, nor could his abbot disobey the king. However that be, certain it is, that he strove, to the utmost of his power, to reconcile his brother with the king of the Lombards, and prevent, by that means, the shedding of Christian blood, which was, in the opinion of Anastasius, "striving to ruin the cause of the holy church of God."² The monk Carloman, says a French historian,³ pleaded the cause of Aistulphus so well before the parliament of Crecy, which he mistakes for Chiersi,⁴ that it was resolved by the states, that an accommodation should, by all means, be attempted between the two nations, and a new embassy sent to the king of the Lombards for that purpose. A new embassy was sent accordingly; but no alteration being made in the terms, it proved as unsuccessful as the other two. The king, it seems, offered to put an end to the war, to renounce all claim to the city and dukedom of Rome, though master of Ravenna, and to suffer the Roman people to enjoy, undisturbed, all the rights and privileges they had enjoyed to that time; but he absolutely refused to restore the exarchate and the Pentapolis. These terms appeared highly reasonable to several of the French nobility; and they were for agreeing to them, and not wasting the blood and the treasure of the nation to gratify the ambition of the pope; nay, some of them, to divert the king from his intended expedition into Italy, took the liberty to tell him, that, notwithstanding their great attachment to his person, and zeal for his glory, they would not attend him in that war.⁵ But the pope, to whom Pepin had promised the exarchate and the Pentapolis, had already begun to look upon himself as a prince, and would not be degraded from that state into the mean condition of a subject. He therefore warmly insisted with Pepin, against the remonstrance of Carloman and the French nobility, upon his putting him in possession of the promised principality, quite regardless of the treasures or the blood of the nation, that was to conquer it for him. He prevailed; and Pepin having gained over, by his address, such of the French nobility as had opposed the Italian

¹ Eginhard. in *Annal.* ad *Ann.* 753.

² Anast. in *Steph.* II.

³ Mezeray. *Abregé Chronol.* ad *Ann.* 754.

⁴ Vide *Mabill. Disquis. de Carisiac.* l. 4. de *re Diplom.* p. 258.

⁵ Eginhard. in *vit. Carol. Mag.*

¹ Anast. in *Hadrian.* I.

² See p. 83.

Carlo-man, on his return, shut up in a monastery, where he dies. Pepin sets out on his march into Italy, attended by the pope. Defeats the Lombards. Besieges their king in his metropolis, and obliges him to submit. To what terms he was obliged to submit. The emperor assembles a general council at Constantinople to put an end to the dispute about images.

expedition, war was resolved on, and the necessary preparations were made throughout the kingdom for carrying it on with the wished-for success.

Carlo-man had occasion to repent of his taking the part of Aistulphus, and striving to prevent a war, that was to prove, if successful, so advantageous to the pope and his see. For the unhappy monk, on his return to Italy, was, at the instigation of the pope, stopped at Vienne by an order from his brother, and there shut up in a monastery, where he died a few days after. Pepin showed a greater regard for him after his death than he had done in his lifetime; for he caused his body to be put into a coffin of gold, and conveyed back, attended by several persons of distinction, to his monastery.¹ He has not, however, been canonized, though Rachis, the brother and predecessor of Aistulphus, has, who embraced a monastic life about the same time that Carlo-man embraced it, and in the same monastery.

War being now declared, Pepin, spurred on by the pope, (impatient to see himself possessed of the promised dominions, and raised to the rank of a prince,) assembled his troops from the different parts of the kingdom, and, heading them in person, set out, though the season was already far advanced, on his march into Italy. The pope would attend the king in this expedition to receive the cities as fast as they were taken, and divert him from hearkening to any terms whatever, different from those that had already been proposed. The army reached the Alps about the middle of the month of September of the present year; but found the passes and defiles leading into Italy, all carefully guarded by numerous bodies of the Lombards. However, they opened themselves a way, sword in hand, with great slaughter of the Lombards, who did not behave, on this occasion, with their usual bravery, though animated by the presence of their king. Pepin, having thus forced the passes, entered, without further opposition, the dominions of Aistulphus; nay, and being informed that the king, quitting the field, had shut himself up, very unadvisedly, in Pavia, he bent his march straight to that city, and closely besieged him in his metropolis; not doubting but he should thus at once put an end to the war. And truly Aistulphus, sensible that the city must fall at last, his army being dispersed, and having no person of reputation or abilities to head them, and that the longer he delayed to satisfy Pepin and the pope, the higher they would raise their demands, sent out, after a few days siege, one of his chief lords, to treat with them of an accommodation. He was ready

to part with some of the cities he had taken; but thought it very hard, that he should be obliged to part with them all. However, Pepin declaring, that he would hearken to no other terms, and the seige being, in the mean time, carried on with great vigor, he was, in the end, forced to acquiesce; and a treaty was drawn up, in virtue of which he was to deliver, not to the emperor, as he had hitherto understood it, but to the pope, the exarchate and the Pentapolis, with all the cities, castles, territories, and lands, thereunto belonging, to be for ever held and possessed by the most holy pope Stephen, and his successors in the apostolic see of St. Peter. By the same treaty Aistulphus was to restore all the places he had seized in the Roman dukedom; to renounce for ever all claim to that dukedom and city; and to live in peace and friendship with the pope, the common father both of the French and the Lombards. This treaty Aistulphus signed, but with great reluctance; and swore, as did all the judges, and chief men of his kingdom, punctually to observe, giving the number of hostages, that was required, for the faithful performance of the articles it contained. The war being thus ended, Pepin returned, with his army, to France; and the pope, attended by the abbot Fulrad, by duke Jerom, a natural son of Charles Martel, and others of the French nobility, to Rome.¹ He was met, at some distance from the city, by several bishops, by the whole Roman clergy, and crowds of people; and conducted by them, with loud acclamations, to the Vatican, where he returned thanks to God and St. Peter for the success of his negotiations in France. When he left Rome he was only a bishop, and he returned a prince. But it cost Pepin another expedition into Italy to put him in possession of his principality, as I shall soon have occasion to relate.

While the pope, laying aside all spiritual affairs, was thus wholly intent on procuring a temporal kingdom for himself, and his successors, at the expense of the empire, the good emperor Constantine, having as much at heart the welfare of the church, and the purity of the Christian worship, as the pope had the temporal power and grandeur of his see, had appointed a general council to meet; and it met this very year, finally to determine the famous controversy concerning the use and the worship of images, and settle, by that means, the church, as he had happily settled the state, in peace and tranquillity. This controversy had lain dormant ever since the time of Gregory III. the emperor being diverted from attending to it by his wars with the Saracens, Bulgarians, and

¹ Anast. in Steph. II. Epist. Steph. ad Pepin. Secund. Append. ad Contin. Fredegar. Annal. Lauresh. Loisel. Bertinian. Regin. &c.

¹ Anast. in Steph. II.

The emperor writes to all the metropolitans. Synods held in the different provinces. The council meets in the palace of Hiera. Who presided. The council condemns both the worship and the use of images. Reasons alleged against the use of images. How answered by the fathers of Nice.

other barbarians; and the popes deeply engaged in affairs, that appeared to them of far greater moment than the breaking or worshipping of images. The emperor Leo had proposed the assembling a general council to pope Gregory II.; but he had rejected the proposal with scorn; reflecting, at the same time, with the utmost insolence, on the character of that excellent prince.¹ Constantine upon his causing the images to be again pulled down, which the usurper Artabasus had set up in the imperial city, had engaged his word to the people, ready to revolt anew on that occasion, that he would take care, when at leisure from his wars, to have the question, "Whether images were or were not to be worshiped?" fairly examined, and finally determined, by a general council.² No sooner, therefore, had he put an end to the war (and he put an end to it the preceding year, by a peace as honorable as the war was glorious,) than, mindful of his promise, he wrote a circular letter to all the metropolitans subject to the empire, to acquaint them with the resolution he had taken of causing the fatal controversy, that had almost been attended with the ruin of the empire, to be decided by them and their fellow-bishops in a general council, that no room being left for further disputes, the church might partake of that peace and tranquillity, which it had pleased heaven to procure, by his arms, to the state. In the same letter he appointed the place, where they were to meet, the imperial palace, called Hiera, over against Constantinople, on the Asiatic shore; and the time when they were to meet, the 10th of February of the following year, 754; but required them, in the mean while, to convene synods in their respective provinces, and examine, lest they should come unprepared, with their suffragans, what might be alleged against, and what urged in favor of the points in dispute.³

In virtue of this letter, provincial synods were held throughout the empire; and the bishops repairing from them to Constantinople, met, at the appointed time, in the palace of Hiera, to the number of three hundred and thirty-eight; the greatest number of bishops that had ever yet met at a general council. The honor of presiding was due to the patriarch of the imperial city; but Anastasius dying a few days before, the emperor wisely declined naming another, lest the person he named should be looked upon as his creature, and thought to act as instructed or directed by him. Two bishops, therefore, of rank, Theodosius, exarch of all Asia, and Pastillus bishop of Perga, and metropolitan of Pamphylia, were appointed, whether by the council or the emperor, history does not inform us, to supply the place

of the patriarch.¹ We shall see in the sequel the empress Irene acting in a very different manner on occasion of the second council of Nice. For the patriarch Paul, who was no friend to images, dying before the council met, she caused Tarasius her secretary, a man of great art and address, and entirely devoted to her, to be raised at once from the state of a layman and a cringing courtier to the patriarchal dignity, that he might preside under her in that council. And yet, if we believe the popish writers, nothing was done unfairly in the council of Nice, and nothing done fairly in the council of Constantinople.²

As for the acts of this council, they were suppressed; and so were all other writings against images, by a decree of the second council of Nice. However, from the parts of those acts, which the Nicene fathers chose to confute, and preserved, as it were, for their triumph, it appears, that the three hundred and thirty-eight bishops condemned, and condemned with one voice, the use of images in places of worship as well as the worship; the use, as a custom borrowed from the idolatrous nations, as repugnant to the practice of the purer ages of the church, as no ways necessary, as dangerous, or exposing those, who used them, to the danger of idolatry; and the worship, as expressly forbidden by God, and rank idolatry, the very idolatry, which the heathens were charged with by the fathers. To make good what they advanced against the use of images, they alleged several passages out of the fathers, but chiefly urged the following three; the first from Epiphanius speaking thus to the Christians of his time: "Take heed you bring no images into the churches, or the cemeteries of the saints, nor yet into your houses; for it is not lawful for a Christian to wander after them with his eyes;" the other from Amphilochius of Iconium, saying, "we care not to paint in colors the persons of the saints, having no need of them; but we should make it our business to imitate their virtues;" and the third from Theodotus of Ancyra, saying, "we Christians have not the colored images of the saints, but we imitate their virtues as their living images." The fathers of Constantinople added, that if the use of images had obtained among the primitive Christians, they would not have condemned, as it appears from their writings they did, the use of images in general, but confined their arguments against them to the images of the pagans.

In opposition to the fathers of Constantinople those of Nice undertook to prove, that

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. 13. Constantin.

² It was called the council of Constantinople, because the fathers adjourned, as we shall see, from the palace of Hiera to the church of St. Mary ad Blachernas, in Constantinople, and there issued their definition and decrees.

¹ See p. 63.

² See p. 80, in fin. note.

³ Theoph. ad Ann. 13. Constantin.

Images declared an invention of the devil. Reasons alleged against the worship of images. How eluded by the fathers of Nice. Christians may relapse into idolatry.

the use of images had obtained in the church from the earliest times, from the times of our Savior and his apostles. But in favor of that, as they called it, apostolical tradition, they could only allege, besides the statue at Paneas, and the picture, which our Savior is supposed to have sent of himself to the king of Edessa,¹ the practice of the fourth century, and the eighty-second canon of the quini-sext council held in 691, allowing Christ, who had been painted till that time in the figure of a lamb, to be thenceforth represented in the shape of a man. And thus they proved the use of images in the church ever since the apostles time. As to the passages out of the works of the fathers, they pretended that Amphilochius meant no more, than that we ought not to be satisfied with the images of the saints, but should besides imitate their virtues. The other two passages they did not pretend to explain, but declared them at once supposititious, and maliciously inserted by the heretics into the works of these holy, men to authorize their heresy. As both passages are unquestionably genuine, Du Pin wishes the good fathers had thought of a better answer to them. But what better answer could they have thought of or given to the prohibition at least of Epiphanius, "take heed you bring no images into the churches?" The school distinctions, by means of which this and all other passages are now eluded, were not yet coined.

The fathers of Constantinople, not satisfied with condemning all images, as unnecessary, as hurtful, as dangerous, declared them, in one of their sessions, an "invention of the devil," who, envying the happiness of mankind, delivered by the Son of God from idolatry, had, by their means, introduced idolatry anew, in the disguise, and under the name of Christianity. This the Nicene fathers answered only with exclamations, reproaches, and injuries; calling those who had thus dared to defame the immaculate church, heretics, and worse than heretics, Jews, apostates, blasphemers of God, and his holy institutions and doctrine. And yet the council of Constantinople, in calling images "an invention of the devil," only repeated what some of the most eminent fathers of the church had said several hundred years before. "The devil," says Tertullian, "brought the makers of statues and images into the world."² "Evil angels taught men to make images: the invention of images was an invention of the devil, or of men actuated by the devil," say Eusebius and Epiphanius.³

Against the worship of images were alleged, by the council of Constantinople, several passages out of the Old and New Testa-

ment; but they chiefly insisted on the second commandment, by which we are in as plain and express terms, forbidden to make graven images, to bow down to them, or worship them, as we are forbidden by the other commandments to commit theft, murder, or adultery. This commandment, they said, our Savior had not abrogated, but enforced; commanding us to "worship in spirit and in truth." To the texts of Scripture they added the testimonies of the fathers, with whom worshippers of images and idolaters were synonymous terms; concluding from thence, that all images, without distinction, that were worshiped, or made to be worshiped, were idols; and all, who worshiped them, guilty of idolatry. The fathers of Nice answered, that they only were guilty of idolatry, who worshiped devils, or the sun, moon, and stars, with beasts, and birds, and creeping things, and worshiped them, or their images, as gods; which was absolving not only themselves, but the whole pagan world, from the guilt of idolatry, as has been shown above.⁴ However, thus the good fathers understood and explained all the texts from Scripture against images, and likewise the second commandment, "thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image," to worship it as the Maker of the heaven and the earth; "thou shalt not bow down to images" as the makers of all things, and of the very man who made them; "nor worship them" as such; as if there could have been occasion for such a prohibition, or the second commandment had been made only for fools and idiots.⁵

But on no one thing did the fathers of Nice lay greater stress in clearing, against the fathers of Constantinople, the worshippers of images from all idolatry, than on the following notion, quite peculiar to themselves; namely, that after Christ had once redeemed Christians from idolatry, it was impossible they should ever relapse into that crime. This they gathered from God's promising to "blot out the names of idols from under the heaven,"⁶ from his kingdom being an "everlasting kingdom;"⁷ "from his gifts being without repentance;"⁸ and from his "smiting his enemies in the hinder parts, and putting them to perpetual shame;"⁹ which one would think had no relation to idolatry, or to images. But St.

¹ See p. 34.

² Had God intended to forbid the worship of all images without distinction, I should be glad to know with what more significant and comprehensive words he could have expressed his mind, than those of the second commandment, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven images," any at all. Are the words, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," more comprehensive or significant? As to the distinction of absolute and relative worship, now used in the schools to elude the law, "Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them," it is quite impertinent; for whether the worship be absolute or relative, it is worship; and whether it be the one or the other, they "bow down to them."

³ Zach. 13.

⁴ Psal. 115.

⁵ Rom. 11.

⁶ Psal. 78.

¹ See vol. I. 29. 30.

² Tertul. de Idol. c. 2.

³ Euseb. de Præpar. Evang. l. 4. c. 16. Epip. Hæros. 79.

The council adjourns to Constantinople. A new patriarch appointed. The decree of faith issued by the council. The canons.

Paul did not think it impossible that Christians redeemed from idolatry should relapse into that crime; nor did St. John; since the one exhorted the Christians of Corinth to "flee from idolatry;"¹ and the other the Christians in general to "keep themselves from idols."² These two apostles were, according to the divinely inspired divines of Nice, arrant triflers; exhorting men to flee, and keep themselves from a crime, which they could not possibly commit. But abstracting from Scripture, from reason, from daily experience, I should be glad to know how the pretended impossibility of relapsing into idolatry can be reconciled with the charge of idolatry, brought by those good fathers themselves against the Arians for worshipping Christ, whom they believed to be but a mere creature! Were the Arians, worshipping the most perfect of all creatures, guilty of idolatry, notwithstanding God's promise to "blot out the names of idols from under the heaven;" and they not guilty of idolatry in worshipping the meanest of all creatures, the works of men's hands?

But to return to the council of Constantinople; the fathers of that assembly continued their sessions, without interruption, from the 10th of February to the 7th of August, examining, as they declared, and re-examining, with the greatest care and attention, the question, for the determining of which it had pleased their most religious emperors, Constantine and Leo,³ to call them together. But on the 7th of August they adjourned from the palace of Hiera to the basilic of St. Mary ad Blachernas in Constantinople, to issue there, as in a more proper place, the decree of faith, which they had all, not one excepted, agreed to, and which they were all, not one excepted, ready to sign. The emperor attended them in person with the great officers of state, and all the nobility; and when the bishops had taken their places, according to their different ranks, in the above-mentioned basilic, he named at last, after a short speech to the assembly (of which not a single word has been suffered to reach our times,) a new patriarch in the room of Anastasius. The person he promoted to that dignity was Constantine, by profession a monk, and bishop of Sylleum in Pamphylia; and his promotion was received by all with the greatest applause.⁴ And now the exarch

of Asia, and the metropolitan of Pamphylia, who had hitherto presided, yielding their place to the new œcumenical patriarch, as they styled him, the emperor, addressing himself, with great respect, to the bishops, desired they would cause the determinations of that holy and œcumenical council to be read so as to be heard by all who were present.

They were read accordingly, after a preamble of some length, giving an account of the rise and progress of the new idolatry; of the arts used by the contriver of all mischief to seduce mankind to worship the creature besides the Creator; and of the motives, that had induced the council to put a stop to that worship. Next to the preamble was read the decree of faith, and after it the canons. The decree of faith was as follows: "The holy and œcumenical council, which it has pleased our most orthodox emperors Constantine and Leo to assemble in the church of St. Mary ad Blachernas, in the imperial city, adhering to the Word of God, to the definitions of the six preceding councils, to the doctrine of the approved fathers, and the practice of the church in the earliest times, pronounce and declare, in the name of the Trinity, and with one heart and mind, that no images are to be worshipped; that to worship them, or any other creature, is robbing God of the honor that is due to him alone, and relapsing into idolatry. Whoever, therefore, shall henceforth presume to worship images, to set them up in the churches, or in private houses, or to conceal them, shall be degraded, if a bishop, a priest, or a deacon; and if a monk, or a layman, excommunicated, and punished, as guilty of a breach of God's express command, and the imperial laws; that is, of the very severe laws issued by the Christian emperors against the worshippers of idols." By the canons were anathematized, I. All makers of images, whether those images were designed to represent the Godhead, and Christ according to his human nature,¹ or only the

contemporary historians, though all his sworn enemies, take not the least notice of his debauched and profligate life, nor of his having ever been driven from his see, we may well conclude the compiler of the above-mentioned acts to have been an impostor and liar, and Constantine, though a monk, a man of a most unblemished character, and exemplary life. Indeed the emperor was too wise a prince to have preferred one, at this juncture, to the patriarchal see of the imperial city, whose scandalous life might have prejudiced the world against his council, and lessened its authority. The author of those acts inveighs with great bitterness against the emperor for presuming to appoint a patriarch, which his predecessors had all done, or any ways concerning himself with the affairs of the church, when he had spent all his life in slaughtering men, the Saracens, and other barbarians, who broke into the empire, and had most wickedly defiled himself with no fewer than three women, all three his lawful wives.—(Apud Bar. ad Ann. 754.)

¹ Besides the reasons they alleged against images in general, they urged one against the images of Christ in particular; namely, that they were false representations, and teachers of lies, (Hab. 2: 18.) represent-

¹ 1 Corinth. 10: 14.

² 1 John 5: 21.

³ Constantine took his son Leo for his partner in the empire when he was not yet a year and a half old. He was born on the 25th of January, 750, and solemnly crowned by the patriarch Anastasius on Whitsunday the following year.

⁴ Baronius, Maimbourg, Natalis Alexander, and other such writers, paint the new patriarch in the blackest colors; telling us, from the lying acts of the pretended martyr Stephen the Younger, that he had abandoned himself from his youth, without shame or remorse, to all manner of wickedness, and had been driven from his see for his lewdness and debauchery. But as the

The decree, and the canons, issued with one consent. The worship of images suppressed in the east. The council of Constantinople a lawful œcumenical council.

virgin Mary, and the other saints. II. All, who did not confess the virgin Mary, the mother of God, to be above all visible and invisible creatures. III. Such as did not confess the saints, who, before the law, and under the law, had pleased God, to be honorable in his sight. They added here, that the virgin Mary and the saints interceded, according to the tradition of the church, for the world: whence, some have concluded, that they confessed the innovation of saints; not aware of the difference (and it is strange they should not be aware of it; for it is wide enough) between the "saints praying for us, and our praying to them." IV. All were anathematized, who did not hold and profess the doctrine delivered in the holy Scriptures, concerning the fall of man, the ineffable mystery of the incarnation, the resurrection, the eternity of rewards and punishments; and lastly, all, who did not receive that sacred and universal seventh synod; or should presume to propose, teach, or deliver, another faith; or introduce new words, or new-coined distinctions (of absolute and relative worship, of supreme and inferior, of *Latria*, *Dulia*, and *Hyperdulia*, &c.) to elude or subvert the determinations of the present holy and œcumenical synod.

The definition of faith and the canons being thus publicly read, the emperor, addressing himself to the assembly, desired the holy universal synod freely to declare whether they all agreed to the determinations they had heard. The bishops answered with one voice, "we all thus believe; we are all of the same mind; we all unanimously and freely subscribe; we all worship and adore the spiritual Deity in a spiritual manner: this is the faith of the apostles; this is the faith of the fathers; this is the faith of all truly orthodox; thus all worship, who worship in spirit and in truth: long

ing Christ only as a man, whereas he was both God and man; the very reason why it was not thought lawful, till so late as the latter end of the seventh century, to paint Christ in the form of a man.—(See vol. I. p. 494.) They added, as we are informed by the fathers of Nice, who undertook to confute them, that to paint Christ in the shape of a man, was to commend Arius and Nestorius. Arius held, as is well known, Christ to be a mere man; on the other hand, Nestorius owned the divinity indeed to be present in, but would not allow it to be hypostatically united to, his humanity; calling him *Homo deiferus*, and not *Homo Deus*. Now the fathers of Constantinople forbid, perhaps, the images of Christ in the form of a man, because they countenanced, in their opinion, the error of Arius, by representing him only as a man; and the error of Nestorius by representing his humanity separated from his divinity. But they had better have kept to the reasons alleged above, if that was their true meaning; and what else they could have meant saying, that to paint Christ in the form of a man, was to commend Arius and Nestorius, I cannot conceive. The answer of the fathers of Nice to this argument was as impertinent as the argument itself; namely, that as the image of a man may represent him truly, though it does not represent his soul, so may the image of Christ represent him truly, though it does not represent his divinity. For the image of a man, if it represents him living, represents, in some manner, his soul; but the image of Christ, in the form of a man, does, in no manner at all, represent his divinity.

live the most religious and orthodox emperors Constantine and Leo: anathema to Germanus, a worshiper of wooden gods; anathema to George, who agrees with him, and falsifies the doctrine of the fathers; anathema to Mansur (or Damascene,) a worshiper of images, and a writer of fables. Confounded be all they that serve graven images.¹ The decree of faith was signed, and so were the canons, by both emperors, and all the bishops, to a man; who, returning to their sees, as soon as they had signed them, caused them to be observed in their respective dioceses and provinces, as they had been enjoined by the emperor, with the utmost strictness and rigor. And thus was the new idolatry, as it was styled, condemned at last in a general council; and the images, that gave occasion to it, banished from the churches, as well as from the private oratories and houses, all over the east. All, but the monks, readily submitted to the decision of the council. They, indeed, opposed it; and it concerned them as nearly to oppose it, as it concerned the craftsmen of Ephesus to oppose the doctrine of St. Paul. But of their unwarrantable and wicked attempts to maintain the condemned superstition in defiance of the decisions of the council, and the imperial laws, as well as of the severe treatment they deservedly met with, on that score, from the emperor and his officers, I shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

As all general councils are believed in the church of Rome infallible, this council, we may be sure, has not been received by that church as a general council. But that it has as good a right to that title as any of the six preceding councils, may be easily demonstrated. For, I. It was convened, as were all the other councils, by the emperor; and, consequently, lawfully convened. II. It was the most numerous council that had been yet held in the church, consisting of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops; whereas at the first council of Nice, far exceeding in number all the rest, assisted only three hundred and eighteen. III. The fathers allowed themselves the time, that was necessary to examine thoroughly and leisurely the question; a question of infinite moment, which they had been called together to decide; continuing their sessions from the 10th of February to the 7th of August. The "second holy, general, and divinely inspired" council of Nice did not proceed

¹ Germanus was heretofore bishop of Constantinople, and a most zealous stickler, as we have seen, for the worship of images. George is supposed by some to have been a bishop; and by others, to have been only a monk. But he must have distinguished himself, whether a monk or bishop, above all his brethren, by his zeal in maintaining the worship of images, and falsifying, with that pious view, the writings of the fathers. As for Mansur or Damascene, we need but dip into his works to be convinced that he was, as the council styles him, a writer of fables.

A council may be lawful without the pope, and without the other patriarchs. The pope, how employed at this time.

with such deliberation and maturity, nor employ the sixth part of the time in examining the same question, if they may be said to have examined it at all; for they met on the 24th of September, and all was over by the 12th of the following October. IV. In the council of Constantinople the debates were entirely free; no man being required, either in the council, or before it, to speak or to vote the one way or the other. The emperor not only declined, as has been said, appointing a patriarch, whose authority would have been of great weight with the fathers of the council, but would not appear amongst them himself till the points in debate were finally determined, lest he should awe or bias them to either side with his presence. On the other hand, none were allowed a place in the packed assembly of Nice, as we may justly style it, who did not declare beforehand for the doctrine they intended to establish, the lawfulness of image worship, or, having, at any time, held the opposite opinion, did not solemnly abjure it. V. The bishops of Constantinople, though in every respect free, agreed, not one out of the three hundred and thirty-eight dissenting from the rest, to condemn, "with one heart, and one mind," the use as well as the worship of images, and anathematize all, who either worshiped them, or used them in their worship. In what other council did such harmony reign among the bishops who composed it? VI. They did not ground the doctrine they defined upon silly, absurd, childish, and impertinent reasons, as they are called by Baronius, Maimbourg, Natalis Alexander, but upon the authority of Scripture, as understood and explained by the fathers of the church, by the councils, and the Christians of the primitive times; introducing thereby anew the use of that long unfashionable and antiquated book. In short, they grounded their doctrine on reasons, which the good fathers of Nice had better have suppressed, as they did all other writings against images, than offered to answer. VII. They received the six preceding general councils, confirmed the doctrine which they had defined, and condemned the heresies and heretics, that they had condemned. Lastly, they ascertained, in the manner we have seen, the honor that is due to the virgin Mary, and the saints, at the same time that they ordered their images to be cast out of the churches, and destroyed; nay, and to prevent even the sacred utensils from being, on this occasion, any ways profaned or abused, they strictly forbid any person whatever to lay hands on them under color of demolishing images, or remove them out of the churches or vestries, without the approbation and consent of the universal patriarch, and an order from the emperor. They have been therefore very unjustly

charged, as even Natalis Alexander has been ingenuous enough to own, by Baronius, Bellarmine, and Maimbourg, with irreligion and profaneness.¹ To conclude, no council held yet in the church does deserve, if this does not, the title of a general or œumenical council.

But the pope, say the advocates for image-worship, did not assist at this council, either in person, or by his legates; nor did the three patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, nor any of them. But neither did pope Damasus assist, either in person, or by his legates, at the first council of Constantinople assembled by the emperor Theodosius;² nor did pope Vigilius at the second,³ convened by the emperor Justinian; nay, Theodoret assures us, in two different places,⁴ that the first consisted of the eastern bishops only; and as to the second, it was held, not only in the absence, but against the will, of Vigilius.⁵ And yet both these councils were received by the whole catholic church; have been approved by all the popes, who have governed the Roman church from those times to the present; and are ranked, by all the Roman catholic divines, among the infallible, lawful, and œumenical councils. And hence it evidently follows, that a council may be lawful and œumenical, may determine and define, censure and condemn, though held in the absence, nay, and against the will of the pope. As for the three above-mentioned patriarchs, they were prevented by the Saracens, to whom they were subject, from assisting at this, or even, as shall be shown hereafter, at the second council of Nice, which, however, is received in the church of Rome as an œumenical and lawful council. To conclude, for no other reason has that church condemned and rejected the present council, but because it condemned and rejected her doctrine; the very reason why the Arians condemned, and condemn to this day, the first council of Nice; why the Macedonians condemned the first of Constantinople; the Nestorians that of Ephesus; the Eutychians the council of Chalcedon; the defenders of the three chapters, the second; and the Monothelites the third council of Constantinople.

Of this council, and its whole proceedings, a full account was immediately transmitted to the pope by his emissaries in those parts, the monks. But Stephen was, at this time, too much taken up with temporal affairs to mind those of the church; and more concerned to rob the emperor of his dominions in the west, than to oppose the heresy, as it was called, which he was striving to establish in the east. He had begun to take upon him the port and state of a prince;

¹ Natal. Alex. Secul. VIII. p. 665.

² See vol. I. p. 101.

³ See vol. I. p. 336.

⁴ Theodo. I. 5. c. 2. 6. et. 7. ⁵ See vol. I. p. 361.

Aistulphus renews the war upon the Roman dukedom. The pope's letter to Pepin on that occasion. Aistulphus lays close siege to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 755.]

but found himself, to his great mortification and disappointment, still a mere bishop; and could not, under so grievous and unexpected a disappointment, attend to disputes of religion, especially to so trifling a dispute as that about images, whether it was or was not idolatry, and a breach of the second commandment, to worship them. Aistulphus had signed, as we have seen, but much against his will, the treaty of Pavia; by virtue of which treaty, he was to deliver up to the pope all the places he had taken from the emperor. As those places were not to be restored to the emperor, the king thought, that he, who had taken them at the expense of the blood and treasure of his nation, had a better right to them than the pope, who founded his whole claim to them on the donation of one, who had no right to dispose of them, if he himself had no right, and the pope had told him he had none, to keep them. Having therefore, under various pretences, put off, for some time, the execution of the above-mentioned treaty, and, in the mean while, recruited his army secretly, he unexpectedly broke into the Roman dukedom, resolved to renew the war at all events; and, instead of parting with the places he had taken, to seize on those he had not taken. Of this the pope gave immediate notice to Pepin in a long letter, which he delivered to the abbot Fulrad, who had attended him to Rome, and was then returning to France. "To defend the church," says the pope in that letter, "is, of all works, the most meritorious; and that, to which is reserved the greatest reward in the world to come. God might himself have defended his church, or raised up others to ascertain and defend the just rights of his apostle St. Peter. But it pleased him to choose you, my most excellent son, out of the whole human race, for that holy purpose. For it was in compliance with his divine inspiration and command, that I applied to you, that I came into your kingdom, that I exhorted you to espouse the cause of his beloved apostle, and your great protector, St. Peter. You espoused his cause accordingly; and your zeal for his honor was quickly rewarded with a signal and miraculous victory. But St. Peter, my most excellent son, has not yet reaped the least advantage from so glorious a victory, though owing entirely to him. The perfidious and wicked Aistulphus has not yet yielded to him one foot of ground; nay, unmindful of his oath, and actuated by the devil, he has begun hostilities anew, and, bidding defiance both to you and St. Peter, threatens us, and the whole Roman people, with death and destruction, as the abbot Fulrad and his companions will inform you." The rest of the pope's letter consists chiefly of repeated invectives against Aistulphus as a sworn enemy to St. Peter,

and repeated commendations of Pepin, his two sons, and the whole French nation, as the chief friends and favorites of that apostle. In the end he puts Pepin, and likewise his two sons, in mind of the promise they had made to the door-keeper of heaven; tells them, that the prince of the apostles himself kept the instrument of their donation; that it had been delivered into the apostle's own hands; and that he held it tight, to produce it, at the last day, for their punishment, if it was not executed; and for their reward, if it was; and therefore conjures them by the living God, by the virgin Mary, by all the angels of heaven, by St. Peter and St. Paul, and the tremendous day of judgment, to cause St. Peter to be put in possession of all the places named in the donation; and to be put in possession of them all, and every one of them, without further delay, without any excuses whatever; lest by excusing others they should themselves become inexcusable; and be, in the end, eternally damned.¹

In the mean time Aistulphus, advancing to Rome, encamped on the first day of January, with his army divided into several bodies before the different gates of that city, and closely besieged it. As he was provoked, beyond all measure, against the pope, who had not only stirred up the French to invade his dominions, but now claimed the exarchate and the Pentapolis for himself, after he had threatened him with vengeance from heaven, as guilty of the greatest injustice in not restoring them to his most religious son the emperor, who alone had a right to them, he sent, on his first arrival, one of his officers into the city to assure the inhabitants, that he came not as an enemy to them, but only to the pope; that if they consented to deliver him up, they should be treated with the greatest humanity; but if they refused, he would level their walls with the ground, and put them all without mercy, to the sword. To this message, the Romans, who were not yet become that dastardly crew they are now, returned answer, that the pope was their common father; that they would stand by him to the last drop of their blood; and that the brave king of the Lombards might, if he prevailed in the end, put the women and children to the sword; but, as to the men, they were all determined to die on the walls before he set foot in the city. The king, provoked at this answer, began to batter the walls on all sides with the utmost fury; sending out parties, at the same time, to ravage the neighboring country, to carry off the inhabitants, with all their effects, and set fire to their houses; insomuch that the country all round appeared in a flame; and the shrieks of the women carried into cap-

¹ Cod. Carolin. Ep. 7.

The pope finds means to convey a letter to Pepin. The contents of his letter.

tivity were heard in the city. However, the Romans, encouraged by the pope, and not doubting but the French would fly to their relief, as soon as they could be acquainted with their distress, defended the walls with incredible bravery, repulsed the enemy in their repeated attacks, repaired the breaches, and, sallying frequently out, destroyed the works of the aggressors, and set fire to their engines. They were commonly headed by a French abbot named Warner; who, arming himself with a breast-plate for the love of St. Peter, says the pope in one of his letters, fought like a good soldier of Christ; never quitting the walls by day, nor by night.

The pope had, from the time the city was first invested, tried all means of getting a letter conveyed to Pepin, his only protector and refuge. But the town was so closely besieged on all sides, and the passes so carefully guarded, that none could come in or go out. However, private intelligence being given him on the fifty-fifth day of the siege, that a vessel, then on the coast, was ready to sail for France, the abbot Warner, a bishop named George, and count Thomeric, venturing over the walls in the dead of the night, had the good luck to avoid the enemy's sentries, and get undiscovered to the vessel, which put immediately to sea, and landed them safe in the dominions of Pepin. They were charged with a letter from the pope, written in his own name, and the name of the whole Roman people; and addressed to Pepin, to his two sons Charles and Carloman, whom he styles kings, and Roman patricians, to all the bishops, abbots, presbyters, monks, dukes, counts, and the whole French army. The pope begins his letter with a most pathetic account of the deplorable condition to which he and the peculiar people of St. Peter were reduced; and a detail, exaggerated beyond all measure, of the cruelties practised upon that unhappy people by the perfidious Aistulphus and his Lombards, all alike possessed with, and instigated by the devil; I say, exaggerated beyond all measure; for that the Lombards, not satisfied with burning the houses, rooting up the vineyards, cutting down the trees, destroying the corn, carrying off the cattle, plundering the churches, and setting fire to them, should, besides, have sacrilegiously abused, being good catholics, the most sacred things, even the holy eucharist, cruelly butchered all the tenants of St. Peter, and the Romans, men and women, ravished the nuns, whipped the monks almost to death, debauched the married women, and, tearing their children from them, dashed out their brains before their mother's eyes, and then murdered them too, is altogether incredible. The Lombards were a warlike, but not a cruel people; and Anastasius only charges them, in his account of the present siege, with having laid waste the neighboring country,

and carried off many bodies of saints dug up in the cemeteries.¹ But the pope wanted, not only to move the French nation to compassion for himself and the Romans, but to inflame them against the Lombards; and thought it lawful, perhaps meritorious, to exaggerate, that is, to lie, for so holy a purpose. The rest of the letter, which seems to have been written in a great hurry, consists of prayers, entreaties, promises, menaces, all blended together, and the burden of every period. Baronius compares him to a woman in labor crying out for help.² Indeed no woman in that condition ever betrayed more anxiety, or, being destitute of all relief, ever craved it more earnestly. He entreats over and over again, and conjures the king and the French nation, the first and the greatest of all nations, the most religious of all nations, and the nation favored above all other nations by God, nay, and by the door-keeper of heaven, to complete the work they have begun, the great work, and of all works the most meritorious, that of redeeming the church of God, and the flock of St. Peter, from imminent ruin and destruction; promises them prosperity and success in all their undertakings, victories, conquests, triumphs over all their enemies in this world, and, by the intercession of St. Peter, a great, inconceivably great, and everlasting reward, in the other, if they suffer not those to be confounded, who, after God, have placed all their confidence in them; threatens them with the wrath of heaven, with the indignation of St. Peter, with all the calamities that can befall, in this world, a faithless people, and eternal damnation in the world to come, if unmindful of their engagements, they leave imperfect, or abandon the work, which they have been chosen by God, out of all the nations of the earth, to complete; and concludes with entreating, and most earnestly pressing them anew, as they expected to hear it said to them on the last day, "come, ye blessed of my Father," not only to come, but to come without delay, to hasten with all possible speed, to fly to the relief of the distressed beyond expression, forsaken, and, but for the trust they put in them, despairing flock of St. Peter, lest the enemy, who seeks their destruction, and thirsts after their blood, should in the meantime, prevail, and they be deprived of their reward, the kingdom of heaven.³ It is to be observed, that the pope, in both his letters, by St. Peter, means himself; by the church, the catholic, the apostolic church, the temporalities of the Roman church; and, by the flock of St. Peter the rebellious people of Rome; as if the rest of the world had nothing to do with St. Peter, nor St. Peter with them.

As the Lombards carried on the siege

¹ Anast. in Steph. II. ² Bar. ad Ann. 755 p. 231.

³ Epist. 6. Cod. Carol. tom. 6. Concil. p. 1663. & apud Bar. ad Ann. 755. p. 229, et seq.

The pope writes to Pepin and the French nation, in the name of St. Peter. St. Peter's letter. Pepin returns to Italy, and besieges Pavia a second time. Ambassadors sent by the emperor to Pepin.

with great vigor, and the town, if not relieved, could not hold out much longer, the pope, who had yet received no intelligence of the march of the French army, began to apprehend that his letters had made little or no impression on the mind of the king. Under this apprehension, and in imminent danger of falling into the hands of his avowed enemies, he bethought himself of an artifice; of which there is not, says Pagi, nor perhaps will there ever be another instance, in the whole history of the popes. He had already employed all the motives he could think of to move his protectors to compassion, but, as he feared, to no effect. Instead, therefore, of urging the same motives again, he resolved to introduce St. Peter himself as urging them; persuaded, that though the French king and nation had, perhaps withstood his entreaties, promises, and threats, they would scarce withstand those of that apostle. He dispatched, accordingly a messenger into France, as sent by St. Peter, with a letter written by him. The direction of the letter was: "Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, to the three most excellent kings, Pepin, Charles, and Carloman; to all the holy bishops, abbots, presbyters, and monks; to all the dukes, counts, commanders of the French army, and to the whole people of France: Grace unto you, and peace be multiplied." The letter begins thus; "I am the apostle Peter, to whom it was said, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock,' &c., 'Feed my sheep,' &c., 'And to thee will I give the keys,' &c. As this was all said to me in particular (here St. Peter, by the way, contradicts all the fathers and the four evangelists,¹) all, who hearken to me, and obey my exhortations, may persuade themselves, and firmly believe, that their sins are forgiven them; and they will be admitted, cleansed from all guilt, into life everlasting. Hearken, therefore, to me, to me Peter the apostle and servant of Jesus Christ; and since I have preferred you to all the nations of the earth, hasten, I beseech and conjure you, if you care to be cleansed from your sins, and to earn an eternal reward, hasten to the relief of my city, of my church, of the people committed to my care, ready to fall into the hands of the wicked Lombards, their merciless enemies. It has pleased the Almighty that my body should rest in this city; the body, that has suffered for the sake of Christ such exquisite torments: And can you, my most Christian sons, stand by unconcerned, and see it insulted by the most wicked of nations? No, let it never be said, and it will, I hope, never be said, that I the apostle of Jesus Christ, that my apostolic church, the foundation of the faith, that my flock

recommended to you by me and my vicar, have trusted in you, but trusted in vain. Our lady, the virgin Mary, mother of God, joins in earnestly entreating, nay, and commands you to hasten, to run, to fly, to the relief of my favorite people, reduced almost to the last gasp, and calling, in that extremity, night and day upon her and upon me. The thrones and dominions, the principalities and the powers, and the whole multitude of the heavenly host, entreat you, together with us, not to delay, but to come with all possible speed, and rescue my chosen flock from the jaws of the ravening wolves ready to devour them. My vicar might, in this extremity, have recurred, and not in vain, to other nations; but with me the French are, and ever have been, the first, the best, the most deserving of all nations; and I would not suffer the reward, the exceeding great reward, that is reserved, in this and the other world, for those who shall deliver my people, to be earned by any other." In the rest of the letter, St. Peter is made to repeat all the pope had said in his letters; to court the favor and protection of the French with the most abject flattery; to inveigh with as much unchristian resentment and rancor, as the pope had inveighed against the most wicked nation of the Lombards; and to entreat his most Christian sons over and over again to come, and with all possible speed, to the relief of his vicar and people, lest they should, in the meantime, fall into the hands of their implacable enemies; and those, from whom they expected relief, incur the displeasure of the Almighty, and his; and be thereby excluded, notwithstanding all their other good works from the kingdom of heaven.¹

With this letter the pope dispatched a messenger, in all haste, to Pepin; but he had, upon the receipt of his first letter, assembled all his forces anew; and was, when he received this, within a day's march of the Alps. He pursued his march without delay; and, having forced the passes of those mountains, advanced, never once halting, till he reached Pavia; and laid, a second time, close siege to that city, not doubting but he should thus oblige Aistulphus to raise that of Rome.²

In the mean time arrived at Rome, in their way to France, two officers of the imperial court, sent by the emperor to congratulate Pepin on the success of his arms against the Lombards in Italy; and, at the same time, to thank him, in his name, for his friendship and generosity, worthy of a prince of his character, in thus defending his dominions most unjustly invaded in the west, while he was employed in defending the empire against the common enemy in the east:

¹ See vol I. p. 413. note (*).

¹ Cod. Carolin. Ep. 7. et apud Bar. ad Ann. 755. p. 231. et seq.

² Anast. in Steph II.

The ambassadors are allowed to enter Rome. They repair to France, and arrive at Marseilles; whence one of them hastens to the king's camp. His speech to Pepin.

for Constantine had heard of the expedition of Pepin into Italy, and of the great advantages he had gained there over the Lombards; but, as he had given no kind of provocation to him, or his nation, he took it for granted, that it was out of friendship for him, engaged in a war with the enemies of the Christian name, that he had undertaken that expedition; or perhaps out of policy, to prevent the Lombards, of whose power the French might be jealous, from growing more powerful; and that he would not be so ungenerous and unjust as to keep the places he had recovered from them. Indeed Constantine knew, that Pepin came into Italy at the persuasion of the pope; but thought, that as his predecessor, pope Gregory II., had stirred up the Venetians to recover Ravenna, when taken by the Lombards, not for themselves, but for the emperor Leo his father,¹ in like manner Stephen had, as it became a good subject, stirred up the French to recover the exarchate and the Pentapolis, not for themselves, but for him. He was, it seems, utterly unacquainted with the treasonable intrigues of the pope, and the private agreement between him and Pepin. And truly, as the popes had all exclaimed against the Lombards as thieves and robbers for invading and seizing the dominions that belonged to the empire, it never once came into Constantine's thoughts, that Stephen, who had exclaimed against them, as much as any of his predecessors, could approve and encourage in the French what he had condemned as a crying injustice in the Lombards. The good emperor was not apprised of the wide difference in the present case, between the one nation and the other. The Lombards, the most wicked of all nations, seized on the imperial dominions for themselves; which was a crying injustice indeed; a damnable robbery; a sin, that provoked the vengeance of heaven, and could be atoned for only in hell-fire. But the French, the first, the best, the most religious of all nations, seized on those dominions; not for themselves, but for the prince of the apostles, St. Peter; which was a work of all good works the most meritorious; a work, that deserved to be rewarded with all the blessings and good things of this world, and with the kingdom of heaven in the world to come.

The two ambassadors were received and treated with the greatest politeness by the king of the Lombards, sensible that the interest of the pope was no longer the same with that of the emperor, nay, and were even suffered by him to enter Rome. There they were informed, by the few friends the emperor had still in that city, of the treasonable practices of the pope; of his negotiations in France; and of the promise he

had extorted from Pepin of yielding to St. Peter, that is, to himself and his successors, instead of restoring to the emperor, the places he should recover from the Lombards. The pope, in the audience he gave to the ambassadors, excused his recurring to the French from the necessity he was under of choosing new protectors, being abandoned by the emperor, not able, or not willing to protect him, against the cruel and merciless nation of the Lombards. Of his agreement with Pepin he took no kind of notice to them, nor did they to him. However, as they could not well doubt of it, they resolved to leave Rome, when they had been but a few days in that city, and repair, in all haste, to the court of Pepin, in order to plead there the cause of their master, and try to divert that prince from seconding the ambitious views, and wicked designs of the pope. This the pope suspected; and therefore apprehending, that their remonstrances might make some impression on the king, perhaps a deeper impression than the letter from St. Peter, he strove, to the utmost of his power, to dissuade them from pursuing their journey. But finding he could not prevail, he took care to send one, at the same time, with the character of his nuncio to Pepin and the French nation, to remonstrate against the remonstrances of the ambassadors; and maintain, in opposition to them, the cause of St. Peter. The nuncio found means to get, undiscovered by the Lombards, on board the vessel prepared for the ambassadors, and they sailed together to Marseilles.¹

On their arrival at that city they were informed, that the king had already crossed the mountains, and entered, at the head of his army, the dominions of the Lombards. Upon that intelligence, one of the ambassadors, namely, Gregory the emperor's first secretary, desirous of having an audience of the king before the nuncio could prepossess him against him, stole privately away, leaving the other ambassador in Marseilles to amuse the nuncio, while he pursued his journey, with all expedition, to the camp. He came up with the army at a small distance from Pavia; and being immediately admitted to the king, he told him, that the fame of his warlike exploits, especially of the success that had attended his arms against the Lombards, the common enemy of France and the empire, having reached the most distant parts of the east, the great and most catholic emperor Constantine had sent him to congratulate the most Christian king of the Franks, his friend and ally, upon the glory and renown he had thereby acquired; and, at the same time, to acknowledge, in his name, the great obligations he owed him for his generosity and friendship in defending the

¹ See p. 47.

¹ Anast. in Steph. II.

Pepin's answer to the speech of the ambassador. Aistulphus obliged to raise the siege of Rome. Peace granted him; and upon what terms.

empire against the Lombards in the west, while he was engaged in defending both the church and the empire against the Saracens in the east, the sworn enemies of both; that this was the whole of the commission he was charged with at his departure from Constantinople; but that he had since heard, to his great surprise, that it was not for the emperor the most Christian king had made war on the Lombards, nor indeed for himself, but for the pope; and that he was not to keep himself, nor yet restore to the emperor, but to yield to the pope, the places he should recover from the Lombards; to the pope, whom he should have thought of all men the least capable of accepting or encouraging others to give, what he could not accept, nor they could give, without being guilty of the greatest injustice. For though the exarchate, said he, and the Pentapolis, are now possessed by the Lombards, yet, as they were seized by them in defiance of the law of nations, and by an open violation of the most sacred treaties subsisting at the time they seized them, between them and the empire, they must still belong of right to the emperor, unless the Lombards be supposed to have acquired a just title to them by a breach of all the laws of justice. Of this the popes themselves have all been sensible; this they have often inculcated to the Lombard kings; and, by that means, even sometimes prevailed upon them to restore, out of a principle of justice, the places, which their ambition had tempted them to seize. From thence Gregory concluded, that as the emperor had still, and he alone had, an unquestionable right to those provinces, they ought either to be left in the possession of the Lombards till he himself was, as he hoped soon to be, in a condition to recover them, or to be restored to him, if recovered by any other. As for the pope, to whom he was informed they were to be yielded, he begged Pepin to consider, that he had already more than what was sufficient to support his dignity; that Constantine, not satisfied with suffering him quietly to enjoy what was given him by others, had himself contributed, and very considerably, to the wealth of his see; that after all, the pope was as much a subject of the emperor as any other man in the empire; that, as it would be treason and rebellion in any other subject to usurp the dominions of his sovereign, so it was treason and rebellion in the pope; and that it was a precedent of a very dangerous consequence for one prince to encourage and countenance the rebels of another. To this speech Pepin returned no other answer, than that it was for St. Peter, and not for the emperor, he had engaged in the present war; that he took not from the emperor the disputed dominions, but from

the Lombards, who had taken them from the emperor; that he had promised, not prompted thereunto by any worldly motive, but merely for the good of his soul, and the remission of his sins, and promised upon oath, to yield to St. Peter and his successors whatever he should recover, with the assistance of that apostle, from his enemies the Lombards; and that nothing should ever divert him from performing that promise. Pepin thought, it seems, that he could by no other means better atone for his sins, especially for his having robbed his lawful sovereign of his crown, to place it on his own head, and degraded him from a king into a monk, but by robbing the emperor of his dominions to bestow them on the pope; and raise him, by that means, from the rank of a bishop to that of a prince.

The ambassador offered to reply; but Pepin, telling him that this was his firm resolution, which nothing should ever make him alter, dismissed him that moment; and, advancing to Pavia, laid close siege to that city, and pursued it with such vigor, that Aistulphus, apprehending the French might make themselves masters of his metropolis, before he could make himself master of Rome, thought it advisable to sue a second time, before it was too late, for a peace. He sued for it accordingly; and it was granted him upon the following terms, which, however hard, he was obliged to comply with. I. That he should execute, and execute immediately, the treaty concluded the year before at Pavia. II. That to the places, which he was to deliver up in virtue of that treaty, he should add the city of Commachio, for having put Pepin to the trouble of crossing the mountains a second time. III. That he should defray all the charges of the present war; and, lastly, that he should pay the annual tribute of twelve thousand solidi of gold, which the Lombards had formerly paid to the French nation.¹ These terms being agreed and sworn to by Aistulphus, Pepin caused a new instrument to be drawn up, whereby he yielded all the places mentioned in the treaty to be forever held and possessed by St. Peter, and his lawful successors in the see of Rome. This instrument, signed by himself, by his two sons, and by the chief barons of the kingdom, he delivered to the abbot Fulrad; appointing him his commissary to receive, in the pope's name, all the places mentioned in it. With this charter the abbot repaired immediately, (for Pepin was impatient to return to France: but yet would not withdraw his troops out of the territories of the Lombards, till the treaty was executed, lest his sins should not be forgiven him,)

¹ Anast. in Steph. II. *Annal. Metens. et Fuldens. et Continuat. Fredegar. ad Ann. 756.*

To this tribute Agilulph submitted in the reign of Clotaire I., in 620; but the Lombards had redeemed themselves from it, by paying a large sum at once in the reign of Clotaire II.

The pope, made a prince. Stephen dies ;—[Year of Christ, 757.]

attended by the commissaries of Aistulphus, to Ravenna; and from thence to every city named in the instrument of donation; and having taken possession of them all in St. Peter's name, and the pope's, and every where received a sufficient number of hostages, he went with all his hostages straight to Rome; and there, laying the instrument of donation, and the keys of each city, on the tomb of St. Peter, put the pope thereby at last in possession of the so long wished for principality.¹ And thus was the bishop

¹ Anast. Annal. Metens. Continuat. Fredegar. &c.

The donation of Pepin, which Leo Ostiensis confounds with that, which was afterwards made by his son Charles to pope Adrian, (Leo Ostiensis. l. 1. c. 8.) extended only to the exarchate and the Pentapolis. The exarchate comprised, according to Sigonius, the following cities; Ravenna, Bologna, Inola, Faenza, Forlimpodi, Forli, Cesena, Bobbio, Ferrara, Commachio, Adria, Cervia, and Secchia. The Pentapolis, now Marca d'Ancona, comprehended Rimini, Pesaro, Conca, Fano, Sinigaglia, Ancona, Osino, Umana, Jesi, Fossombrone, Monteferetro, Urbino, Cagli, Luceoli, and Eugubio. As for the city and dukedom of Rome, containing several cities of note, and Perugia among the rest, they had withdrawn themselves from all subjection to the emperor, and submitted to St. Peter ever since the time of pope Gregory II. So that St. Peter, that is, the pope, made no contemptible figure, even as a temporal prince. Stephen committed the government of the exarchate to the archbishop of Ravenna; who thereupon assumed the title of exarch, not as archbishop, but as an officer of the pope. As for the Lombards, they remained still masters of all the country now called Lombardy, of the present state of Genoa, of all Tuscany, of the city and dukedom of Spoleti, and of all the present kingdom of Naples, except the cities and dukedoms of Naples and Gaeta, and some maritime cities of Brutium and Calabria, which continued steadfast in their allegiance to the emperor, though they looked upon him as an heretic, on account of his condemning the use and the worship of images. The people of Naples were as much addicted even as the Romans to that superstition. But not thinking themselves therefore absolved from their allegiance, nor authorized to shake off the yoke, they continued to acknowledge Constantine for their lawful sovereign at the same time that they rejected the definition, and refused to comply with the decrees of the late council of Constantinople.

Aistulphus, not able to brook his having been obliged to part with those fruitful provinces in favor of one, who had no better right to them than himself, had begun to make vast preparations, with a design to recover them, and put himself, at the same time, in a condition to withstand the French, who, he did not doubt, would return to Italy, and renew the war there. But being in the meanwhile overtaken by the vengeance of heaven, say Anastasius and the annalist of Metz, (Anast. in Steph. II. et Annal. Met. ad Ann. 756.) he fell from his horse at a hunting-match (an accident that had happened to many before his time, and has happened to many since, whose deaths no man will ascribe to the vengeance of heaven,) and did not outlive that misfortune three whole days. He published, in the 5th year of his reign, a new edict of

raised to the rank of a prince. Whether he acted or not on so remarkable an occasion, I will not say, like the vicar, but like a disciple of Christ, who commanded us to "render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's;" who fled, when the multitude would have made him a king; who declared, that his kingdom was not of this world, I leave the reader to judge.

Stephen enjoyed, but a very short time, his new dignity; for the donation was brought to Rome by Fulrad after the month of August, 755, and he died on the 29th of April 757.¹ He was, and is justly styled, the founder of the temporal grandeur of the popes; and yet, who can account for it? So deserving a pope has not been honored by his ungrateful successors, who enjoy to this day the fruit of his apostolic labors, with a place in the calendar; an honor, which, as it was then bestowed, he had a much better claim to than his predecessor Zachary, or any other pope whatsoever.

And now that we have seen the temporal power united in the popes to the spiritual, the crown to the mitre, and the sword to the keys, I shall leave them for awhile, and close the present history with two short observations. I. That as their spiritual power was, so was their temporal owing to an usurper; the one to Phocas,² and the other to Pepin. II. That as they most bitterly inveighed against the patriarchs of Constantinople as the forerunners of the antichrist for assuming the title of universal bishop; and yet laid hold of the first opportunity that offered to assume that very title themselves; so did they inveigh against the Lombards as the most wicked of men, for usurping the dominions of their most religious sons the emperors; and yet they themselves usurped the dominions of their most religious sons as soon as they had it in their power to usurp them.

laws still to be seen entire in the monastery of Cava, and highly commended by all the civilians.—(Giannoni. Historia Civil. di Napoli, l. 5. c. 1. sect. 3.) In the same monastery is preserved to this day a charter of his confirming the grant of certain lands to the monks of Nonantula in the neighborhood of Modena, upon condition they supplied his table with forty pikes in the advent, and with forty more, during the forty days lent-fast: so that Aistulphus fasted, at least, like a true son of the church, and a very good catholic.

¹ Anast. in Steph. II.

² See vol. I. p. 426.

Paul chosen. Courts the favor of Pepin, and of the French nation. Pepin assures him of his protection. He complains to Pepin of the king of the Lombards. Strives to keep the French, the Greeks, and the Lombards, at variance.

PAUL, NINETY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, LEO.—DESIDERIUS, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 757.] Stephen dying, the people were divided in the election of his successor, some declaring for the deacon Paul, brother to the late pope, and some for the archdeacon Theophylactus. This division occasioned a vacancy of one month and five days. But the nobility, the clergy, and the magistrates, all warmly promoting the interest of Paul, his party prevailed in the end.¹ And this is the only instance, that occurs in the whole history of the popes, of two brothers successively raised to the papal chair.

The new pope, sensible that unless Pepin, who of a bishop had made him a prince, maintained him in that rank, he would soon from a prince be degraded again into a bishop, did not wait till he was ordained to engage his protection; but quite unmindful of the affairs of the church, and only concerned to ensure his temporal dominions, he dispatched a messenger into France, the moment he was chosen, with a letter to the king to acquaint him with his promotion, and earnestly entreat him, as he expected that his sins should be forgiven him, not to suffer his zeal for the safety and welfare of the church and the flock of St. Peter ever to cool, since that apostle had distinguished him above all the princes of the earth in choosing him for their only protector after God and himself.² The pope wrote at the same time to the French in general, to thank them for the zeal they had so meritoriously exerted in the cause of the apostolic church of St. Peter, and assure them of the protection and favor of the prince of the apostles, so long as they continued to protect and to favor his church and his people.³

Pepin, in his answer, congratulated the pope on his promotion with the warmest expressions of friendship and kindness, exhorted the Roman senate and people to continue steadfast in their obedience and submission to St. Peter and his vicar, and assured them, that nothing was capable of lessening his zeal for their prosperity and welfare, or shaking the resolution he had taken of maintaining St. Peter and his successors in the

full possession and quiet enjoyment of what he had given them, and employing for that purpose, if necessary, the whole strength of his kingdom.¹

As the treaty of Pavia was not fully executed at the death of Aistulphus, the next care of the pope was to have such places delivered up to him as had been yielded to his predecessor by that treaty, but were still kept, under various pretences, by the Lombards. Desiderius, duke or governor of Tuscany, had been raised to the throne in the room of Aistulphus; and he owed his crown chiefly to the interest and the intrigues of pope Stephen, who had not only himself declared, but had prevailed upon Pepin to declare in his favor, and diverted by that means the Lombards, unwilling to quarrel, at so critical a juncture, with the French, from choosing the monk Rachis, who, being tired of a monastic life, the far greater part of the nation were for placing again on the throne. But it was upon condition that Desiderius should, if he succeeded, execute, without delay, the treaty of Pavia to its full extent, and besides yield to St. Peter certain cities, territories, and strongholds, not contained in that treaty, that Stephen had espoused his cause, and persuaded his friend Pepin to espouse it. For no sooner were the popes possessed of temporal dominions, than, giving way to their ambition, they began, like the other princes of this world, to contrive all possible means of extending them. To those conditions Desiderius had agreed; but as he had not yet complied with them, Paul took care, as soon as he was ordained, to put him in mind of his agreement, and challenge the performance of it. Desiderius pretended to have nothing so much at heart, as to satisfy the pope; but alleging, that the affairs of his new kingdom engrossed all his attention, he begged his holiness to excuse his not complying, till they were settled, with his demands. Of this delay the pope complained, in a long letter to Pepin. And truly he seems to have been entirely taken up, during the whole time of his pontificate, in writing letters to Pepin, to his two sons, to the French in general, filled with complaints, either against the king of the Lombards, or the emperor; and in striving, by frequent legations, as well as by letters, to keep the French, the Greeks, and the Lombards, ever at variance. In most of his letters he paints the emperor as a pro-

¹ Anasi in Paulo.

² Cod. Carol. Ep. 26.

³ Cod. Carolin. Ep. 13.

The direction of the letter was "To Pepin of France, our most excellent son, and Roman patrician, Paul the deacon, and, in the name of God, the elect of the holy apostolic see."—(Cod. Carolin. Ep. 13.) For the person elected was not styled pope, as has been observed elsewhere; (See vol. I. p. 438, note †.) but only the elect, during the interval between his election, and his ordination.

¹ Cod. Carol. Ep. 26.

The Greeks and Lombards complain, in their turn, to Pepin, of the pope, but in vain. The emperor sends a solemn embassy into France;—[Year of Christ, 764.] Proposes a match between his son and Pepin's daughter. The proposal rejected, and why. The ambassadors undertake to show that their master was no heretic.

fessed heretic, as a persecutor of the orthodox, as a faithless tyrant; as one, with whom no Christian prince could live in friendship and amity, without renouncing the Christian religion. Of these letters, no fewer than thirty-one have reached our times,¹ all calculated to keep Pepin steady in his attachment to St. Peter and his see, and to prejudice him against the Greeks and the Lombards, as the sworn enemies of both.

On the other hand, the emperor and the king of the Lombards left nothing unattempted to gain Pepin, and persuade him to abandon the protection of the pope; representing him not only as a rebel to his liege lord, and an usurper, but as a public incendiary; who, instead of striving to unite the Christian princes among themselves against the Saracens, their common enemy, made it his study to sow and foment divisions among them; and that with no other view, but to aggrandize himself at their expense, or rather at the expense of the Christian religion; since the Saracens, taking advantage of their divisions, had already extended, and continued daily to extend, their conquests both in the east and the west, and with their conquests their detestable superstition. The emperor urged, in particular, his unquestionable right to the exarchate and the Pentapolis, which, he said, had been unjustly seized by the Lombards, and therefore ought, in justice, to have been restored to him, agreeably to the known and never yet disputed maxim, that whatever is taken from an unlawful possessor, ought to be restored to the lawful owner. But the remonstrances of the emperor proved all ineffectual, Pepin returning no other answer to them, but that he had taken those provinces from the Lombards, and not from him; that they were his by right of conquest, and that being, consequently, free to dispose of them to whom he pleased, he had thought fit to give them, for the good of his soul, to be forever possessed by St. Peter and his successors, and could not, without being guilty of a sacrilege, revoke that donation.²

The emperor, however, did not yet de-

spair of being able to gain Pepin, and prevail upon him to abandon the pope, and enter into an alliance with the empire. With that view he sent, in 764, a most solemn embassy into France; the most solemn, that had yet been seen in that kingdom. It consisted of six patricians, of several bishops, and a great number of other ecclesiastics, all men eminent for their piety and learning, as well as for their address in negotiations, and skill in affairs of state. They brought with them most magnificent presents for Pepin and the chief lords of his court; among the rest, an organ, an instrument till then never seen in France. Their commission was, to propose a marriage between Leo, the emperor's son, born in 750; and Gesil, Pepin's daughter, born in 757; Constantine flattering himself, that Pepin might be brought, by such an alliance, to hearken to his just remonstrances; and either restore to him the provinces he claimed, or suffer him, at least, to recover them. He well knew, that the pope, to prejudice the western princes, especially Pepin and his two sons, against him, had, on account of his aversion to images, represented him to them as a professed heretic, as a declared enemy of the church, as a Jew or a Mahometan, rather than a Christian; and it was to remove these prejudices, and satisfy the French nation, that it was no heresy to forbid the worship of images; but, on the contrary, idolatry to worship them, that he appointed so many learned ecclesiastics to attend his ambassadors, on this occasion, into France. Pepin granted them an audience soon after their arrival, received them with great politeness, and seemed highly pleased with their presents. But as to the marriage between his daughter and the young emperor Leo, he told them, when they proposed it, that he should be proud of such an alliance, were their master a catholic prince; but being, as he was informed, a heretic, a persecutor of the church, an enemy to the virgin Mary and the saints, who reigned with her in heaven, to contract an alliance with him, would be countenancing the heresy, which he professed, and renouncing the faith which the French nation thought it their greatest glory to defend and maintain.

This was no more than what the ambassadors expected; and therefore they readily replied, that their master was neither a heretic, nor an abettor of heretics; that he received the six general councils, held the doctrine which they had defined, and condemned all the heretics and heresies which they had condemned; that, treading in the footsteps of his father of glorious memory, and animated, as well as he, with a true zeal for the purity of the Christian religion, he had indeed proscribed the worship of

¹ James Grezer published at Ingolstat, in 1613, the letters which the popes Gregory III., Zachary, Stephen II., Paul, Stephen III., and the antipope Constantine, had written to Charles Martel, to Pepin, to Charlemagne, and to his brother Carloman. These original letters, in all ninety-nine, were collected into one volume by Charlemagne himself. But as some of them were greatly damaged, and in several places hardly legible, he caused them to be transcribed in 792, as appears from the inscription that was prefixed to them by the person whom he employed on that occasion. That copy is still preserved in the emperor's library, as Lambecius informs us; (Lamb. Biblioth. Cæsar. l. 2. c. 5.) who adds, that the transcriber, who copied them for Grezer, took too much liberty in altering several passages, under color of correcting them. This collection is commonly known by the name of the "Caroline Code," being so called from Charles, who first collected the letters it contains.

² Cod. Carol. Ep. 14, 17, 24.

A great council assembled at Gentilli about images. The worship of images not approved by that council.

images, and obliged all his loving subjects to worship God alone, and to worship him in spirit and in truth; that he had therein entirely conformed to the doctrine of our Savior and his apostles, as well as to the practice of the primitive Christians and the fathers, who had all abhorred, as might be easily made to appear from their writings, not only the worship, but even the use of images in the places of their worship; that the worship, which their master, as guardian of the church, had undertaken to abolish, was an innovation, an abuse of a very late date; that it had been zealously opposed by the greatest men, as well as the greatest saints in the church, and had been condemned, but ten years since, by the most numerous council that had ever been convened. They added, that the French nation, and the princes in the west, were quite misinformed, and most grossly imposed upon with respect to the state of religion in the east; that the popes, prompted by their boundless ambition, wanted only a pretence to shake off the yoke, and seize on the dominions of their liege lords the emperors; and that it was only to disguise their treason and rebellion, that they had charged them, and the Greeks in general, with heresy: but if the most Christian king would allow the points in dispute to be candidly examined in his presence by the French bishops, and the ecclesiastics, whom the emperor had sent, for that purpose, from Constantinople, (a favor which they earnestly entreated him to grant them) they would leave him to judge, and stand to his judgment, whether the emperors were justly or unjustly traduced by the popes and their emissaries as heretics.¹

Peppin had hitherto entirely acquiesced in the judgment of the pope, taking it upon his word, that the emperor and the Greeks were all heretics. But tempted by the favorable opportunity, that now offered, and extremely desirous to know what might be said on either side in a dispute that had made, and continued to make, so great a noise in the church, he resolved to comply with the request of the ambassadors, and for once take the liberty of judging for himself. He issued, accordingly an order, enjoining all the bishops in his dominions to meet, after Easter, at Gentilli, a royal villa about a league from Paris, where he frequently resided. The bishops met at the place and time appointed; and it proved the most solemn and numerous assembly that had ever yet met in France. It consisted of all the bishops of that kingdom and those of Germany too, who were subject to the crown of France; and there were present, besides the six ambassadors from the emperor with the bishops and other ecclesiastics, who attended them, two legates sent from

Rome to represent the pope, a great number of other ecclesiastics, and Peppin assisted in person, attended by the chief nobility, and all the great officers of state. In that great council (for so it is called in the annals of France) two points were proposed and debated; namely, "whether it was lawful to worship images, or set them up in the places of worship; and whether the Holy Ghost proceeded only from the Father, or from the Father and the Son;" the Greeks charging the Latins with having added to the Nicene creed the words, "and from the Son;" and the Latins reproaching the Greeks, in their turn, with having erased them.¹

What was the issue of this council, what the decision concerning either of these points, history does not inform us: and hence some have concluded, that they came to no determination; as if so many bishops assembled on purpose to decide a question, and a question, so far as it concerned the worship of images, of the utmost importance, would have left it quite undecided. Indeed no councils, that we know of, have been thus backward; but, on the contrary, most of them too forward to decide and define, and even to damn all who did not acquiesce in their definitions and decisions. The Jesuit Maimbourg takes it for granted, and roundly asserts, as a thing not at all to be doubted, that the Gallican bishops condemned, and condemned with one voice, both the errors of the Greeks, especially that concerning the use and the worship of images. To make good his assertion, he tells us, that twelve of the most learned bishops of France, sent to represent the Gallican church in a council held two years after at Rome, distinguished themselves, above all the rest, by their zeal in the defence and in favor of images. He adds, that as no man can doubt but those bishops acted agreeably to the sentiments of their fellow-bishops, and the council, that had been held on the same subject in France, no man can doubt but that the use and worship of images were approved by that council, and the opposite doctrine condemned as heretical.² But I should be glad to know who informed Maimbourg that the twelve Gallican bishops distinguished themselves by their zeal in the defence of images? Anastasius, who wrote in the next century, and has given us the most particular account we have of the council held at Rome, and has been copied by Maimbourg, and almost all who speak of that council, tells us, indeed, that twelve of the most learned bishops of France were sent to Rome by Charles, or Charlemagne, to assist at it; but takes not the least notice of their boasted zeal in the defence of images.³ One of them, by name Herulphus, spoke, it is true, if pope Adrian is to

¹ Annal. Franc. Bert. ad ann. 767. Eginhard, in Chron. Ado Vienn. Rhegin. Aimoïn, l. 4. c. 37.

¹ Annal. Franc. Bert. ad ann. 767. Eginhard, in Chron. Ado Vienn. Rhegin. Aimoïn, l. 4. c. 37.

² Maimb. Hist. Iconoclast. l. 3. p. 228.

³ Anast. in Steph. III.

The council of Gentilli condemned the worship, but approved the use of images. Pepin satisfied that the Greeks were no heretics, but unwilling to disoblige the pope, rejects the proposed alliance with the emperor. Paul dies;—[Year of Christ, 767.]

be credited¹ without any warrant from the contemporary historians, for the worship of images; and that one Maimbourg has taken the liberty to multiply into twelve, arguing thus: one of the twelve Gallican bishops spoke in the council of Rome for the worship of images, therefore they all spoke for that worship, and all distinguished themselves by their zeal in maintaining it: no man can doubt but they acted therein agreeably to the sentiments of their fellow bishops, and the council that had been held in France but two years before on the same subject; therefore no man can doubt but the worship of images was approved by that council, and the opposite doctrine condemned as heretical.

F. Sirmond, a writer well known for his uncommon erudition and learning, and, though a Jesuit, not void of all candor, ingenuously owns that in the council of Gentilli the worship of images was condemned, though the use was approved. "In the council of Gentilli," says he, "the Gallican bishops decreed against the Greek iconoclasts, that images should be retained only as helps to memory, or for the sake of instruction, but should not be worshiped, for that they absolutely rejected."² and Sirmond is extolled by Maimbourg himself as better acquainted than any other writer whatever with the ancient discipline and faith of the Gallican church. That this was the doctrine of that church in the latter end of the present, and the beginning of the following century, is manifest, from the decrees of two other councils; the council of Frankfort, in 794, at which some bishops might have assisted, who were present at that of Gentilli; and the council of Paris in 824. For in both these councils, consisting chiefly of Gallican bishops, it was decreed, as shall be shown in the sequel, that images should be retained only as helps to memory, as books for the ignorant, as ornaments; but that no kind of worship should be given them. We must therefore either suppose the Gallican bishops and church to have entirely changed, in the space of thirty years, their faith and their doctrine, or to have defined at Gentilli, in 764, what they defined in 794, that is, thirty years after, at Frankfort; namely, "that images were not to be broken, nor were they to be worshiped;" the very doctrine of pope Gregory the Great.³ And here it is to be observed, that the council of Constantinople did not condemn the use of images, in the places of worship, as evil in itself, but only as dangerous, as exposing those, who prayed before them, especially the ignorant, to the danger of praying to them; and it was not as we have seen,⁴ till Leo, the first

Iconoclast emperor, found by experience, that the use of images could not be allowed, and the worship prevented, that he ordered them to be cast out of the churches, and broken.

And now the only objection against the proposed marriage, namely, that the emperor was a heretic, being thus removed, and Pepin satisfied that the Greeks were no enemies to the virgin Mary and the saints, though they did not worship their images, but broke them to prevent their being worshiped, the ambassadors renewed the proposal, urging the great advantages, that would accrue to the Christian religion from an union between the two chief Christian powers, at a time when the common enemy, availing himself of their divisions, aimed at nothing less than its utter destruction. But Pepin, unwilling to disoblige the pope, who he knew would be no less displeased than alarmed at an alliance between France and the empire, how advantageous soever it might prove to the Christian religion, kept still to his former resolution, nor could the ambassadors, though seconded by some of his court, prevail upon him, by any means, to alter it. He sent, however, in his turn, a solemn embassy into the east with letters in answer to those which the imperial ambassadors had brought him from the emperor: but lest he should thereby give umbrage to the pope, jealous of the least appearance of a good understanding between him and the emperor, he took care to transmit copies of all these letters to his holiness, who, highly pleased with his conduct, dispatched, as soon as he received them, a nuncio extraordinary into France, to thank the king for his inviolable attachment to the apostolic see, and assure him of the favor and protection of St. Peter, whose honor and interest he had so much at heart.¹

These are the only events, I find recorded in the pontificate of Paul worthy of notice, though he presided in the Roman church ten years, and one month. For he was ordained on the 29th of May, 757, and died on the 28th of June, 767. He was buried in the church of St. Paul, where no pope had been buried before: but his remains were, three months after, translated to the Vatican, and deposited in an oratory, which he had built there in honor of the virgin Mary.² He has been allowed a place in the calendar, and is now worshiped, on the 28th of June, as a saint; but for what extraordinary merit history does not inform us, nor even the legends, unless it were for his uncommon address in courting the favor of Pepin, in flattering him, for all his letters to that prince are filled with the most fulsome

¹ Adrian. in ep. ad Carol.

² Sirmond. Concil. Gallican. tom. 11. p. 192.

³ See p. 42.

⁴ See p. 55.

¹ Cod. Carolin. ep. 20.

² Anast. Mart. Pol. Luitpr. &c.

In Paul's time an invaluable treasure discovered in Rome. In the east, the monks refuse to comply with the definition of the council of Constantinople against images. Treated with great severity by the governors of the provinces, and banished Constantinople. Some of them quit their profession.

flattery; and keeping him, by that means, steadily attached, and entirely devoted to his see. In his time was discovered at Rome an invaluable treasure, the body of St. Petronilla, St. Peter's daughter; and the pope, transported with joy at such a discovery, caused it to be translated from the cemetery, where it was found, to the Vatican. She died at Rome, during the pontificate of her father.

Of this pope many letters have reached our times, but all concerning temporal affairs, which he was too much taken up with to attend to the affairs of religion, or to think of affording any comfort or relief to his friends in the east, though treated by the emperor and his officers with the utmost severity. It had been but very lately defined, as we have seen,¹ and defined in a council consisting of no fewer than three hundred and thirty-eight bishops, that to worship images, or any other creature, was robbing God of the honor that was due to him alone, and relapsing into idolatry; and by the same council, they, who should thenceforth presume to set up images in the churches, or in private houses, or to conceal them, had been anathematized, and declared guilty of a breach of God's express command, and the imperial laws. To the definition and decrees of so great and so numerous a council, or, almost all, but the monks, readily submitted; and it was universally received in the east as the seventh œcumenical or general council. But the monks, not satisfied with rejecting it, and stigmatizing the prelates, who composed it, with the opprobrious names of heretics, apostates, Jews, Mahometans, still retained their images, continued to expose them to public adoration, and even paid them, as it were in defiance of the council and the imperial laws, extraordinary honors; nay, quitting their solitudes, and repairing, in great numbers, to the cities, they strove to maintain, by stirring up the populace to sedition and rebellion, in spite of the emperor, the condemned superstition. Of this the bishops complained to the governors of the provinces, and they to the emperor, who thereupon strictly enjoined them to cause the decrees of the council to be punctually complied with in their respective governments, and the laws to be executed, with the utmost severity, against the worshippers of images, which his most religious predecessors had issued against the worshippers of idols. Pursuant to this order, the monasteries were everywhere stripped by the imperial officers of all their images; and the monks, who offered to defend them, dragged to prison, publicly whipped, and sent into exile. Several monasteries were pulled down, or set on fire, and the monks,

who had the good luck to make their escape, obliged to seek for shelter in the deserts, against the fury of the incensed soldiery. Draco, or, as some call him, Laconodraeo, governor of Lydia, Ionia, Caria, and Mysia, distinguished himself, on this occasion, above all the rest: for finding he could not, by fair means, prevail upon the monks, who were very numerous in those provinces, to part with their images, nor even restrain them from seducing the ignorant multitude, and raising disturbances among the populace, he resolved to extirpate the whole race. Having accordingly surrounded, with the troops under his command, one of their chief monasteries, he seized all the monks, cut off their noses, shut up thirty-eight of them in a bath, where they were all stifled, and sent the rest into exile. He secured, in like manner, all the monks of the other monasteries within his government, who had not made their escape, as well as the nuns; and carrying them, surrounded by his troops, into a spacious field, he put it to their choice, either to quit their profession and marry, each monk a nun, or to have their eyes put out, and be confined to the most inhospitable places in the empire. Most of them chose to quit their profession, and to marry; and those, who did not, met with no mercy. Draco, having thus quite cleared his government of monks and nuns, burnt all their images, gave up their monasteries to be plundered by the soldiery, and then levelled them with the ground.¹ The other governors, less strangers to compassion and mercy than Draco, contented themselves with confining in the public jails, with whipping and sending into exile, such of those unhappy wretches as obstinately refused to submit, or encouraged others not to submit to the definition and decrees of the council.

They met with no better treatment in Constantinople than they did in the provinces; for the most mad enthusiasts among them, resorting to the metropolis to keep the people their steady in what they called the catholic faith, raised daily such disturbances in every quarter of the city, that the emperor, apprehending a general revolt, was obliged, in the end, to issue an edict, commanding all monks to quit their whimsical habit, and renounce their idle profession, or depart the city in the term of three days, on pain of being treated as disturbers of the public peace, as rebels, as enemies both to the state and the church. In compliance with that edict, many, fearing God, says Theophanes, less than the emperor, quitted their holy habit, renounced their profession, and of monks becoming husbands, had even the assurance to appear, O shocking sight! leading their brides in the public streets of

¹ See p. 100.

¹ Theoph. ad ann. Const. 20. Cedren. ibid.

The insolent behavior of the monks to the emperor, punished with great severity. No martyrs, though honored as such. The monkish order suppressed in the east, and the worship of images abolished. Schism in the Roman church. Constantine, yet a layman, raised by his party to the see.

Constantinople. Others, withdrawing from the city, retired to the deserts, where, none being allowed to relieve them, they perished with hunger, and the hardships they suffered. But some, more zealous than the rest, continued at Constantinople, in open defiance of the imperial edict, and concealing themselves in the day-time, but skulking about from house to house in the night, still kept up the spirit of sedition and rebellion in the people. Two of them, Andrew and Stephen, who are now both honored as martyrs and saints of the first rate, had even the boldness to appear in public, nay, and to insult the emperor in person; the one calling him another Julian, a Valens, an apostate, a persecutor of Christ and the saints in their images; and the other treading under foot, in his presence, a coin with his image, and telling him, that as it was no crime, according to him, to break the images of Christ and his saints, it could be no crime to insult, abuse, and tread under foot, his, nor ought he to take it amiss, or resent it. No wonder, therefore, that Constantine, thus provoked, should have proceeded against them, as he is said to have done, with the utmost severity; causing all, who fell into his hands, to be either publicly executed, or severely whipped, deprived of their sight, a punishment common in the east, and sent into exile. As for Andrew and Stephen, the one was whipped to death by the emperor's guards; and the other dragged by them through the streets, and torn to pieces.¹ From these executions the Jesuit Maimbourg takes occasion to paint Constantine as a Nero, as a Dioclesian, as one of the most cruel and merciless tyrants that ever swayed a sceptre. But his severity to the rebellious monks did not, perhaps, exceed that of Lewis XIV. to his protestant subjects, though guilty of no rebellion, or treason: and yet Maimbourg, far from thinking his grand monarch a Nero, a Dioclesian, a tyrant, for thus persecuting his innocent subjects, commends and extols him as thereby well deserving the title he bore of the most Christian king.² If it was tyranny in Constantine to punish,

with so much severity, those who worshipped images; it was tyranny in Lewis to punish, with the like severity, those who refused to worship them: if it was no tyranny in the one, it could be none in the other. In short, both were tyrants, which Maimbourg will not allow, or neither.

The menology of the Greeks, and the Roman martyrology, are filled with the names of monks, who are said to have suffered martyrdom, under Copronymus, in the defence of images; but it was not, in truth, for their opinion they suffered, but for the disturbances and tumults they every where raised; insomuch, that had not the emperor proceeded against them with the utmost severity, and quite cleared the empire of those incendiaries, as he is said to have done, he would probably have seen, as they were very numerous, and had a great ascendant over the multitude, a civil war kindled, by their means, in the bowels of the empire, and a favorable opportunity given to the Saracens of seizing anew the provinces which he had lately recovered, and carrying on their conquests to the very gates of Constantinople. The monkish order being thus entirely suppressed in all the provinces subject to the empire in the east, and the monasteries either converted to better uses, or levelled with the ground, the decrees of the council of Constantinople were quietly complied with by all ranks of people, the use of images was every where abolished, as well as the worship; and Constantine had, in the end, the satisfaction he had so long wished for, of seeing the Christian worship restored, throughout his dominions, to its primitive purity. During this cruel persecution, as it is called by the Byzantine historians, the pope, though well acquainted with the sufferings of his friends and emissaries, the monks, never once offered to interpose in their favor, nor so much as to encourage or to comfort them in their distress by his letters, his attention being wholly engrossed by affairs of a very different nature, the securing of his new principality against the attempts of the Greeks and the Lombards.

STEPHEN III., NINETY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, LEO.—DESIDERIUS, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 767.] The death of Paul occasioned great disturbances and confusion in Rome. For Toto, duke of Nepi, a small city in the present patrimony of St. Peter, resolved to raise one of his family to

the papal chair; and coming to Rome with that view, while the pope lay at the point of death, attended by his three brothers, and a great number of his friends and his vassals, all well armed, caused, the moment Paul expired, his brother Constantine to be proclaimed by them pope in his room; and car-

¹ Theoph. ad ann. Const. 25.

² Maimb. Hist. du Calvinis. ep. Dedicat.

Constantine strives to gain Pepin. His letter to him. Gives him an account of the state of religion in the east. Great disturbances in Rome;—[Year of Christ, 768.]

rying him in triumph, without loss of time, to the Lateran palace, obliged George, bishop of Palestrina, by threatening him with present death, to initiate him, as he was yet a layman, with the usual ceremonies among the clergy. The next day he was, by the same bishop, ordained subdeacon and deacon; and the Sunday after, by him and the two bishops of Porto and Albano, consecrated bishop.¹

Constantine well knew, that the most effectual, nay, and only means of maintaining himself in the station to which he had been thus raised, in open defiance of all the laws and canons of the church, was to engage the French nation in his cause, and get himself acknowledged by them for lawful pope. He therefore took care, as soon as he was ordained, to write to Pepin, to acquaint him with his promotion, to assure him of his inviolable attachment to him and his family, and earnestly entreat him, as he hoped to be favored and protected by St. Peter, to take him, the successor and vicar of that apostle, into his favor and protection. In the same letter he had the assurance to tell Pepin, that he had been chosen by the joint suffrages of the clergy and people of Rome; that he had long withstood their prayers, their entreaties, and even their tears; but that finding them determined to choose no other, he had, in the end, been obliged to acquiesce in the will of God and his people.² This letter he conveyed to Pepin by two ambassadors, who had been sent by that prince to beg of pope Paul the Lives of the Saints, legends alone being now in request, and were then returning to France. As the ambassadors had been present at his election, and well knew what had passed on that occasion, he took care to engage them, before they left Rome, with many rich presents, to confirm, by word of mouth, all he had said in his letter. As he was well apprised that Pepin would soon be informed by others, if not by them, of the unlawfulness of his election, to prepossess him in his favor, he dispatched, soon after their departure, two of his most trusty friends into France; Christopher, presbyter, and Anastasius, notary, with another letter to the king, entreating him not to give credit to certain false and scandalous reports, that were maliciously spread abroad by his enemies concerning his election; and assuring him, that no violence

had been used with any but himself; that no bishop had ever more unfeignedly declined, and none more unwillingly accepted the episcopal dignity, than himself; that he had indeed complied, in the end, with the will of the people, or rather of God, revealed to him in the will of the people. He added, that he had sent two persons of the greatest probity, and the most unexceptionable characters, on whose veracity he might entirely rely, to inform him of every particular relating to his election; and that he did not doubt, but that his most Christian son would give more credit to them, than to the emissaries of those whose ambition had been, to their great mortification and his own, disappointed.¹

In the same letter, to make his court to Pepin, he gives him an account of the state of religion in the east; telling him, among other things, that he had received a synodical letter from Theodore, patriarch of Jerusalem, addressed to his predecessor, to acquaint him, that the worship of images began to revive in the east; and that not only Theodore himself, but the two patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria entirely agreed, in the article relating to images, with the patriarch of Rome. Of that letter, genuine or supposititious,² Constantine sent a copy, both in Greek and in Latin, to Pepin; and, after entreating him, over and over again, to continue his protection to the church, the people, and the vicar of St. Peter, he begged him to remind, as soon as possible, the two nuncios, whom his predecessor had sent into France; pretending, that their churches suffered greatly by their absence; but in truth, to learn of them what the French and their king thought of his election. In both letters he expresses great zeal for the welfare of the church, and the good of the Christian religion and the catholic faith; and had not, perhaps, more of the hypocrite than most of his predecessors.

The war which Pepin was carrying on, at this time against Vaifar, duke of Aquitaine, diverted him from attending, at present, to the affairs of Italy; and before he put an end to that war, which he did soon after by the reduction of that country, Constantine was deposed, and another raised to the see in his room. Of this event Anastasius give us the following account. Chris-

¹ Cod. Carol. ep. 99.

¹ Anast. in Steph. III.

It was not then thought necessary, as we may observe here by the way, that a man should be ordained priest in order to be made a bishop: for deacons were as commonly raised to the episcopal dignity as presbyters; and in the ancient "Ordo Romanus" the same ceremony is prescribed for the ordination of the one and the other.—(Vide Mabill. in comment. prævio in Ord. Rom. n. 18.) Constantine was, according to the account of Anastasius, of a deacon made bishop; and it is not to be doubted but he would have been first ordained presbyter, had he thought it necessary.

² Cod. Carol. ep. 98.

² I said genuine or supposititious; it not being at all probable that the Saracens, who were more averse to images even than the emperor, and to whom the three patriarchs were subject, would have suffered that worship to revive in their dominions. Besides, no notice is taken by any of the historians of those times, though all most zealous advocates for pictures and images, nor even by the fathers of Nice, of any council approving at this time, in the east, the use or the worship of images; nay, pope Adrian, in a letter which he wrote, thirty years after, to the emperor Constantine, the present emperor's grandson, and his mother Irene, tells them, that till their time, the people in the east had all erred in what concerned images; (Tom. 7. Concil. p. 89.) that is, had all rejected both the use and the worship of images.

Duke Toto, Constantine's brother, killed. Constantine taken, and dragged to prison. Philip, a monk, made pope and deposed. Stephen chosen, and Constantine degraded.

topher and his son Sergius, the one primicerius and counsellor,¹ and the other treasurer of the Roman church, shocked at so barefaced an usurpation, formed a design of driving out the usurper, by some means or other, and making room for a new and canonical election. This design they imparted to some Roman citizens, who, they knew, were no friends to Constantine: but finding them too much intimidated and awed by Toto and his followers, to join in the enterprise, they resolved to apply to the Lombards; and with that view begged leave of Constantine to retire, as being tired of the world to the monastery of St. Saviour in the dukedom of Spoleti. Constantine, apprehending they might raise some disturbances in the city, readily complied with their request, but obliged them, before they left Rome, to swear that their design was to embrace a monastic life, that they had no other design whatsoever, and that they would never undertake anything themselves, or encourage others to undertake anything against him. This oath they both took, the honor of the Roman church being at stake, without the least scruple or remorse, thinking it could be no sin to forswear themselves for the good of the apostolic see. And now Constantine, apprehending nothing from them, suffered them to depart. But they, instead of repairing to the monastery, where the abbot expected them, went straight to Spoleti, and from thence to Pavia, to impart their design to the king of the Lombards, and gain him over, which they thought might be easily accomplished, to their side. But they found the king not inclined to concern himself in the affair the one way or the other. However, he declared, that if they could persuade any of his subjects to join them, he would not prevent it. With this answer they left Pavia, and being joined in the cities of Spoleti and Rieti by a great many Lombards, they marched silently with them towards Rome. They arrived on the 29th of July in the evening at the gate of St. Pancrase, which being early next morning opened to them by their friends, they entered the city, and declaring that they were come to deliver Rome from its tyrants, set up their standard on the wall. In the meantime Toto, a man of great resolution and bravery, alarmed at the noise, and hastening, with one of his brothers, named Passif, and some of his friends, to the walls, fell on the Lombards, killed with his own hand RaciPERT, their leader, and put the rest, both Lombards

and Romans, to flight. But while he was pursuing them, two Romans, who were with him, and pretended to be his friends, attacking him behind, ran him through with their lances, and laid him dead at their feet. Toto being killed, all, who were with him, betaking themselves to flight, endeavored to make their escape. Passif fled to the Lateran palace to acquaint his brother Constantine with what had passed, and apprise him of the danger he was in. Both took refuge in the oratory of St. Cæsarius within the palace; but were soon discovered there, and dragged to prison.¹

During this confusion, a presbyter, named Waldipert, flew with some Romans to the monastery of St. Vitus, and taking from thence Philip, a Lombard monk, proclaimed him pope, conducted him to the Lateran, crying aloud, "Long live pope Philip, St. Peter has chosen him," and there placed him in the pontifical chair. The monk, who had never once thought of the papal dignity, looked upon all this as a dream. But Waldipert encouraging him, and some of the populace applauding, with repeated acclamations, the election of pope Philip, he took upon him all the state and majesty of a pope, gave his blessing, with great solemnity, to the people, who flocked, from all quarters of the city to see their new sovereign, and entertained that night at supper, the leading men of the militia and the clergy. In the meantime Christopher and Sergius, greatly surprised at this new election, assembled, upon the first notice they had of it, the heads of the people and the clergy, and protesting against it, declared, in their presence, that they were determined not to acquiesce in the election of Philip, no less scandalous than that of Constantine, and would not dismiss the Lombards they had brought with them, till the mock pope quitting the Lateran returned to his monastery. Waldipert and his party, were no match for Christopher and his Lombards, and therefore abandoning Philip, advised him to withdraw quietly to his monastery; which he did, having enjoyed the papal dignity not quite twenty-four hours.²

Both intruders being thus driven out, Christopher assembled, a few days after, the people and the clergy, in order to proceed, according to the canons, to a new election. They met on the fifth of August, and the same day chose, with one consent, Stephen, presbyter of the church of St. Cæcilia, and conducted him, with the usual ceremonies, to the Lateran. The next day, the sixth of August, some bishops and Roman presbyters, assembling in the church of St. Saviour, ordered Constantine to be brought before them, and having first caused the canons to be read, solemnly deposed him. He was

¹ The primicerius and secundicerius were the two chief officers of the Roman church. Their office was, to judge and decide all disputes among those, who immediately belonged to the pope, or waited on his person; to attend him in the public processions, the one walking on his right, and the other on his left hand; and to assist him, with their advice, in all affairs of importance, ecclesiastical or civil. Whence they are frequently styled the pope's counsellors.

¹ Anast. in Steph. III.

² Idem ibid.

Constantine and his friends treated with the utmost cruelty. The new pope writes to Pepin and his two sons; [Year of Christ, 769.] Begs them to send some of their bishops to assist at a council to be held in Rome. The council meets, and Constantine is brought before them.

then sent to Collanova, and there shut up in a monastery. The day after, being the seventh of August, which in 769, fell on a Sunday, Stephen was ordained, and an end put at last to the schism.¹

But no end was put to the cruelties practised by the partisans of the new pope on all, who had adhered either to Constantine, or Philip. Theodore, a bishop, and Constantine's major domo, had his eyes and his tongue plucked out, and was confined to a monastery on mount Scaurus, where he died of hunger and thirst, roaring in a manner to melt the most hardened heart, but in vain, only for a cup of water. Passiv, Constantine's brother, was likewise deprived, and in a most barbarous manner, of his sight. Gracilis, tribune of Alatri in Campania, and Constantine's friend, being seized and brought to Rome, met there with the same treatment as Theodore. Constantine had been confined, as I have related above, to a monastery in Callanova; but these barbarians, thinking he had been too mildly dealt with, dragged him from thence, and leading him about exposed to the insults of the populace on horseback with heavy weights at his feet, in the end they put out his eyes, and left him in that condition lying in the street. The presbyter Waldipert, who had caused Philip to be proclaimed pope, was dragged from the Pantheon, where he had taken refuge, and condemned to have his eyes and his tongue pulled out; which was done in so cruel a manner, that he died of the pain.² Did the cruelty of the emperor to the monks, allowing all the Byzantine historians have said of his cruelty to be true, exceed that, I will not say of the pope to these unhappy wretches, but of his ministers and friends, whom it does not appear that he ever once offered to restrain? The cruelties practised at Rome, Baronius construes into a judgment upon those, who suffered them, for presuming to raise a layman, and raise him by force and violence, to the throne of St. Peter: and may we not, with much better reason, construe the cruelties, that are said to have been practised on the monks at Constantinople, into a just judgment upon them for presuming to maintain, and with treason and rebellion, an idolatrous worship forbidden by the law of God, and the laws of the empire?

The new pope was a native of Sicily, and the son of one Olivus. He is said by Anastasius, to have been held in great esteem by the four preceding popes, on account of his piety and learning, especially by his immediate predecessor Paul, whom he attended in his last malady with great care and tenderness, never stirring from his bed till he expired.³ Upon his death he withdrew to his church, and there continued quiet till Constantine being deposed, he was raised to

the see in his room, in the manner we have seen. He was no sooner ordained, than courting the favor of Pepin, as his predecessors had all done ever since they shook off the yoke and all subjection to the emperors, he dispatched Sergius, the son of Christopher, into France with a letter to the king and his two sons Charles and Carloman, to acquaint them with his election, to engage their protection, and at the same time entreat them to send some of the most learned bishops of their kingdom to assist at a council, which he proposed to assemble at Rome, in order to restore the ecclesiastical discipline entirely neglected during the usurpation of Constantine. Sergius received, on the road, the melancholy news of Pepin's death, (he died of a dropsy on the 23d of September of the present year, in the fifty-fourth year of his age, and the seventeenth of his reign,) but pursuing, nevertheless, his journey, he delivered the letter, with which he was charged, to the deceased king's two sons, Charles and Carloman. Both received him with the greatest marks of respect and esteem, assured him that they were determined to maintain St. Peter and his vicar in the quiet possession of whatever their father had, out of his great piety and religion, been pleased to give them, and in compliance with the request of the pope, sent together with the legate, on his return to Rome, twelve of the most learned bishops of their kingdom.¹ On their arrival, a council was assembled in the Lateran, consisting of the bishops of Tuscany, Campania, and of some other provinces of Italy, and the twelve bishops come from France. The pope presided in person; and the first day they met, the unhappy Constantine was, by his order, brought, in a most deplorable condition, his wounds not being yet healed, before them. They asked him, how he had presumed to intrude himself, being yet a layman, into the holy apostolic see? What could have tempted him to commit so enormous and unheard of a crime? He answered, that it was not by any intrigues of his, that he had attained the pontifical dignity; but that the people had carried him by force to the Lateran, and obliged him to accept it, hoping he would redress the grievances they had complained of under Paul. He then threw himself on the ground, owned himself guilty, confessed that his sins were more in number than the sand of the sea, and stretching out his arms, begged they would suffer mercy to take place of justice, and forgive him. The fathers returned him no answer, but only ordered him to be raised from the ground, and led out of the assembly.

The next day he was brought again before the council, and interrogated anew concerning his intrusion. As the fathers laid great

¹ Anast. in Steph. III. ² Idem ibid. ³ Idem ibid.

¹ Anast. in Steph. III.

Constantine's cruel treatment. Sentence pronounced against him. Decrees enacted by the council.

stress on his being, in defiance of the laws of the church, of a layman ordained bishop, calling it a new crime, an unheard of attempt; he modestly replied, "that of such ordinations many instances occurred in the annals of the church; and, to waive more ancient precedents, that Sergius of Ravenna, and Stephen of Naples, both metropolitans, had been thus ordained in the late pontificate." This answer one would think, could have given no offence, the bishops he named being still living, and in the quiet possession of their sees. But he had the assurance to speak in his own defence, nay, and to contradict the council: the fathers therefore, provoked beyond measure at his insolence, and fired with zeal, says Anastasius, for the ancient practice of the church, ordered him to be most cruelly beaten in their presence, and drove him with reproaches and curses out of the assembly. From his being thus barbarously treated, though an object of compassion rather than of resentment and revenge, by a council, at which the pope presided, nay, and by his order, for all the bishops joined, "universi sacerdotes," says Anastasius, in that cruel order, may we not conclude the cruelties used with the friends of that unhappy man to have been, if not commanded, at least tacitly approved by his holiness? If so, I leave the reader to judge, which of the two was the greater tyrant, Stephen, or the emperor Constantine.

In the third session, the council, that is, the acts of the council, that had confirmed the election of Constantine, and not the bishops, who composed it, as Marianus Scotus understood it, was burnt in the presence of all, and Constantine himself condemned, as if no punishment had yet been inflicted on him, to lead, so long as he lived, shut up in a monastery, the austere life of a penitent. This sentence being pronounced, all, who had acknowledged him, and received the eucharist at his hands, in which number was Stephen himself, though now so zealous for the ancient practice of the church, prostrating themselves on the ground, begged pardon of God for so great a crime; and penance was enjoined them, we know not by whom.²

In the next place, to deter and prevent others from intruding themselves by force, after the example of Constantine, into the throne of St. Peter, they ordered the canons of the church to be brought in; which being publicly read, they issued a decree, forbidding, on pain of excommunication, any person whatever to be thenceforth raised to the pontifical dignity who had not previously passed through the inferior degrees to that of cardinal deacon, or cardinal priest. And thus was that dignity first confined to the cardinal deacons and cardinal priests.¹ By

¹ The word cardinal is derived from the Latin word *cardo*, a hinge, and signifies a thing upon which other things hang or depend, as a door does on its hinges, that is a chief or principal thing. Thus the four chief points of the compass, and the ecliptic, are called the cardinal points, the four chief moral virtues, the cardinal virtues; and the chief or leading men among the Donatists are styled by St. Austin, the cardinal Donatists.—(Aug. de Baptist. l. 1. c. 6.) In like manner the principal priests and deacons of a church were called the cardinal priests, the cardinal deacons, of that church. But who were the principal deacons and priests, to whom the name of cardinals was appropriated, is not agreed amongst authors. Onuphrius Panvinius is of opinion, that as several priests and deacons belonged to one and the same church, the chief priests and deacons were those who presided over the rest of their respective orders in the same church. Thus the priest, for instance, who presided over all the priests of the church of St. Balbina, was styled the cardinal priest of St. Balbina; and the deacon, who presided over all deacons of the church of St. Sabina, was styled the cardinal deacon of St. Sabina.—(Onuph. Panvini. lib. de Episcopatus, titulis, &c.) According to this interpretation, there must have been only one cardinal priest in each church. But in the works of pope Gregory the Great, we frequently read of several cardinal priests belonging to the same church; and the acts of a council, which that pope held at Rome, are signed by three cardinal priests of St. Balbina, by two of St. Damasus, two of St. Sylvester, and two of the holy apostles.—(Greg. regist. l. 4. c. 85.) By the cardinal priests Salmassius understands the archbishops.—(Salm. de Primat. c. 1.) But he is therein grossly mistaken, nothing being more certain, than that there were several cardinal priests in the same city, and but one archbishop. Besides, the name of cardinal is of a much later date, and not to be found in any genuine writer till the time of Gregory the Great, the council of Rome under pope Sylvester, the only authority alleged by Bellarmine (Bellar. de Cleric. l. 1. c. 16.) to prove it more ancient, being now universally rejected as a mere fiction. Some think that the cardinal priests and deacons were so called from their being fixed in the principal churches, where baptism might be administered, which were therefore styled *eclesiee* and *tituli cardinales*; (Bellar. de Cleric. l. 1. c. 16.) so that the name of cardinal was according to this opinion, first given to the place, and from the place derived to the persons. Others tell us, that when the number of the ecclesiastics was so increased in the populous cities, that they could not all conveniently meet to regulate with the bishops the affairs of the church, some presbyters and deacons were chosen out of the rest to be, as it were, the bishop's council, who were therefore called chief or cardinal presbyters and deacons.—(Stillingh. Irenic. part. 2. c. 7.) Machiavel in his history of Florence gives us the following account of the original of cardinals: "In the pontificate," says he, "of pope Paschal I., (created in 817,) the curates of Rome took upon them the pompous title of cardinals, as being the pope's ministers nearest to his person, and having a chief share in his election; and their authority increased to that degree after they had found means of depriving the people of Rome of the right of electing the pope, that the papal dignity fell almost always upon one of them."—(Machiavel. Istor. di Firenze. l. 1.) In Paschal's time, and long after, such of them, as were only deacons or priests, signed all public writings, as appears from several councils held at Rome, after the bishops, as inferior in rank to them. But when the papal dignity was restrained to them, as it was by the present council;

² St. Ambrose was not only a layman, but still a catechumen, and not yet baptized, when the people of Milan chose him for their bishop; and he was ordained a few days after his election.—(Paulin. vit. Ambros.) St. Cyprian was but a neophyte, or newly baptized, when he was chosen, and consecrated bishop; (Pontius in vit. Cypr.) and so was Nectarius, when he was named, by the second general council, to succeed Gregory Nazianzen in the see of Constantinople.—(Socrat. l. 5. c. 8. Sozom. l. 7. c. 8.) Eucherius was but a layman when chosen and ordained bishop of Lyons; (Hilar. Arelat. in vit. Honorat.) and Philogonius of Antioch was carried, as Chrysostom informs us, (Chrys. hom. 31. de Philog.) from the court of judicature to the bishop's throne. And it is to be observed, that in those days, a layman, when named to the episcopal dignity, was ordained bishop at once, without any other previous ordination.

³ Anast. in Steph. III.

Deacons, presbyters, and bishops, ordained by Constantine, ordered to be re-ordained. The worship of images approved by this council. Upon what grounds they approved it.

the same decree it was likewise enacted, on pain of excommunication, that none should assist at the election with swords, clubs, or any other weapon, and that none, coming from Campania or Tuscany, should be admitted into the city, till the election was made. As to the deacons, presbyters, and bishops, who had been ordained by Constantine, it was decreed, that they should be chosen anew in their respective cities; that, repairing to Rome with the decree of their election, they should there be re-ordained by the pope, and that the deacons and presbyters should be for ever excluded from the episcopal dignity. It was added, that the laymen, whom Constantine had preferred to any rank in the church, should never be admitted among the clergy, but wear, as penitents, a religious habit so long as they lived.¹ No punishment was inflicted upon those who had acknowledged Constantine and communicated with him, the pope himself being one of that number.

As ordination is no more to be reiterated, according to the present doctrine of the church of Rome, than baptism, and it is thought a sacrilege in that church to reiterate either, the popish writers take a great deal of pains, and above all Natalis Alexander,² to convince us, that the deacons, presbyters, and bishops, ordained by Constantine, were not, by the decree of the present council, to be ordained anew, but only to be restored, by the imposition of hands, to the free exercise of their respective offices, from which they

and they had besides engrossed to themselves the power of electing the pope, their dignity increased with his, till he became superior, and they equal to the greatest princes of the earth. Thus what was originally no degree at all, nor order in the church, became, in process of time, the highest degree after the papal, and was courted as such by the greatest bishops. A most political institution! For thus the popes were supplied with the means of gaining and attaching to their see the most eminent prelates of the different Christian kingdoms, who, being once vested with that dignity, looked upon the interests of the apostolic see as their own, since they might be raised to it in their turn. The cardinals, though thus distinguished by their rank, wore no peculiar habit nor badge of their dignity till the time of pope Innocent IV., who having created twelve cardinals in a council he held at Lyons in 1244, allowed them to wear thenceforth a red hat, to declare thereby that they were ready to defend the Roman church, then grievously oppressed by the emperor Frederic II., at the expense of their heads or their lives.—(Onuph. Panvin. in not. ad vit. Innoc. IV.) Paul II. raised to the see in 1464, added the red garment and cap, to be worn by all but monks and friars: and to them too the red cap was granted in 1560, by pope Gregory XIV. Lastly, that they might not be distinguished by their habit alone, Urban VIII., chosen in 1623, granted them, by a special bull, the title of most eminent. It is to be observed, that in other cities, as well as in Rome, there were cardinal priests and cardinal deacons: but that title was in 1543, suppressed by Paul III., in all churches but the Roman. And now all cardinals, to what church soever they belonged before their creation, style themselves after it “cardinals of the holy Roman church.” They are the pope’s counsellors; and with them he advises in all matters of moment, as he formerly did with the neighboring bishops, but is not bound to follow their advice.

¹ Anast. in Steph. III.

² Natal. Alex. sec. 8. c. 1. art. 8. & Bar. ad Ann. 769. p. 300. n. 6.

were suspended on account of their unlawful ordination. But Anastasius, the only writer who gives us an account of that council, says that those bishops, presbyters and deacons were, by the decree of the council, to be all consecrated anew; and to consecrate and ordain are with that writer, as might be shown by innumerable instances, synonymous terms. Besides, Anastasius tells us, in express words, that “by the same council it was decreed, that all things, relating to the sacraments of the church, and the worship of God, done by Constantine, should be reiterated, except baptism, and the sacred chrism:”¹ and he knew better, as we may well suppose (for he flourished not quite a hundred years after the time of this council) what was, and what was not to be reiterated, than either Natalis or Baronius.

The acts of Constantine being thus annulled, and such measures agreed on as seemed the most proper to prevent, for the future, all force and violence in the election of the pope, in the fourth and last session other matters were settled, and among the rest the point relating to the use and the worship of images, a point, which the popes had now, for the space of nearly fifty years, never concerned themselves with, being too much taken up with state affairs to attend to those of religion. What was the determination of the council concerning that article Anastasius informs us in a few words: the testimonies of the fathers, says he, in behalf of images, were produced and most carefully examined; and, it being found, upon the strictest examination and inquiry, that images had been used and worshiped by the Christians since the earliest times, that the popes and all the holy fathers had ever approved, recommended, and promoted their use and their worship,² it was decreed, that images should not only be retained, but be honored and worshiped, and the execrable synod, that had been lately assembled in Greece to break and destroy them (the council of Constantinople, which consisted of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops, and spent six months in examining what a few bishops are said to have “most carefully examined” in a few hours) was condemned, rejected, and accursed.³ Of this council some fragments occur in the letter pope Adrian wrote to Charlemagne in defence of the second council of Nice; and from them we learn, that a passage was alleged by the French bishop Herulphus out of pope Gregory the Great to show, that the worship of images was approved by that pope; and another by Sergius of Ravenna, out of St. Ambrose, saying that a person appeared to him resembling St. Paul, as represented by his image.⁴ But that no Iconoclast was ever

¹ Anast. in Steph. III.

² See p. 23, &c.

³ Anast. ubi supra.

⁴ Epist. Hadrian. ad Carol. mag. 28. act. 5.

The pope presses the king of the Lombards to deliver up some places he still kept. Great disturbances raised in Rome by the friends of the king; who advances to Rome with his army. The pope grants him an interview in the church of St. Peter.

more averse to the worship of images than pope Gregory the Great, though he was against breaking them, has been shown elsewhere;¹ and from the saying of St. Ambrose we can only conclude, that in his time, or in the latter end of the fourth century, there were images of St. Paul, which we do not deny, the use of images having been introduced, as I have observed elsewhere,² about that time. From the same letter of pope Adrian it appears, that by the very learned bishops of the present assembly great stress was laid on the image, which our Savior was said to have sent of himself to Abgarus, king of Edessa. But should we allow all that has been said of that image to be true, and the letter, which our Savior is supposed to have written on that occasion, to be as authentic and genuine as Stephen and Adrian believed it, it would from thence only follow, that the use of images was approved by our Savior to put us in mind of him, nothing else being said of that image in the letter, but that it was sent to satisfy the desire king Abgarus had of seeing Jesus, and to convince him by so miraculous an effigy, that the miracles he had wrought were not impossible. But the whole is a mere fable, as has already been clearly shown;³ and we need no better proof of the ignorance, that universally prevailed in the times, when the worship of images was established, than to find such fabulous stories, gravely related, and firmly believed by the bishops, the popes, and the councils of those days.

As several cities, that had been yielded by the treaty of Pavia to the apostolic see, were still kept by the Lombards, Stephen had no sooner dismissed the council, than laying aside all thoughts of images and ecclesiastical affairs, he began to press Desiderius to deliver up those places without further delay, threatening, if he did not forthwith comply with his just demands, to recur to his beloved sons, the two kings of France, Charles and Carloman, who, he said, had signed that treaty as well as king Pepin their father, and had bound themselves by a solemn oath to employ, if necessary, the whole strength of their kingdom in procuring the execution of the articles it contained. As it was at the instigation of Christopher and his son Sergius, of whom I have spoken above, that the pope, who was entirely directed and governed by their counsels, thus insisted on the immediate execution of the treaty, and they trusting in the protection of France, diverted him from hearkening to any terms of accommodation with the Lombards, Desiderius resolved to remove them, by some means or other, out of the way. With that view he privately applied to Paul Afiarta, the

pope's chamberlain, by nation a Lombard, and one, in whom the pope reposed an entire confidence, conveying to him by means of his emissaries in Rome many rich presents, and promising him a great reward, provided he prevailed on the pope to dismiss his two favorite ministers. This Paul readily undertook; and having accordingly with artful insinuations, with censuring their conduct, and misconstruing their measures, greatly lessened the confidence the pope had placed in them, and the high opinion he entertained of their integrity, and zeal for his welfare, and that of his see, he at last assured him, that they had formed a design of murdering him, and making themselves sovereigns of Rome, which they governed already with an uncontrolled power and absolute sway. This barefaced calumny he caused to be published by his friends and accomplices among the people; which, as it was by some believed, and disbelieved by others, gave rise to two opposite factions; and thereupon great divisions, animosities, and tumults daily ensued in the city.

Of these disturbances Desiderius was soon informed by his friends, and being resolved to avail himself of them he drew together, in great haste, a considerable body of troops, and marching at their head towards Rome, gave out that he intended to visit the holy places there, and confer in person with the pope, which, he said, was the most expeditious way of settling, to their mutual satisfaction, all points in dispute. But his true design was to foment the disturbances, to support Paul and his friends, to crush the opposite party, and get the two ministers, with such persons of note as adhered to them, destroyed or delivered up into his hands. But they, receiving timely notice of his march, and suspecting his design, took care to defeat it, assembling for that purpose, with incredible expedition, and bringing into the city a numerous militia from Tuscany, Campania, and the dukedom of Perugia; insomuch that the king, finding, as he drew near, the gates all shut, and the walls well defended, encamped his army in the meadows of Nero, and went himself, attended only by his guards, to the church of St. Peter then without the city. From thence he sent some of his chief lords to acquaint the pope, that he was come to confer with him in person, and to beg, that since he was not allowed to enter the city, though he had no hostile designs, his holiness would be pleased to grant him an interview in the church of the apostle St. Peter, since he could not but be sensible, that their differences would be more easily made up by themselves than their ministers. The pope, suspecting no treachery, readily complied with the request of the king. But the conference was scarce begun, when the pope was obliged to inter-

¹ See p. 42. ² See p. 40. ³ See p. 29 note (2).

The party of Paul overpowered in Rome. In a second interview he obliges the pope to dismiss his two favorite ministers; whom he seizes, and uses with great barbarity.

rupt it, and hasten back into the city. In his absence, Paul and his accomplices had raised the mob, as was agreed between them and the king of the Lombards, against the two ministers with a design to destroy them. But they, repelling, with the assistance of their friends, whom they quickly assembled, force by force, a skirmish ensued, in which the party of Paul was in the end overpowered and obliged to take shelter in the Lateran palace. Thither the conquerors pursued them, and entering, sword in hand, the basilic itself, would have dragged them from thence and put them to death, had not the pope, who was there, severely reprimanded them and obliged them to retire.

The tumult being thus appeased, and all quiet in the city, the pope returned the next day to the conference. But the king, finding the attempt of Paul had proved unsuccessful, instead of entering upon business, broke unexpectedly out into most bitter complaints and invectives against the two tyrants, as he called them, who, not satisfied with usurping the power and tyrannically abusing it to the oppression of the unhappy people of Rome, had most wickedly conspired against the life of his holiness, with a design of usurping the sovereignty as well as the power. He then ordered all the gates of the church to be shut, declaring, as if he had nothing in his view but the safety of the pope, for which he expressed the greatest concern, that neither his holiness nor any of his retinue should stir from thence, till the two traitors were dismissed from their employments, and divested of all power. The pope, now in the power of the Lombards and in a manner their prisoner, immediately dispatched two bishops of his retinue into the city to declare Christopher and his son Sergius dismissed from his service, and command them, in his name, to retire forthwith into a monastery, or, if they were conscious of their innocence, to repair to the church of St. Peter, and there make it appear to the king of the Lombards and to him. They were well apprised of the design of the king, that he only wanted to get them into his power, and that it was not of his own accord that the pope had sent them such a message or command, but at the king's instigation and to gratify him. They therefore returned answer, that they should make their innocence appear to his holiness, to whom alone they were accountable for their conduct, on his return into the city; but would, in the mean time, continue with their friends to defend it till the Lombards were retired, and his holiness left at full liberty to absolve or condemn them, as he should find them, upon a fair trial, innocent or guilty. But as disgraced ministers, generally speaking, have no friends, it was no sooner known in the city that the pope had discharged them, than they found themselves abandoned by all,

even by their nearest relations, among whom was duke Gratosus, their cousin-german, a man of great power and authority with the people of Rome. And now the party of Paul prevailing in the city, the two unhappy ministers resolved to quit it, and repairing to the pope in the Vatican, (the king of the Lombards being returned to his camp,) to throw themselves at his feet, and having satisfied him of their innocence, implore his protection. They got accordingly over the walls in the night; but falling on the sentinels of the Lombards, they were carried by them to their king, who sent them the next day to the pope. The pope had engaged his word to the king that they should be no more employed; and therefore would not suffer them to utter a single word in their defence, but let them know, as soon as they appeared before him, that they must take the monkish habit and spend the rest of their lives in a monastery. The same day the pope and the king met the third time in the church of St. Peter, when the king promised upon oath, and he took it, says Anastasius, on the body of St. Peter, to satisfy his holiness as to all his pretensions and claims as soon as he returned to his kingdom. They then took leave of each other, the pope returning into the city, and the king to his camp.

As for Christopher and Sergius, the pope, desirous of saving their lives, as he was indebted to them for his dignity, left them in the church of St. Peter, the king having promised not to molest them; and they were to enter the city in the night to avoid falling into the hands of Paul and the mob of his party, who, the pope well knew, sought their destruction. But Paul and the king, apprehending they might make their escape in the dark, and perhaps be re-admitted to the confidence and favor of the pope, to prevent their being ever more employed, dragged them before night from their asylum, and caused their eyes to be plucked out in so barbarous a manner, that Christopher died the third day of the pain. Sergius survived it, but it was only to be kept closely confined so long as the pope lived, and barbarously murdered as soon as he died. Such is the account the bibliothecarian gives us of the cause and the issue of the present disturbances: and it is to be observed, that Christopher and Sergius were, as the ruling ministers, the chief authors of all the cruelties, that were practised upon the anti-pope Constantine, and all, who adhered to him, many of whom were shut up in monasteries, as we have seen, after they had been most barbarously deprived of their sight, a punishment scarce ever used, before their time, in the west. Their having therefore undergone the very same punishment, may be looked

¹ Anast. in Steph. III. & Hadrian.

The pope excuses the king in his letter to Charlemagne; which was probably dictated by the king of the Lombards. The king of the Lombards refuses to perform the promise he had made to the pope. Strives to persuade him to enter into an alliance with the Lombards. The pope at a loss what measures to pursue.

upon as a just retaliation, and would have been construed by Baronius into a manifest judgment, had they been Iconoclasts, or no friends to the pope.

The account, which the pope himself gives of this matter in a letter he wrote to queen Bertrad and her son Charlemagne, is very different from that, which we read in Anastasius. For in that letter the pope tells them, that Christopher and Sergius had, in concert with Dodo, the ambassador of Carloman, conspired against his life, and broken into the Lateran palace, nay and into the Basilic itself with a design to murder him; that he had, with the utmost difficulty, escaped their fury, and taken refuge in the church of St. Peter, from whence he had sent two bishops to command Christopher and Sergius, in his name, to repair to him, which they refusing to do, the people, acquainted with their wicked design, had seized them, and carried them to him by force; that the incensed populace were for tearing them to pieces; that he, to save them, had attempted to get them brought into the city in the dead of the night; but that they had unfortunately fallen into the hands of their enemies, who had put out their eyes, he calls God to witness, without his consent, or even his privity. He adds, that he owes his life to the protection of God and St. Peter, and after them to his most excellent son Desiderius, king of the Lombards, who happened very luckily to be then at Rome, and who, he says, had entirely satisfied him as to all his demands.¹

As on the one hand it appears not only from the account of Anastasius, but from the whole conduct of Christopher and Sergius, that, far from conspiring against the pope, or affecting the sovereignty of Rome, they had nothing so much at heart as the interest and welfare of the apostolic see; and on the other it is very certain, that when the pope wrote that letter, not one of the many places he claimed had been yet delivered up to him, Le Coint is of opinion,² and so is F. Pagi,³ that the letter was dictated by the king, while the pope was still in his power, and kept by him, in a manner, prisoner in the Vatican. As to what is said there of Dodo, the ambassador of Carloman, he might, say these writers, have joined the two ministers, who were friends to France, against Paul and his party, who favored the Lombards, and together with them, broken into the Lateran, as has been related above. The same authors add, that as Charlemagne could not but condemn the conduct of Dodo as represented in that letter, Desiderius hoped by that means to foment and increase the misunderstanding that subsisted, at this

time, between the two brothers, and thus divert them from uniting their forces against him in favor of the pope. However that be, it is agreed on all hands, that several untruths were advanced by the pope in that letter.

Desiderius having thus removed out of the way the two ministers, whom he looked upon as his enemies, and the enemies of his nation, returned to his capital; whither he was soon followed by two legates sent by the pope to challenge the performance of the promise he had made, and sworn upon the tomb of St. Peter to observe. They met with a very cold reception from the king, who, interrupting them as soon as they mentioned the treaty of Pavia and his promise, "what treaty," said he, "what promise? Does not his holiness owe more to me, than I owe to him? Have I not delivered him from imminent destruction, and the people of Rome from imminent slavery? And is this his gratitude? And does he thus repay such eminent services? But if he has so quickly forgotten the obligations he owes me, he will soon be obliged to court my protection and favor anew. The treatment, which Christopher and Sergius, who were under the protection of Carloman and acted by his order, have met with, has highly provoked that prince; and he will soon appear in Italy at the head of an army to revenge it. The Lombards alone are able to withstand him; and his holiness has no other possible means of escaping the impending vengeance, but by recurring to them." He then proposed an alliance between the apostolic see and the Lombards, magnified the advantages that would accrue from such an alliance to both, and pretending great zeal for the safety of the pope, whom, he said, Carloman was determined to carry with him as his prisoner, into France, entreated the legates to persuade his holiness to accept, before the French had entered Italy and it was too late, the offer he made of his alliance and friendship.¹

Charlemagne and Carloman were quarreling, at this very time, about their respective shares of the dominions of their father, who had, by his will, divided them between them; the people of Aquitaine, but very lately subdued by Pepin, had revolted upon the news of his death, and Thassilo, duke of Bavaria, had already begun to act more like a sovereign than a vassal, and seemed strongly inclined to shake off the yoke. Neither Charlemagne, therefore, nor Carloman could think of marching an army, at this juncture, into Italy. But Desiderius proposed, by thus alarming the pope, to frighten him into an alliance with him; which he knew would disoblige the French;

¹ Cod. Carolin. ep. 46. ² Le Coint. ad Ann. 769. n. 7.

³ Pagi Crit. Bar. ad Ann. 770. n. 2.

¹ Anast. in Hadrian.

The pope delivered from all perplexity by a solemn embassy from Charles and Carloman;—[Year of Christ, 770.] Complains in his letter to them of the king of the Lombards, but both decline breaking at present with the Lombards. A marriage proposed by the king of the Lombards between his son and the sister of the two kings, and between his daughter and either of them.

and he might, by that means, be abandoned by them, and left entirely at the mercy of the Lombards. The report of the legates perplexed the pope beyond expression. Paul, and those of his party, pressed him to agree to the proposed alliance, and to put himself, without delay, under the protection of the Lombards, who were near at hand to protect and defend him against all his enemies. Others loudly declared against his hearkening to any proposals whatever from that quarter, advising him steadily to adhere, at all events, to the French; and the pope, being himself no deep politician, was quite at a loss what measures to pursue. But from this perplexity he was soon delivered by a solemn, and as seasonable as unexpected an embassy from France. It consisted of a bishop, an abbot, and two lords of great distinction; and they were sent by the two kings to impart to his holiness the agreeable news of their entire reconciliation, and assure him, at the same time, that they were determined to maintain St. Peter and him, against the Greeks as well as the Lombards, in the quiet possession of all the places their father had given them. The pope had assured the queen and her son Charlemagne, in his letter to them mentioned above, that the king of the Lombards had entirely satisfied him as to all his demands. That the two kings seem to have taken for granted; and therefore supposing his holiness already possessed of the places he claimed, they only signified to him, at present, their resolution of maintaining him undisturbed in the possession of those places. But the pope took care to undeceive them, assuring them, as his holiness was not, on this occasion, ashamed to give himself the lie, by a letter, which he wrote to both kings on the return of their ambassadors, that the perfidious king (to whom he had owned himself in his former letter indebted for his life) had yet complied with none of his demands, and begging they would give no sort of credit to any, who should tell them, that he had, notwithstanding all his promises, delivered up, to that day, a single village, nay, or a foot of ground to St. Peter. In the same letter, after congratulating his two most Christian sons upon their reconciliation, which he is confident will redound to the exaltation of their holy mother, the church, he conjures them over and over again by that God, who has placed them on the throne, to cause justice to be done, and to be done without delay, to St. Peter and his vicar: reminds them of the promise they made together with their father of holy memory; exhorts them to tread in his foot-steps, and lastly begs them seriously to reflect on the account they must one day give, at the tremendous tribunal of Christ, to the prince of

the apostles, (not to Christ,) if they neglect or even delay putting that apostle and his vicar in possession of every inch of ground, that was given and consecrated to them by the great and most religious king their father.¹ Thus the pope: but as notwithstanding the boasted reconciliation, some remains were still left of the ancient jealousy between the two brothers, neither thought it advisable to engage, at this juncture, for the sake of the pope, in a war with the Lombards, who, they knew, would not comply with his demands unless forced to it by an unsuccessful war.

And now the king of the Lombards, despairing of being able to take the pope off from his attachment to the French, resolved to leave nothing unattempted to take the French off from their attachment to the pope. With that view he caused proposals to be privately made of a marriage between his son Adalgisus and the princess Gisel, sister to the two kings; and at the same time offered his daughter Desideria in marriage to either of those princes. This he thought the most effectual means of closely uniting the two families; and he did not at all doubt but that he should be able, if the proposed alliances took place, to divert the two kings from insisting on the execution, at least on the full execution, of the treaty of Pavia. There was no impediment to obstruct the marriage of Adalgisus and Gisel; and but one to obstruct that of Desideria with either of the princes, namely, that both were married and their wives were living. But that, in those days of ignorance, was scarce looked upon, at least in France, as an impediment, as appears from the many divorces we read of in that and the two following centuries, nay, and from the decisions of a council held in France but a few years before.² The above-

¹ Cod. Carol. ep. 47.

² The council held in 753, at Verberie, a royal villa in the neighborhood of Compiègne. By that council divorces were allowed in the following cases; if the wife conspired against the life of her husband; if either was a slave, but thought free at the time of the marriage by the other; if the wife refused to accompany her husband, when obliged to remove from one country to another, or from one place of the country to another; if the husband was found to have had a criminal conversation with his wife's sister, or her mother; if he had never had any commerce with his wife, whether that was owing to aversion, or impotency; if both being slaves, the husband should obtain his liberty and not the wife. In all these cases the party was allowed to marry again.—(Sirmond. Concil. Gallic. tom. 2.) In more ancient times divorces were, in many cases, allowed by the imperial laws, but by the ecclesiastical laws only in the case of adultery, or of malicious desertion. Whether, after a lawful divorce, the husband might marry again, during the life-time of his divorced wife, or the wife, during the life-time of her divorced husband? is a question that has divided both councils and fathers. Such marriages were allowed in some churches and forbidden in others; but of these different practices the reader will find a curious and learned account in the notes upon Ihermes Pastor by Cotelerius.—(Coteler. Patres Apostol. t. 1. p. 89.) I shall only observe

Charlemagne is persuaded by the queen to marry the king's daughter. The pope opposes the match, and strives to divert the two princes from the intended alliance. His letter to them.

mentioned proposals were, it seems, secretly made to queen Bertrad, the mother of the two princes, to whose counsels great deference was paid, as the king of the Lombards well knew, in all matters of moment by both, especially by Charlemagne; and she not only hearkened to them with great joy, but undertook to bring the intended alliance about. Her thus so readily engaging in such an undertaking, was owing to her zeal for the welfare of her children and the good of the kingdom. She was sensible, that the reconciliation between the two brothers would be but of a very short duration, Carloman, who was naturally of a restless and turbulent temper, being still dissatisfied with the share allotted him of his father's dominions. Besides, she knew that he was encouraged and animated underhand against his brother by the king of the Lombards, and the duke of Bavaria, the son-in-law of that king, (for he had married Lutberg, the king's other daughter) with a design of kindling a civil war in the bowels of France. The queen therefore, satisfied that she could by no other means more effectually prevail upon those princes to abandon Carloman, and side with Charlemagne, than by persuading the latter to marry the daughter of the one, and the sister-in-law of the other, earnestly entreated and pressed him to agree to that marriage; and he agreed to it accordingly.

Of this negotiation, how secretly soever carried on, the pope was soon informed; and no sooner was he informed of it, than he resolved to oppose it to the utmost of his power, to exert all his apostolic authority, and leave nothing unattempted to defeat the wicked measures and designs of the queen; wicked, because likely to prove, in the end, prejudicial to the temporal interest of his see, though intended to unite two Christian princes, and prevent, by their union, destructive wars, and the effusion of much Christian blood. In the same manner, and upon the same principle, that of self-interest, pope Paul opposed, as we have seen,¹ the intended alliance and union between France and the empire, as unlawful and wicked; and this has been, as we shall see in the sequel, the policy of the popes since the time they were first possessed of temporal dominions to the present, to prostitute their authority, and with their authority all faith, morality and religion, to worldly views; to preach concord and discord among Christian princes as they found it turn most to their interest to preach the one or the other; and to

here, that marriages of children under age, without the consent of their parents or their guardians, were null by the laws both of the church and the empire; that slaves or nurses, who had been any ways instrumental in bringing such marriages about, were to be burnt alive or to have melted lead poured down their throats, and that the man was to be punished as guilty of fornication, and the woman as a harlot.—(Cod. Theodos. l. 9. tit. 24. & l. 3. tit. 7, &c.)

¹ See p. 112.

choose that the world should rather be deluged in Christian blood than that they should forego, or run the risk of foregoing the least temporal advantage. In the present case pope Stephen, no less alarmed at the measures that were taken to establish a good understanding between the French and the Lombards, than if the whole of the faith and the Christian religion had depended upon a misunderstanding between those two nations, dispatched in great haste two legates into France with a letter to both the young princes, to divert them, with prayers, menaces, anathemas, and all the motives and reasons he could think of, from the intended alliance, or any kind of connection whatever with the wicked, perfidious, and accursed nation of the Lombards.

This letter he begins with informing the two kings, that the author of our race, the first man (so far he goes back) was seduced by a woman; that death and the numberless evils mankind now groan under were all brought into the world by a woman; that women are the instruments and tools of the devil; and therefore exhorts the young princes to be upon their guard, and not suffer their hearts to be ensnared and captivated by their charms. Thus far he abuses women in general; and one would think he intended to inspire men with an aversion to all women, even to their wives. In the next place he tells the kings, that he has heard, with the deepest concern, that the king of the Lombards was negotiating a marriage between one of them and his daughter; expresses great surprise at the consummate wickedness of those, who have dared to propose such a match; and wonders that his most Christian sons should have suffered such a proposal to be made, or should not have rejected it, as soon as it was made, with the utmost indignation and horror. He then paints the Lombards as of all nations the most wicked, the most perfidious, the most despicable; as a herd of savages scarce deserving the name of a nation; as a people accursed of God, and bearing the visible marks of that curse in the plague of leprosy common among them; as of all the nations on the earth by far the most unworthy of so great an honor, as that of being allied to the French, of all nations the greatest, the most religious, the most illustrious, the most glorious, and as much above, as the Lombards are below, the rest of mankind. And what fellowship, says he, has righteousness with unrighteousness? What communion has light with darkness?

He adds, that the Lombards are a strange nation with respect to the French, and that marriages with strange women, or women of strange nations, are frequently condemned in the Scriptures; thus ignorantly, or wickedly perverting the sense of the Scripture, as if men were there forbidden to marry

The queen, however, prevails on Charles to agree to the match;—[Year of Christ, 771;]—and on the pope not to oppose it. Stephen dies;—[Year of Christ, 772.]

women of a different nation from their own, though professing the same faith and religion with their own. In the second place, he alleges against the proposed marriage what he ought to have alleged in the first, and indeed what alone could, in the present case, be of any weight; namely, that both princes were already married, and that Christians are not allowed to have two wives at a time, nor to put one away at pleasure, and take another to their bed in her room. Here he tells them, that king Pepin, their father, had once proposed to divorce their mother, but that pope Stephen, his holy predecessor, representing to him the enormity of that crime, he had laid aside so impious a thought, and lived happily with her to the day of his death; exhorts them to follow, like dutiful children, the example of their father, and above all things, to avoid, as they tendered the protection and favor of St. Peter, having any kind of connection with the accursed nation of the Lombards, the avowed enemies of that apostle and his favorite people. The rest of the letter is filled with heavy complaints against the Lombards, and he closes it with entreating and conjuring the two kings over and over again to hearken to his admonitions, and threatening them, if they did not, with the indignation of St. Peter, and, in consequence thereof, with eternal damnation. "If any one," says he, "shall presume to act contrary to this, our admonition, we declare him, by the authority of our lord St. Peter, deprived for ever of the protection of that apostle, anathematized, excluded from the kingdom of heaven, and destined to burn eternally in hell fire, with the devil."¹ This letter the pope laid on the tomb of St. Peter, and having there celebrated divine service, sent it from thence, by the two legates, into France.

But neither the reasons alleged by the pope against the proposed marriage (which were indeed all absurd and ridiculous, except the unlawfulness of divorce, and divorces were allowed at this time on the most trifling occasions in France) nor his entreaties, menaces, anathemas, were capable of diverting the queen from pursuing a design, that appeared to her the best calculated of any to maintain the tranquillity and peace of the kingdom; nay, so much had she at heart the bringing it to a happy issue, that, trusting no other, she undertook to manage the whole matter herself. Having accordingly persuaded her eldest son Charles to consent to the match, notwithstanding all the remonstrances of the pope, and his legates against it, she set out for Italy to settle, in person, with the king of the Lombards, the terms of the intended alliance. She had an interview with her son Carloman at a place called Salossa; and from thence she repaired to the court

of Bavaria to divert that duke from attempting to shake off the yoke, which he, depending on the assistance and friendship of the Lombards, seemed strongly inclined to attempt. From the court of Bavaria she pursued her journey to that of Pavia, and having there settled the marriage articles to her entire satisfaction, and the entire satisfaction of the king, she resolved to try, before she left Italy, whether his holiness might not be prevailed upon, by some means or other, if not openly to approve, at least not to oppose her design. With that view she continued her journey to Rome, was received there by the pope, the clergy, and the people, as the widow of Pepin and the mother of the two French kings, with all possible marks of distinction; and had, during her stay in that city, several private conferences with the pope; the result of which seems to have been, that his holiness should no longer oppose the designed marriage, and that the king of the Lombards should, in consideration thereof, deliver up, before his daughter set out for France, certain places, which he had hitherto withheld from the apostolic see, and solemnly engage to live thenceforth in peace and amity with the pope and the people of Rome. This, I say, seems to have been the result of those conferences; it being certain, that Desiderius delivered up several places to the pope at the request of the queen, while she was yet in Italy; that she set out, as soon as the pope was put in possession of them, on her return to France with the king's daughter; that on her arrival Charlemagne, divorcing his lawful wife, married her,² and that no further opposition is said to have been made to that marriage either by the pope or his legates. Thus, what was an enormous crime, when likely to prove prejudicial to the interest of the apostolic see, became no crime, or a crime to be connived at, when it turned to the advantage of that see.²

Of this pope no further mention is made till the time of his death, which happened on the second of February, 772, after he had governed the Roman church three years, five months, and twenty days.

¹ Vet. Annal. & Annal. Petav. ad Ann. 770. Eginard. in vit. Carol.

² Some, to excuse the pope for first condemning that marriage as an enormous crime, and afterwards approving, or at least not disapproving it, would make us believe, that the first marriage of Charles was null; that the pope was not acquainted therewith when he condemned his second marriage as a crime, but was, when he approved it, having been assured of its nullity by the queen; and it was, say they, to gratify her, after she had prevailed on the king of the Lombards to yield to him the places he claimed, that he consented at last to that match. But the contemporary historians all suppose the first marriage of Charles to have been a true marriage, and speak of his divorce as a thing, that gave great offence. Paschasius Ratbertus among the rest, an author of great note, who flourished about the middle of the next century, and wrote the life of St. Adalhard, the brother of Pepin, and uncle of the two kings, tells us, that all good men were greatly scandalized at the king's putting away

¹ Cod. Carolin. ep. 48.

Hadrian chosen. His birth, education, &c. Charlemagne divorces the daughter of the king of the Lombards, who strives to engage the pope on his side to revenge that affront.

HADRIAN, NINETY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, LEO, CONSTANTINE PORPHYROGENITUS, IRENE.—DESIDERIUS, *king of the Lombards.*]

[Year of Christ, 772.] Stephen was succeeded by Hadrian or Adrian, chosen and ordained after a vacancy of seven days, and consequently on the 9th of February, which, in the present year 772, fell on a Sunday, the day, on which bishops, especially the popes, were commonly ordained. Hadrian was a native of Rome, descended from one of the most illustrious families of that city; and he is highly commended by Anastasius for his extraordinary piety, uncommon learning, engaging behavior, excellent parts, and even for the majesty of his mien, and the comeliness of his person. He had passed, with great reputation, through all the inferior degrees, and was cardinal deacon of the holy Roman church, when the people and clergy raised him with one voice to the see.¹ On the very day of his election, Anastasius says, the very hour he was elected, he recalled all, whom Paul Afiarta had sent into exile, during the illness of the late pope; and set at liberty such as were kept by him confined in the different jails, that is, all the leading men of the French party in Rome: so forward was he in declaring his resolution of cultivating the friendship of the French princes and nation.

And truly he soon had occasion for the favor and assistance of such powerful protectors. For scarce had he taken possession of the see, when a misunderstanding arose between him and the king of the Lombards, which, had not the French interposed in his behalf, would, in all likelihood, have proved as fatal to him and the Roman people as it proved in the end to that unhappy nation. It arose on the following occasion. Queen Bertrad had persuaded her son Charlemagne, as has been related above, to marry the daughter of the king of the Lombards, as the most effectual means of taking off that prince from his connection, with Carloman, and engaging him in the interest of Charle-

his lawful wife without any just cause and marrying another, and that Adalhard in particular was shocked to such a degree at so wicked an action, that quitting a court, where such wickedness was countenanced, and with it the world, he retired to a monastery, though at that time only in the twentieth year of his age.—(Pasch. in vit. S. Adal. apud Mabill. secul. 4. Benedictin. part. 1.) Besides, it was not only because Charles was already married that the pope opposed his marriage with the daughter of Desiderius; but because she was, according to him, a strange woman, and marriages with strange women are condemned in Scripture. And how will they excuse his holiness consenting to a match, which he had condemned on that account? Did the queen remove that scruple too, and teach the infallible interpreter of the Scripture the true meaning of the Scripture?

¹ Anast. in Adrian.

magne. But Carloman dying soon after that marriage, and Charlemagne, who disliked his new wife, thinking, as he became by the death of his brother sole master of the whole French monarchy, that he had no further occasion for an alliance with the king of the Lombards, divorced his daughter, and marrying Hildegard, a princess of Suevia, in her room, sent her back to her father.¹ Desiderius, highly provoked at the treatment his daughter had met with, resolved to revenge it. He had then at his court Gilberg, the widow of Carloman, and his two sons, both yet infants. For Gilberg, apprehending that Charlemagne, prompted by his ambition, might either destroy both her and them, if he got them into his power, or at least cause them to be shut up in a monastery, had abandoned the kingdom, upon the death of her husband, and taken refuge, with her children, in the court of Desiderius. The king had received them with open arms, and entertained them, as well as the many French lords, who had attended them in their flight, in a manner suitable to their respective ranks, merely, as he pretended and declared at that time, out of the regard he owed to the memory of his deceased friend and ally. But on the present occasion he resolved openly to espouse their cause, to acknowledge them for the lawful heirs of their father's kingdom, which Charlemagne had seized upon their flight, and to attempt, by stirring up their friends in France, to form there a party in their favor and kindle a civil war in the bowels of that kingdom. This he thought he should easily accomplish provided he could prevail on the new pope to engage in the same cause, and persuade him not only to take the children of Carloman into his protection, but to anoint them kings of their father's kingdom. With that view he sent, as soon as he heard of the election of Hadrian, a solemn embassy to Rome to congratulate him on his promotion, to assure him of his friendship, and at the same time to recommend to him, as the father of the distressed, the distressed widow and destitute children of Carloman. The ambassadors omitted nothing they thought capable of making an impression on the mind of the pope, and awakening his compassion for the children of a prince, to whom his see owed, in great

¹ From his not recalling, on this occasion, his first wife Himiltrude, authors generally conclude that she was dead; as if Charlemagne, who had not scrupled to marry a second wife while his first wife was living, would have scrupled to marry a third.

The pope adheres to Charlemagne, and even acquaints him with the designs of the Lombards. His answer to the king's ambassadors. The king of the Lombards invades the exarchate. Promises to forbear hostilities upon the pope's anointing the sons of Carloman kings of their father's kingdom. The king redoubles his hostilities upon the pope's refusing to comply with his demand.

measure, its grandeur. They represented to him, in the strongest light, the crying injustice of Charlemagne in robbing his own brother's children of a kingdom, to which they had as unquestionable a right as he, or his children, had to his; exaggerated the deplorable condition, to which his insatiable avarice, and unbounded ambition had reduced them; put his holiness in mind of the extraordinary regard their father Carloman had always shown and professed for the apostolic see, and assuring him that whatever assistance he should lend to them the king of the Lombards would look upon it as lent to himself, they entreated him in the most pathetic terms, to pity their unhappy situation, and generously undertake, in conjunction with their master, who had nothing in his view but the relief of the distressed, their defence and protection.¹

Hadrian was a man of too much penetration not to be apprised of the true designs of the king. He pitied the forlorn condition of the children of Carloman: but sensible that, should he take them into his protection, and anoint them kings of their father's kingdom, he would thereby highly disoblige his protector Charlemagne, and be abandoned by him to the mercy of the Lombards, he made his compassion give way to his interest, and not only declined entering, at so critical a juncture, into any engagements with the king, but to earn the favor of Charlemagne, privately acquainted him with the designs, that the king, the widow of Carloman, and the French lords, who had attended her in her flight, were hatching against him in favor of his nephews. However, to gain time, as Charlemagne was then engaged in a war with the Saxons, the pope pretended to hearken to the proposals of the ambassadors, told them that he had nothing so much at heart as to live in friendship and amity with his neighbors the Lombards; that he was ready to do everything they could in reason and justice require of him; but that as their master had, in the pontificate of his predecessor, seized on several places in defiance of the most solemn treaties, they could not well blame him for insisting, first of all, on the restitution of the said places, as a pledge of his pacific disposition and the sincerity of his intentions; that as soon as they were restored, he would send, if agreeable to the king, legates to Pavia vested with full powers to conclude, upon his own terms, a treaty of friendship and peace between the Lombards and the Romans.²

Desiderius, finding that the new pope was not to be gained, as his predecessor had been, with fair words, protestations and pro-

mises, resolved, as he had no thoughts of parting with the places he had taken, to recur to violence and force. He entered accordingly the territory of Ravenna, made himself master of several places there, laid the country everywhere waste, and suffering no kind of provisions to be conveyed into the city, reduced the citizens to the utmost extremity. In that condition they applied for relief to the pope, who immediately wrote to the king to put him in mind of the promise he had very lately made to live in friendship and peace with the apostolic see, and entreat him, as he tendered his reputation and character, to forbear hostilities so repugnant to his protestations and promises, so unjust in themselves, and so unworthy of a Christian prince. The king answered, that he was ready to withdraw his troops, to forbear hostilities, and to live in peace with the pope and the Romans upon one condition, and one condition alone, namely, that he acknowledged and anointed, in his presence, the two sons of Carloman kings of their father's kingdom. He added, that those unhappy children had an indisputable right to the dominions of their father, as his holiness well knew, and that his refusing to acknowledge that right, by anointing them kings, was in effect countenancing, and declaring to the world that he countenanced the usurper in his unjust usurpation. The pope, determined to do nothing he thought could give the least umbrage to Charlemagne, still kept to his former answer, assuring the king that he was ready to do every thing that lay in his power to oblige him, but insisting, at the same time, on his restoring the places he had taken before he would enter into any new engagements with him or his nation.¹

The king was highly provoked at this answer, but still more at the death of his zealous partizan Paul Afiarta, that happened at this time. Paul, to be revenged on the pope, who had driven him out of Rome, had undertaken to return to that city; to reanimate the Lombard faction, that was there still very powerful, and even to seize the pope himself, and deliver him up in chains to the Lombards. But Hadrian, receiving timely intelligence of his design, and the rout he was to take, sent a private order to Leo, archbishop of Ravenna, to arrest and confine him. The archbishop was not satisfied with executing that order; but having got the unhappy wretch into his power, he caused him, after a short confinement, to be put to death, contrary, says Anastasius, to the declared intention and express command of the pope. The king, upon the news of his death, redoubled his hostilities, his par-

¹ Anast. in Hadrian.² Anast. in Hadrian.³ Anast. in Hadrian. Eginhard. in vit. Carol.

The pope recurs to Charlemagne. His answer to the pope's letter. He sets out with a numerous army for Italy. The king of the Lombards attempts to surprise Rome;—[Year of Christ. 773.]

ties advancing to the very gates of Rome, and putting to the sword or carrying into captivity all, who fell into their hands. But nothing could make Hadrian depart from the resolution he had taken of entering into no engagements with the Lombards, that might give the least jealousy or occasion of complaint to the French. He was greatly affected with the calamities of the unhappy people exposed to the insults and the fury of the merciless Lombards; but at the same time determined to take no step for their relief, that appeared to him inconsistent with his interest, when the king offered to withdraw his troops and put an end to all hostilities the very moment he gave the royal unction to the sons of Carloman, he returned answer, that the king was by former treaties and repeated promises bound to forbear hostilities; that he had, by an open breach of those treaties and in defiance of the most solemn promises, seized on several places belonging to the apostolic see, and could not therefore well require the holy see to trust to his present till he had fully executed his former promises by withdrawing his troops, and restoring all the places he had taken.

The pope was sensible that this answer, instead of appeasing the king, would provoke him beyond all measure; and therefore apprehending, that not satisfied with ravaging the country, he might lay siege to the city itself, he dispatched, in great haste, a messenger into France with a letter to Charlemagne to acquaint him with the deplorable condition to which he and the Roman people were reduced by the Lombards, and putting him in mind of the vow he had made in his father's life-time never to abandon the protection of the successors of St. Peter, and the defence of his church, earnestly entreats him in the name of St. Peter and his, to hasten to their relief pursuant to that vow. He added, that to delay relieving him, let the delay be ever so short, at so critical a juncture, was abandoning him to the mercy of his implacable enemies; and took care to let Charlemagne know, that it was chiefly, if not merely, on account of his inviolable attachment to his interest, and because he could not be prevailed upon to anoint the sons of Carloman kings of their father's kingdom, and thereby concur with his enemies in the design they had formed of kindling a civil war in the bowels of his kingdom, that he was thus cruelly persecuted by the Lombards. As the passes in the Alps were all carefully guarded by the Lombards, the messenger went by sea, and being informed, upon his arrival at Marseilles, that Charlemagne was at Thionville, he repaired thither, and delivered, pursuant to his instructions, the pope's letter into his own hands.

Charlemagne being fully informed by the messenger of the state of affairs in Italy,

and the designs of the Lombards, remanded him, the very day after his arrival, with an answer to the pope's letter, assuring his holiness that he remembered, and should ever inviolably observe the vow he had made; that he was resolved, as bound by that vow, to march, with all speed, to his relief, to employ, if necessary, the whole strength of his kingdom in curbing the insolence of the Lombards, and that he would hearken to no treaties, since no treaties could bind them, but strive to put them out of a condition of disturbing hereafter him or his successors in the possession of the places which his father and he had, for the redemption of their souls, given to St. Peter. Charlemagne considered that the Lombards never would suffer the pope quietly to enjoy the territories, which they had taken from the emperor, and claimed as their own by right of conquest; that whatever treaties they pretended to agree to, they would observe them no longer than they found it expedient, but would lay hold of every opportunity that offered to raise disturbances in Italy, and in his own dominions too, as soon as they found him engaged in other wars; that as they had taken into their protection the two sons of Carloman, who had no contemptible party in France, such disturbances might end, when he expected it the least, in a civil war. Upon these considerations he resolved not only to relieve the pope in his present distress, but encouraged by his late extraordinary success against the Saxons, to attempt the conquest of Italy, as the only effectual means of delivering the apostolic see and himself from so troublesome and faithless an enemy. Pursuant to that resolution he put, without delay, all his forces in motion; appointed the city of Geneva for the place of the general rendezvous, and repairing thither in person, divided, after several councils of war, his numerous army into two bodies. The one, commanded by duke Bernard, brother of the late king Pepin, and natural son of Charles Martel, he ordered to enter Italy by mount St. Bernard; with the other he marched himself towards mount Cenis.¹

In the mean time the king of the Lombards, despairing of being able to persuade the pope to anoint the sons of Carloman, resolved to surprise him, and extort by force, when he had him in his power, what he could not obtain by art or persuasion. With that view he ordered several bodies of troops secretly to march, by different ways, towards Rome; and privately leaving Pavia himself with his son Adalgisus, the two sons of Carloman, and the queen their mother, he appeared unexpectedly at the head of a powerful army in the neighborhood of Rome. The news of his approach threw the whole

¹ Anast. Eginhard. in vit. Carol.

The king finding the city well guarded, begs an interview with the pope. His answer to the king's demand. The king awed with the threats of the pope, returns to his own kingdom. Charlemagne advances with his army to the Alps. Finding the passes well guarded, proposes an accommodation. His proposals rejected. He resolves to decamp and return to France. The Lombards seized with a panic, betake themselves to a disorderly flight.

city into the utmost confusion. Hadrian however, not forgetting, in the midst of that confusion, to provide for his defence, summoned the militia of Campania, Tuscany, and the dukedom of Perugia into the city, caused the gates and the walls to be carefully guarded night and day, and by assuring the people that Charlemagne was hastening, with a mighty army, to their relief, inspired them with such courage, that even those, who at first had betrayed the most cowardice and fear, were now the foremost in flying to arms, and preparing for a vigorous defence. The king, as he approached Rome, sent some of his officers to acquaint the pope with his arrival, and to beg his holiness would grant him an interview, which, he said, he was confident would end to the entire satisfaction of both. To this message Hadrian returned the same answer he had given to all the other proposals and messages from the king; that he would hearken to no proposals whatever till all the places he had seized, belonging to St. Peter, and his church, were restored; that the restitution of those places was a preliminary, which he was unalterably determined never to dispense with. The king, finding the pope thus determined, pursued his march towards Rome, plundering the cities, and laying the countries everywhere waste through which he passed. Hereupon the pope, resolved to try the edge of his spiritual weapons before he employed any other, drew up a sentence of excommunication in the strongest terms, threatening the king and all, who followed him, with immediate vengeance from heaven, if he presumed to advance one step nearer to Rome, or ravaged the lands of the church. With this sentence Hadrian dispatched the three bishops of Albano, Palestrina and Tivoli; and it struck the king with such terror, that, putting a stop to all further hostilities, he set out that instant on his return to Pavia. So great was the awe even kings and princes stood in of the anathemas of the popes till experience taught them, that their cursing did no more harm to mankind than their blessing did good.

In the mean time Charlemagne, advancing with his army to the Alps, found all the passes and defiles so well fortified, and guarded by such numerous bodies of Lombards, commanded by the king in person and his son Adalgisus, that most of the officers thought they could not be forced; that it would cost the loss of the whole army to attempt it, and were therefore of opinion, in a council of war that was held, that they should either return to France, without exposing so many gallant men to certain destruction, or try whether the Lombards might not be brought by way of negotiation to satisfy the

pope. Charlemagne chose the latter, none in the whole army being more sensible of the difficulty of the enterprise than himself; and he sent accordingly, as soon as the council broke up, ambassadors to represent to the king the justice of the pope's complaints and demands, the obligation the kings of France were under of making good the donation of Pepin, the dreadful consequences that would inevitably attend the war, that was upon the point of being kindled in Italy, and the many advantages, that would accrue to the Lombard nation from their friendship with France: nay Charlemagne was so apprehensive of the issue of the present undertaking, that he even offered to defray the charges the Lombards had been at in their military preparations on this occasion, provided they delivered up to the pope, in compliance with the treaty of Pavia, all the places yielded by that treaty to the apostolic see. What is still more, he did not insist on the immediate restitution of those places, but let the king know, that he was willing to allow him what time he could reasonably require for the execution of the treaty; on condition that he delivered three hostages into his hands, the sons of some of the chief lords of his court, as pledges of his sincerity: he added, that as soon as they arrived in his camp, he should forget all former breaches of so solemn a treaty, should look upon the Lombards as his friends and allies, and forbearing all further hostilities, march back with his army to France.

But the more advantageous were the offers of Charlemagne the more averse was the king of the Lombards to accept them, concluding that they proceeded from fear, and that Charlemagne, aware of the difficulty of his undertaking and despairing of success, would rather choose to retire, if his proposals were not agreed to, and abandon the pope to the mercy of the Lombards, than expose his army to the evident danger of being entirely cut off to relieve him. Indeed the French generals after reconnoitring the situation of the enemy, and carefully examining the many strong works they had raised in the passes of the mountains, delivered it as their opinion, that it was impossible to dislodge them, and therefore not only advised but jointly entreated their king not to attempt it, but reserve his army, the strength and the flower of the French nation, for other less hazardous but more glorious achievements. Charlemagne yielded; and it was resolved in a council of war, that they should abandon the enterprize for the present and decamp the next day. But heaven interposed, says Baronius, and confounding the enemies of the holy pontiff, opened a safe and free passage to his friends. For that very night

The flight ascribed by Baronius to the interposition of heaven. Pavia besieged by Charlemagne. The widow of Carloman delivers herself and her children up to Charlemagne. Adalgisus makes his escape. Verona and many other cities submit to Charlemagne. The French repulsed with great slaughter before Pavia.

the advanced guards of the Lombards, seized unexpectedly with a panic, retreated in the utmost confusion to the main guard, and the main guard, alarmed at their fright and confusion, fled, in the like fright and confusion, to the army. The terror in an instant became general; and, as it commonly happens in such cases, all fled, leaving their tents and their baggage behind them, though nobody could tell why. The king, the prince and the other officers did all that lay in their power to reanimate the affrighted soldiery, and stop them in their flight; but they were themselves carried away by the flying multitude. Hereupon the king threw himself, with the flower of his troops, into Pavia, and his son Adalgisus with the two sons of Carloman, the queen their mother, and a French lord named Ancair, into Verona. Had Charlemagne out of a principle of justice, made war on the Lombards to reinstate the emperor in those dominions, who alone had a right, and an unquestionable right to them, I should not quarrel with Baronius for ascribing the panic and sudden flight of the Lombards to the miraculous interposition of heaven. But as the pope had no better right to those territories than the Lombards, that is, no right at all; nay as they belonged in justice to his liege lord and sovereign, and he could not consequently claim them without being guilty of treason and rebellion, to suppose that heaven miraculously interposed in his favor is supposing heaven to have miraculously interposed in favor of a traitor and a rebel, and thereby countenanced rebellion and treason.

Charlemagne, seeing the next morning, to his great surprise, the passes all open and unguarded, entered them at first, not without fear of some ambuscade; but finding that the Lombards were all retired, he detached several parties after them, and advancing himself with the main body of the army to Pavia, invested it on all sides, and began to batter the walls with incredible fury. But as the town abounded with all manner of provisions, was well fortified, and defended by the king in person, by a numerous garrison, and a great many officers, among whom was Hunald, duke of Aquitaine,¹ the French, notwithstanding all their efforts, made but very little progress in the siege. Charlemagne therefore, changing the siege into a blockade, marched with part of his army to attempt the reduction of Verona; and he no sooner appeared before that place,

than the widow of Carloman, sensible she could not avoid falling at last into his hands, begged leave of Adalgisus to go out with her children, and deliver herself up to him, flattering herself, that the confidence she thereby seemed to repose in him, would recommend both her and her children to his mercy. Her request was readily granted; and she, repairing accordingly to the camp, threw herself, with her children, at the feet of her brother-in-law. But what reception she met with; what afterwards became of her and her children, history has not informed us. Had they been kindly received; had Charlemagne shown, on this occasion, the least generosity, I cannot persuade myself that the contemporary writers, who have omitted nothing, that could any ways redound to his glory, would have all passed it over in silence. As no mention is thenceforth made of that unhappy princess and her unfortunate children, it would not perhaps be absurd to suppose, that they were soon removed, by some means or other, out of the way.

The siege of Verona kept Charlemagne employed from the middle of June to the beginning of October, when Adalgisus, finding himself reduced, for want of provisions, to the last extremity, and despairing of relief, privately withdrew from the place in the dead of the night, and wandering a long time about the country in disguise, found means, at last, to make his escape by sea to Constantinople, where he was kindly received and entertained, suitably to his rank, by the emperor Constantine. Upon his flight the garrison and inhabitants of Verona, opening their gates, submitted to Charlemagne, and their example was followed by all the cities on the same side of the Po; nay, several cities on the other side, and nearer to Rome, namely, Ancona, Fermo, Spoleti, Rieti, Foligno, looking upon the kingdom of the Lombards as already at an end, submitted themselves, by their deputies, to the apostolic see, and swearing allegiance to St. Peter and his successors, caused their hair to be cut short, after the Roman manner, to show that they renounced the Lombards, who wore long hair, and their modes.

From Verona Charlemagne returned to Pavia, and sitting down, with his whole army, before that city, pursued the siege with more vigor than ever. But as the place was defended by a warlike prince fighting for his crown, and the liberty of his nation as well as his own, the French were repulsed, with great slaughter, in all their attacks; insomuch that the town was in as good a state of defence at Christmas, and the citizens and garrison as little inclined to submit and deliver it up, as they were the first day of the siege. Charlemagne, finding the town would hold out much longer than he expect-

¹ Hunald, duke of Aquitaine, had attempted to recover his dukedom, which Charlemagne had seized; but, being utterly defeated in the attempt, he took refuge in the court of Lupus duke of Gascony, who chose rather to deliver him up than engage in a war with the conqueror. Charlemagne carried him prisoner with him into France. But he found means to make his escape, and get safe into Italy, where he is said to have encouraged the king of the Lombards to reject all the proposals of peace, that were made him.

Charlemagne goes to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 774.]
Charlemagne visits the holy places at Rome.

How received there by the Romans, and the pope.
Confirms the donation of his father Pepin.

ed, sent for his wife and his children, and continued in the camp, entertaining himself with them, and pursuing the siege with great loss of men, and little success, till the approach of Easter. That festival Charlemagne resolved to keep at Rome; and committing accordingly the care of the siege to his uncle count Bernard, he set out in the latter end of March for that city, attended by a great many bishops, abbots, and other ecclesiastics, who had accompanied him into Italy, as well as officers and persons of distinction. As he had not acquainted the pope with his design, having perhaps taken it suddenly, being tired with the length of the siege, he was far advanced in his journey before Hadrian heard of his coming. But no sooner did he hear of it, and of the route he had taken, than thinking it his duty to distinguish so great a prince, a prince to whom his see was so highly indebted, above all the princes and kings, who had ever yet honored Rome with their presence, he sent all the magistrates and judges of the city, with their banners, and the badges of their respective offices to meet him at thirty miles distance, and attend him the remaining part of the journey. At a mile from the gate he was received by all the militia of Rome under arms, and a procession of children, carrying branches of olive trees in their hands, and singing his praises. After them appeared at some distance the crosses, that were carried, according to custom, before the exarchs, and the Roman patricians in their public entries. Charlemagne alighted, as soon as he saw the crosses, from his horse, with all his retinue, and, attended by his own nobility and the Roman, went on foot, amidst the loud acclamations of the people, crowding from all parts to see him, the rest of the way to the Vatican. As for the pope, he repaired to that church early in the morning, with the whole body of the clergy, to wait there the arrival of the king, and conduct him in person to the tomb of St. Peter. Charlemagne being arrived at the foot of the steps leading up to the church, kneeled down and kissed the first step; and thus he continued kneeling down and kissing each step as he ascended. At the entry of the church he was received by the pontiff in all the gorgeous attire of his pontifical ornaments. They embraced each other with great tenderness; and the king holding the pope's right hand with his left, they thus entered the church, the people and clergy singing aloud the words of the Gospel, "blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." The pope conducted the king straight to the confession, that is, to the supposed tomb of St. Peter; and there, prostrating themselves both on the ground, they returned thanks to the prince of the apostles for the great advantages the king had, by his intercession, already obtained over his ene-

mies, and the enemies of the church, that is, the Lombards, who, in truth, were as good catholics, and wished as well to the catholic church as the French, but would not tamely suffer themselves to be robbed by the pope of the countries they had acquired at the expense of the blood and the treasure of their nation, and to which, on that consideration, they thought they had a much better title than he or his church.

Charlemagne, having thus satisfied his devotion to St. Peter, expressed an earnest desire to the pope of visiting the holy places within the walls; and they entered accordingly the city together, after the pope, with the Roman nobility and the magistrates on one side, and the king with the French nobility on the other, had solemnly sworn, on the body of St. Peter, perpetual friendship to each other. They first repaired to the Lateran, where, as it was the eve of Easter, one of the days appointed by the church for the baptizing of catechumens, the pope performed that ceremony, with great pomp, in the presence of the king. The next day, being the festival of Easter, the king, attended by the militia under arms, and all the Roman nobility, assisted at divine service, performed by the pope in the church of St. Mary ad Præsepe, now Santa Maria Maggiore, and after the service dined with his holiness in the Lateran palace. The two following days were spent after the same manner, in different churches; and the third, the pope and the king had a conference in the Vatican, when Hadrian, coming to the main point, put the king in mind of the promise, which king Pepin, his father, and he himself had made at Chiersi to his holy predecessor pope Stephen,¹ extolled the generosity of his predecessors and his own to the apostolic see, and the merit they had thereby acquired; and the reward that was, on that account, reserved for them in heaven, and earnestly entreated him, as he tendered his happiness in this world and the other, to confirm his former promise or donation, to cause all the places mentioned therein to be delivered up, without further delay, to St. Peter, and to secure for ever the possession of them to that apostle, and his church. Charlemagne readily complied with the desire of the pope; and having caused the former instrument of donation to be read, he ordered Etherius, his chaplain and notary, to draw up another. This new instrument he signed himself, and requiring all the bishops, abbots, and other great men, who had attended him to Rome, to sign it, with his own hand he laid it thus signed, kissing it with great respect and devotion, on the body of St. Peter.²

What countries this new donation com-

¹ See p. 96.

² Anast. in Adrian. Eginhard. in vit. Carol. Mag. Leo Ostien. l. 1. c. 12.

The countries the donation of Pepin contained. The dukedom of Spoleti added to the former donation. Charlemagne returns to the siege of Pavia. The king, after a most vigorous defence, is obliged to submit. The end of Lombard kings.

prised is not agreed among authors. Anastasius writes, that Charlemagne, not satisfied with the donation of the Pentapolis and the exarchate, made by his father; added the island of Corsica, and the large country, which, extending from Luna to Sorano and Monte Bordone, comprehends the cities and territories of Vercetri, Parma, Reggio, Mantua, and Menselice; nay, the present donation extended besides, according to that writer, to the provinces of Istria and Venetia, and the two dukedoms of Benevento and Spoleti.¹ In the very ancient manuscript chronicle of the monastery of St. Clement at Naples, Charlemagne is said to have added those two dukedoms to the donation of his father. Sigonius will have the donation of Charlemagne to have comprised, besides those dukedoms and the countries given by Pepin, the Sabinian territory with great part of Tuscany and Campania. De Marca adds all Campania with the city of Naples and the provinces of Abruzzo and Apulia.² Others add Saxony, which he had lately conquered, and other countries too, which he never conquered, namely, Sardinia and Sicily; for these two islands were held by the emperors of the east till torn from the empire by the Saracens. On the other hand some are of opinion that Charlemagne only confirmed the donation of his father, comprehending the exarchate and the Pentapolis. In short, as no authentic copy of this new instrument of donation is any where to be found, some will not allow him to have given any thing to the pope on this occasion, but to have only renewed and confirmed the donation of his father; while others pretend, that he kept nothing to himself, but gave all he had to the pope, and more than he had. Charlemagne indeed caused the patrimonies of the Roman church in Campania, Sabinia, Tuscany, Istria, &c., which had been confiscated by the Lombards, to be restored to that church; and hence probably arose the mistake of the writers, who will have him to have given those provinces to the pope: They founded the patrimonies of the church in the above-mentioned countries with the countries themselves.³ However, that Charlemagne added something to the donation of king Pepin his father, namely, the dukedom of Spoleti, is manifest from the letters of Hadrian to that prince: for in several of those letters, written after the present year, 744, express mention is made of the dukedom of Spoleti, which had never, till that time, been subject to the apostolic see, as then subject to that see.⁴ As the pope, in his letters, mentions no other place, that was

not comprehended in the former donation, we may well conclude, that no other was added to the present.

From Rome Charlemagne returned to the camp before Pavia, where he found his men quite disheartened, and ready to despair of ever being able to reduce the place. His presence inspired them with new courage: the attacks were doubled, and the walls furiously battered night and day without intermission. But in all the attacks the Lombards prevailed, and the breaches were no sooner made than repaired. Thus the besiegers and the besieged continued signalizing themselves till an epidemical distemper began to rage with great violence in the city. As by that distemper great numbers were daily swept off both of the garrison and the inhabitants, those, who survived, began to mutiny, and cry out that it was time to surrender. The duke of Aquitaine, dreading to fall into the hands of Charlemagne, took upon him to restrain the mutineers; but he was killed by the enraged multitude on the spot. The unhappy Desiderius, finding himself thus abandoned by his own people, was obliged in the end to surrender the place, and deliver up himself, with his wife and his daughter, to Charlemagne, upon condition, for the conqueror would hearken to no other, that their lives were spared. Charlemagne took them with him into France, and confined them, according to some writers,¹ first to Liege and afterwards to the monastery of Corbie, where Desiderius is said to have spent the rest of his life in fasting, in praying, and in other good works.² Thus ended the reign of the Lombard princes in Italy, two hundred and six years after they had made themselves masters of that country. I say the reign of the Lombard princes; for, properly speaking, that kingdom did not end now, Charlemagne having assumed, upon the surrender of Pavia and the captivity of Desiderius, the title of king of the Lombards, and left the people in the same condition he found them; so that the monarch was changed, but no alteration was made in the monarchy.³

¹ Annal. Nazar. & Meten. ² Hepidan. ad Ann. 774.

³ As Charlemagne claimed the kingdom of the Lombards by right of conquest, he caused himself, soon after the reduction of Pavia, to be crowned king of Lombardy by the archbishop of Milan at a place called Modostia about ten miles from that city. Of that ceremony we find the following account in the Ordo Romanus a very ancient ritual. The new king was led out of his chamber by several bishops to the church; and being conducted to the high altar, the archbishop, after some solemn prayers, asked the people, whether they were willing to subject themselves to Charles, and with constant fidelity obey his commands? The people answering they were willing, the bishop anointed his head, breast, shoulders, and arms, praying that the new king might be successful in his wars, and happy in his issue. He then girt him with a sword, put bracelets on his arms, and gave him a robe, a ring and a sceptre, and having placed the crown on his head, he led him through the choir to the throne, and having seated him there, and given

¹ Anast. in Hadrian.

² Marc. de concord. Sacerdot. & imper. l. 3. c. 10.

³ See Pietro Giannone Istor. Civil. di Napol. l. 5. c. 4.

⁴ Lib. Carol.

The pope put in possession of the places yielded to him by Pepin. No change made by Charlemagne in the government. The Lombards unjustly aspersed by the popes. Their true character.

Charlemagne's first care, after the reduction of Pavia, was to put the pope in possession of all the places, that had been yielded to him by his father or himself, namely, the exarchate, the Pentapolis, and the dukedom of Spoleti, which however continued to be governed by its own dukes. Thus the popes had, at last, the satisfaction, the so long wished for satisfaction, of seeing the Lombards humbled, and no longer able to control them in their ambitious views, the emperor driven almost quite out of Italy, and themselves enriched with the spoils of both. As for the countries, which Charlemagne kept to himself, namely, the country now called Piemont, Monferrato, the Riviera of Genoa, the Parmesan, the Modenesse, Tuscany, the Milanese, the Brescian, the Veronese, and the dukedoms of Friuli and Benevento, he made there very little change in the government, continuing in most places the same governors, and allowing the people to enjoy the same privileges they had enjoyed under the Lombard princes. He made no alteration at all in their laws, but only added to them, as king of the Lombards, some of his own. In Pavia and in some other strong towns he left French governors and garrisons, but strictly enjoined them to govern with moderation and mildness, that they might be looked upon by the conquered people as friends rather than conquerors. Charlemagne, having thus settled the affairs of Italy to the entire satisfaction of the pope and his own, repassed the mountains in the month of August of the present year, and returned to France.

I cannot, in justice, dismiss this subject without vindicating the character of the unhappy Lombards against the anti-christian and virulent invectives of the popes, painting them in all their letters, as a "lawless, cruel, brutal, barbarous and savage people, as of all the nations on the earth the most wicked, the most abandoned to every kind of vice, as the dregs of mankind, and a disgrace to human nature." They were indeed, when they first came into Italy, a rude and unpolished race; and so were the Goths, the Franks, the Saxons, and the other northern nations, when they first broke into Spain, France, Britain, &c. But divesting themselves, by degrees, of their native rudeness and barbarity, especially after they had embraced the Christian religion, they became, in the course of a few years, if the contemporary writers are to be credited, quite another people. Nowhere was justice more impartially administered, nowhere were the rights and the properties of the people more

safe, or secured by better laws, or those laws more strictly executed than under their government. Under the government of the Lombards, says Paulus Diaconus, no violence was committed, no man unjustly dispossessed of his property, none oppressed with taxes; theft, robberies, murder, and adultery were seldom heard of; every one went, without the least apprehension of danger, whither he pleased.¹ Paul was, it is true, himself a Lombard; and Gunter,² the incomparable Grotius,³ and, in short, all who have writ of the Lombards, except the popes and their avowed partisans, speak no less favorably of them than Paul himself. And truly their many wholesome laws,⁴ restraining and severely punishing all sorts of crimes; the magnificent churches, and rich monasteries, with which they filled that part of Italy, that was subject to them; the many bishoprics they founded; the many towns and cities they either built, repaired, or embellished; the uncommon respect and veneration, that even their most warlike princes paid to the pope, when he acted in the character of a Christian bishop, or a prelate of the Christian church, and finally the many persons of both sexes and all conditions among them, whose sanctity and eminent virtues have been acknowledged by the popes themselves, are convincing proofs of their piety, justice and wisdom, and at the same time a full confutation, as Grotius observes, of the many calumnies, with which the popes have endeavored, in their letters, or rather in their libels, to blacken them in the eyes of the world. As the Lombards were the only power in Italy capable of controlling the ambitious views of the popes, and determined, as they apprehended, to control them, they dreaded nothing so much as their ever becoming masters of that country; and therefore, without any regard to conscience or truth, they made it their business, as it was their interest, to prejudice and stir up first the emperors, and afterwards the French nation against them, by representing them to both as the most wicked of people: and thus, in the end, they accomplished their ruin, and made themselves, at their expense, no inconsiderable princes.⁵

¹ Pal. Diac. Hist. Long. l. 3. c. 8.

² Gunt. in Ligurino. ³ Grot. in Proleg. ad Hist. Goth.

⁴ Their laws were found so just, so clear, so comprehensive, that they were retained and observed in Italy some ages after the reign of their princes was at an end. Grotius equals, and in many particulars prefers them to the laws of the Romans themselves; (Grot. in Proleg. ad Hist. Goth.) and Gunter, a famous poet in those days, sung thus of the Lombards in his *Ligurinum*:

"Gens astuta, sagax, prudens, industria, solers,
Provida consilio, legum jurisque perita."

⁵ For the better understanding of what will be said in the sequel, I shall give here a succinct account of the state of Italy after Charlemagne had, by the reduction of Pavia and the captivity of Desiderius, put an end to the reign of the Lombard kings. Italy was possessed, at that time, by four different potentates, the Venetians,

him the kiss of peace, he celebrated divine service.—(Ordo Roman. apud Sizon.) Charlemagne ordained, that the same ceremony should be observed in the coronation of his successors, and performed by the archbishop of Milan, who thenceforth began to contend for dignity with the archbishop of Ravenna.

The bishop of Ravenna claims the exarchate and seizes it. The pope invites Charlemagne again into Italy. He excuses himself from undertaking that journey;—[Year of Christ, 775.] The Lombard dukes falsely charged by the pope with conspiring against Charlemagne.

The pope had by Charlemagne been put in possession, as has been related above, of the exarchate, the Pentapolis, and the dukedom of Spoleti: and he now flattered himself, that he should enjoy undisturbed his new principality, and besides find some leisure to attend to the affairs of the church, to redress the many enormous abuses, that had everywhere crept into it, and restore the ecclesiastical discipline, at this time, entirely decayed. But he found himself, when he expected it the least, involved in new troubles, that engrossing all his attention, allowed him no spare time to think of any reformation in church. For no sooner had Charlemagne left Italy than Leo, archbishop of Ravenna, pretending, that, by the appointment of that prince, he had succeeded the exarch in all his rights as well as in his power and authority, and laying claim, on that pretence, to the exarchate, and the Pentapolis, seized on the cities of Faenza, Forlimpopoli, Forli, Cesena, Bobio, Imola, Bologna, and the dukedom as well as the city of Ferrara; drove everywhere out the officers of the pope, and threw those into prison, who were sent from Rome to complain, in Hadrian's name, of such violent and unwarrantable proceedings in a prelate

the French, the popes, and the emperors. The Venetians, by their trade to the Levant, were become very considerable. and as they had a great number of vessels, they bore no small sway in the affairs of Italy. The French were masters of the several provinces mentioned above, (See p. 133.) and besides, of the two great dukedoms of Friuli and Benevento, the former comprehending all the Friuli with the greater part of Istria, and the latter above two-thirds of the present kingdom of Naples. Those two dukes Charlemagne continued in their respective dukedoms; nay, and allowed them the same power and authority, which they had enjoyed under the Lombard kings, only requiring them to take annually the same oath of allegiance to him they had annually taken to the kings of their own nation. The pope possessed the exarchate, the Pentapolis, (See p. 108. note (1.) and the dukedom of Spoleti with the city and dukedom of Rome; but under him the dukes of Spoleti retained the same power, that the other dukes retained under Charlemagne. The emperors still held the dukedom of Naples, with the cities of Gallipoli, Otranto, and Tarento in the hither Calabria, and in the farther Calabria, the cities of Reggio, Gerace, Santa Severina, Crotona, Amantea, Agrigoli and Amalfi. The dukedom of Naples comprised, besides that city and its territory, the cities of Pozzuolo, Baia, Miseno, Castellamare, Sorrento, and all the adjacent islands. The dukedom of Naples was governed by a duke sent from Constantinople; but all the other cities, that the emperors still retained in Italy, were under the governor, or as he is styled, the patrician of Sicily. In more ancient times, only the farther Calabria was subject to the patrician of Sicily. But the cities, which the emperors held in those parts, being reduced to a very small number, they were all subjected to that patrician: and thence that part of Italy took the name of Sicily, which name was afterwards extended by the Norman and Suevoian princes, masters of those countries, to all the provinces, of which the present kingdom of Naples is composed. From a charter of Roger the Norman of the year 1115, it is manifest, that the name of Sicily was then common to that island and that kingdom, but with this difference, that the former was called Sicily beyond the Faro, and the latter Sicily on this side the Faro. In our days the king of Naples is still styled "king of the two Sicilies."

of the church. Hereupon Hadrian, not able, or not caring to redress himself while he had one ever ready to fight his battles for him, had again recourse to his protector Charlemagne, complaining to him, in a long letter, of the unparalleled boldness and presumption of the archbishop, on whom he bestows, without any regard to his character, the epithet of Nefandissimus, and conjuring his most Christian son, by all that is sacred, to undertake, without delay, a second journey into Italy, if he intended that St. Peter should reap any benefit from his first.¹

Upon the receipt of the pope's letter Charlemagne, who was then pursuing the conquest of Saxony, or rather the destruction of that people and their country, dispatched immediately to Rome, Possessor, bishop, and the abbot Rabigaud to assure the pope, that he had the interest of the apostolic see as much at heart as his own; but, at the same time, to let him know, that he was not then at leisure to undertake another journey to Italy; but would not fail, as soon as he had put an end to the war, in which he was engaged, to comply with his holiness' desire, and settle matters to his entire satisfaction. But that war was not likely to be soon at an end, and the pope was quite impatient to have the cities restored, that the archbishop had siezed. Being therefore informed by a nuncio, whom he sent to Spoleti to adjust some differences between him and the duke, that envoys from the dukes of Friuli, Benevento and Chiusi were met in that city, he construed, without further inquiry, the meeting of the envoys into a conspiracy, that was hatching by the dukes against Charlemagne and himself. And accordingly, to make Charlemagne hasten his return into Italy, he immediately dispatched a messenger to him with the following intelligence; that the four dukes maintained a private correspondence with Adalgisus and the emperor, who had warmly espoused the cause of that prince; that early in the spring a mighty fleet was to be sent against Italy with a numerous army on board; that the four dukes had agreed to act in concert with the emperor, and that they had nothing less in their view than to surprise Rome, to drive the French everywhere out, and placing Adalgisus on the throne of his father, restore the kingdom of the Lombards.² Charlemagne however made, it seems, no great account of that intelligence: for he only ordered his envoys Possessor and Rabigaud to repair to the courts of Spoleti and Benevento, in order to discover the disposition of those dukes, and observe whether any military preparations were carrying on in their dukedoms. The envoys found everything quiet in both places, and the dukes, so far as they could

¹ Cod. Carol. ep. 54.

² Idem ep. 59.

The duke of Friuli takes upon him the title of king of the Lombards. Charlemagne returns into Italy;— [Year of Christ, 776.]—Takes the duke prisoner and puts him to death. From Friuli he returns to Saxony. The pope disappointed and mortified at his departure. His letter to him.

judge, pleased rather than dissatisfied with the new government. Hadrian had flattered himself, that the king, taking upon his bare word all he had written to be true, would have hastened into Italy, would have deposed those dukes without further inquiry, and, what was his chief concern, obliged the archbishop to restore all the places he had taken. But Charlemagne, knowing how jealous the pope was of the power of those dukes; what hatred he bore, as all his predecessors had done, to the Lombards in general, acquiesced in the report, that was made to him by his envoys, without taking the least notice to the dukes of the pretended conspiracy, or of anything else, that had been written against them by the pope. This prudent conduct in the king was not at all pleasing to the pope, who, thinking himself thereby distrusted and slighted by his friend and protector, loudly complained of it in a letter he wrote to him on this occasion.¹ But Charlemagne made no more account of his complaints than he had made of his intelligence.

However, in the latter end of the present year Rotgaud, duke of Friuli, and next to the duke of Benevento the most powerful of all the Lombard dukes, scorning to live subject to a foreign prince, openly revolted, with a design to place, not Adalgis but himself on the throne. Several cities declared in his favor; and others he surprised, or took by force, causing himself to be everywhere proclaimed king of the Lombards. Upon the first notice of this revolt Charlemagne, who had put his troops into winter quarters on the frontiers of Saxony, hastened with the choice of his army into Alsace; for he is said to have kept his Christmas there, and marching from thence in the depth of winter, entered Italy before it was known that he had moved from Saxony, surprised the duke, and having put to flight the few troops he had time to assemble in that surprise, took him prisoner, and caused his head to be publicly struck off. Stabilinian, father-in-law to the duke, shutting himself up in the city of Trevigio, defended the place with great bravery till it was betrayed to the enemy by an Italian priest, whose treachery Charlemagne rewarded with the bishopric of Verdun. Indeed it was by such services that the clergy qualified themselves, at this time, for bishoprics; and for such services were they commonly preferred to that station by the princes. We therefore need not at all wonder at the scandalous and debauched lives that the ecclesiastics of all ranks are said to have led in those days. The princes preferred such only as had been, or were capable of being serviceable to them, however otherwise disqualified; and the pretend-

ed heads of the church were so entirely taken up with temporal affairs, that they had no time to mind the ecclesiastic. Upon the reduction of Trevigio the other cities all submitted of their own accord; and Charlemagne, not caring to trust a Lombard with the government, appointed one Marcaire, a native of France, duke of Friuli, and counts in each city to govern under him.¹

The king continued at Friuli till Easter, which he proposed, as he wrote to the pope, to keep at Rome; and to have the son, whom queen Hildegard had lately brought him, baptized by his holiness on that solemnity. But being, in the mean time, informed, that the Saxons had revolted a second time, that is, had endeavored to recover their liberty, of which Charlemagne had no right, nor pretence to rob them, he solemnized that festival, which fell this year on the 14th of April, at Trevigio; and then repassing the Alps with the same expedition, with which he had passed them, he appeared on the frontiers of Saxony while he was thought by the Saxons to be still in Italy.²

His sudden departure was a great mortification to the pope, who had flattered himself, that before he left Italy, he would have obliged the audacious archbishop to restore to the apostolic see, the places he had taken, and at least severely reprimanded him for presuming to seize on them. But instead of that, upon the return of the legates, whom he had sent to wait on the king, and complain to him of the unjust and violent proceedings of the presumptuous prelate, he received a letter written with the king's own hand in commendation of the archbishop, who, it seems, had been very assiduous in attending him, during his stay in Friuli, and being a man of address, had found means to insinuate himself greatly into his favor. The pope, in answer to the king's letter, assured him, that he bore no ill will to the archbishop; that whoever was so happy as to be favored by his most Christian son, should be equally favored by him; but that he could not, in conscience, suffer St. Peter to be robbed of the effects of his generosity, nor him of the reward, that was reserved for his generosity in heaven. He therefore earnestly entreats and conjures him, as he tenders the salvation of his soul, not to connive at the sacrilegious presumption of the archbishop, how well soever he may have deserved of him in other respects, but oblige him, without delay, to restore to St. Peter what he could not allow him to keep without taking from the apostle what he himself had given him, and thereby forfeiting his favor and protection.³

¹ Annal. Meten. & Petav. Regin. in Chronic. Cod. Carol. ep. 57. Eginhard in vit. Carol.

² Annal. Met. & Loisel. Egolis in vit. Carol.

³ Cod. Carol. ep. 53.

¹ Cod. Carolin. ep. 58.

The pope complains to Charlemagne of the duke of Chiusi and the bishop of Ravenna, and presses him to send commissaries or to come himself into Italy. Charlemagne sends ambassadors to quiet the pope. Goes himself to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 781.] His son Carloman baptized there by the pope, who gives the royal unction to him and his brother Lewis.

This year the pope wrote three other letters to Charlemagne. In the first he loudly complains of Ragnald, duke of Chiusi, who had seized on the patrimony of St. Peter in that dukedom, and begs that he may be removed, as an avowed enemy to that apostle, and one who had ever been at variance with him and his vicars.¹ In the other, to prejudice Charlemagne against his antagonist, the archbishop of Ravenna, he acquaints him that he has received a letter from the patriarch of Grado in Friuli, which, he says, was intercepted, opened, and read, by the archbishop of Ravenna, no doubt, with a design to discover the contents, and communicate them, if he found they were of any importance, to the duke of Benevento, and to the other enemies of the apostolic see, and of France. As John, patriarch of Grado, lived in great intimacy with the pope, the archbishop might have opened the letter, and probably did, to discover whether it contained any thing relating to himself. But upon that action the pope put the worst construction he possibly could, because it best served his purpose, to estrange the king from one, who rivaled him in his favor. To calumniate with so pious a design, was, it seems, no crime, but rather meritorious, according to the casuistry of Hadrian. In the same letter he tells the king, that the insolence of the archbishop was no longer to be endured; that depending upon his favor and protection he paid no kind of regard to the admonitions, menaces and exhortations of the apostolic see, and that, bidding defiance to St. Peter and himself, he had even the assurance to assume and oblige others to give him the title of prince of Ravenna.² To these letters Charlemagne, who had, at this time, other affairs of greater importance on his hands, and was quite tired with the pope's complaints, returned no other answer, than that he should send, in the autumn, ambassadors into Italy with a strict charge to see all the promises made good, that had ever been made by himself, or his father to St. Peter and his see.³

The pope waited the arrival of the ambassadors with the greatest impatience, till the month of November. But not receiving, even then, any tidings of them, he wrote to the magistrates of Pavia, to know of them when he might expect them. The magistrates answered, that they were not yet set out from France, nor would they, they believed, set out in haste. This answer gave great uneasiness to the pope. He began to apprehend, that Charlemagne was grown cold in his friendship for him, and his zeal for the interest of his see; and besides beheld, with the utmost indignation, the haughty and ambitious archbishop, (being

himself free from all haughtiness and ambition,) taking upon him, in the meantime, the part of a prince, and enjoying undisturbed the rich revenues, and all the wealth of the exarchate. He therefore wrote a third letter to Charlemagne, pressing and conjuring him to send ambassadors without delay, or return in person into Italy to protect the patrimony of St. Peter against the sacrilegious depredations of wicked men, if he desired to be, as he had hitherto been on all occasions, protected by that apostle.¹ Upon the receipt of this letter Charlemagne dispatched to Rome the bishop Possessor, and an abbot named Dodo; but it was only to acquaint the pope, or rather make him believe, that he proposed returning to Italy the ensuing October, and quiet him, as he grew daily more troublesome, by that means for a while. For that journey he put off, though importuned by the pope with letters after letters, and endless legations, till the year 780, when having, after a nine years war, settled, for the present, the affairs of Saxony, he set out for Italy at last, with his queen Hildegard, and two of his sons by her, Carloman and Lewis. He arrived at Pavia in the autumn of that year, and having kept his Christmas, and spent the rest of the winter in that city, he repaired to Rome, as Easter approached, to solemnize that festival there. His second entry into Rome was no less magnificent and solemn than his first; and he was attended, so long as he stayed, by the pope in person, by the Roman magistrates, and all the Roman nobility. One of the chief motives that brought him to Rome, at this time, was, that his son Carloman might be baptized on Easter-day by the pope. Carloman was born in 776; but Charlemagne had put off his baptism till his affairs allowed him to repair to Rome to have that sacrament administered to him there by his holiness: and it was administered to him accordingly by his holiness with the greatest solemnity. It is observable, that the pope, who was himself sponsor for the child, changed, on that occasion, the name of Carloman for that of Pepin, probably out of regard to the memory of his grandfather, the author of his temporal grandeur. As Charlemagne's eldest son, whom he had by his first wife Himiltrude, bore the same name, authors frequently mistake the one for the other. A few days after Hadrian, at the request of the king, gave the royal unction to his two sons; and Carloman, now Pepin, was by his father proclaimed king of Lombardy, and Lewis, at this time but three years old, king of Aquitaine. Thus he provided for his two younger children, the kingdoms of Neustria, Austrasia and Burgundy falling to the share of the two elder Pepin

¹ Cod. Carol. ep. 60. ² Idem ep. 52. ³ Idem ep. 51.

¹ Cod. Carol. ep. 51.

The affairs of Italy, how settled by Charlemagne. Great changes in the court of Constantinople.

and Charles; and at the same time flattered himself, that the Lombards and people of Aquitaine, whom he had lately conquered, having kings of their own, would not be so easily tempted to shake off the yoke, as if their countries were made provinces of France.¹

As for the affairs of the pope, no kind of mention is made, at this time, of the quarrel between him and the archbishop of Ravenna, or of the restitution of the places the archbishop had seized. However, as we find the pope henceforth possessed of those places, it is not to be doubted but that Charlemagne caused them all to be restored before he left Rome. He likewise adjusted, during his stay in that city, the difference, that had some time subsisted, between the pope and the duke, or governor of Naples. The duke had seized on the patrimony of St. Peter in that dukedom, and the pope, by way of reprisals, on the city of Terracina. But that city the duke had retaken by surprise, and still continued to withhold the revenues of the patrimony. The pope therefore, to deliver himself from so troublesome a neighbor, would have willingly persuaded the king to invade the dukedom, and seize on the city of Naples itself, alledging that he would thereby entirely defeat the wicked designs of the duke of Benevento, who, depending on the neighborhood and the assistance of the Greeks, was ready, he said, to declare for Adalgisus, whose sister he had married, and place him, when an opportunity offered, on the throne of his father. But the king, unwilling to break at this juncture with the emperor, instead of hearkening to the suggestions of the pope, contented himself with interposing his good offices; and it was agreed, that the duke should restore the patrimony; should pay the arrears as soon as he conveniently could, and in the meantime deliver up to the pope four children of the four chief families of Naples to be kept as hostages till the agreement was fully performed. As for the duke of Benevento, the king, knowing how jealous the pope was of the power of that duke, paid no kind of regard to his insinuations against him. The king had given the dukedom of Spoleti to the pope, as has been related above; but disputes daily arising between him and the duke, he took back that dukedom, before he left Rome, and gave the province of Sabina to the pope in its lieu.² Charlemagne, having thus settled the affairs of Italy returned to France, leaving his son Pepin, king of Lombardy, in Pavia the metropolis of his new kingdom.

During these transactions in the west, great changes happened at the court of Constantinople in the east. The emperor Con-

stantine, surnamed Copronymus, died in 775,¹ and was succeeded by his son Leo the

¹ The contemporary historians give us the following account of his death. The king of the Bulgarians, whose army, breaking under his conduct into the empire had been entirely cut off by Constantine, suspecting that he had been betrayed by some of his own people, wrote, in appearance, a most friendly letter to the emperor, pretending that he designed to quit the crown, and lead a private life at Constantinople. For that purpose he begged Constantine would send him a safe conduct, and, at the same time, let him know what friends he had among the Bulgarians, that he might repair with them to Constantinople, being unwilling to trust his design or his person to others. Constantine, not suspecting any deceit, which seems very surprising and scarce credible, sent him immediately the names of the Bulgarians, who corresponded privately with him; which the crafty prince no sooner received than he caused them all to be inhumanly massacred. The emperor, finding himself thus shamefully deluded, is said by Theophanes to have torn off his hair in the transport of his passion, to have sworn revenge, and ordered vast military preparations to be made throughout the empire, with a design to extirpate the whole race of the Bulgarians. Having thus spent, in warlike preparations, the greater part of the year, he set out from Constantinople in the latter end of the summer. But being seized on his march, as the weather was extremely hot, with a violent fever, and carbuncles, as the historians call them, breaking out on his thighs and his legs, he returned to Archadropolis, was conveyed from thence to Selymbria, and from Selymbria by sea to Strongylum, where he died in the vessel, on the 13th of September, in the fifty-sixth year of his age, after he had reigned fifty-five, namely, twenty-one with his father, ten alone, and twenty-four with his son.—(Theoph. ad ann. Constantin. 33, 34, 35. Auctor. Miscell.) To the account the author of the Miscella, and Theophanes, who lived at this very time, give us of Constantine's death, Cedrenus, who wrote three hundred years after, adds that in the agonies of death he cried out that "he was delivered alive to an unextinguishable fire, on account of the virgin Mary;" that he commanded her to be thenceforth honored as the true mother of God, and that he expired in praying for the safety of the people, of the senate, of his son, and the preservation of the churches of St. Sophia, of St. Mary in Blachernis, St. Mary in Chalcoopratriis, and other churches of Constantinople, which that writer names. Upon the authority of Cedrenus Baronius, Natalis Alexander, Maimbourg and the whole tribe of the popish writers deliver it as a thing not at all to be doubted, that Constantine, at the point of death, despaired of his salvation; that he died crying out he was condemned alive to the eternal flames, for the blasphemies he had uttered against the virgin Mary, and that he commanded her to be thenceforth honored as the true mother of God, without any regard to what he had said or done against her. But of all this not a single word in Theophanes, in the author of the Miscella, in Paulus Diaconus, or Nicephorus, who all lived in these times or near them, and were all no less zealous advocates for the worship of images, of saints, of the virgin Mary, and no less provoked against Constantine for banishing that superstition than Cedrenus. And is it at all probable, that had they been acquainted with the above mentioned circumstances of Constantine's death, so favorable to the cause they maintained, they would have all passed them over in silence? They would not perhaps have been so uncharitable as to triumph and exult, as Baronius and Maimbourg have done, in the supposed damnation of the emperor; but neither would they have concealed it. Now, if the writers, who lived, as some of them did whom I have mentioned, at the very time of Constantine's death, were unacquainted with those melancholy circumstances of it, how came Cedrenus acquainted with them three hundred years after? We shall soon see the testimony of Siegbert, concerning a certain council, rejected by Baronius, and all the popish writers to a man, (and shall reject it together with them) chiefly because no mention is made of that council by any of the contemporary writers, and Siegbert lived three hundred years after the time, in which it was supposed to have been held. The only reason I can alledge, and Baronius himself, I believe, could have alledged no other, why he rejected the testimony of the one writer, and admitted that of the other, though the

¹ Eginhard. in vit. Carol. Chron. Nibelung. in appendice. Annal. Moissiac.

² Cod. Carol. ep. 69.

Constantine opposed to image worship.

XI. of that name, who reigned only five years.¹ He was married in 769 to Irene,

same objection lay equally against both, was because the testimony of the one made against, and the testimony of the other made for the cause, which he had undertaken to maintain without any regard to truth, conscience, or honesty. As for Constantine's blaspheming the virgin Mary, and believing himself damned on that account, if the words of Cedrenus are to be thus understood; he would not indeed allow the worship to be given to her, to her image, or to any other creature, that he thought due to God alone; but at the same time he respected, revered and honored her as the mother of God, anathematizing with the fathers of the council, that was held under him, "all who did not confess the virgin Mary, mother of God, to be above all visible and invisible creatures."—(See p. 101.) By the same council were anathematized "all who did not confess the saints, who before the law, and under the law had pleased God, to be honorable in his sight;" (See p. 101.) so that he no otherwise blasphemed the virgin Mary, or the other saints, but by forbidding them to be worshiped, or commanding all worship to be given to God alone. He did not, even according to Cedrenus, command the virgin Mary and the saints to be thenceforth worshiped, or their images to be restored, which he had caused to be cast out of the churches; and therefore did not repent or retract what he had done, as is affirmed by Baronius and Maimbourg, who from thence take occasion to compare him to the wicked king Antiochus, and would make us believe, that repentance was as useless to him, as it was to that king.

As Constantine spared no pains, and, I may say, no punishments to suppress, and effectually suppressed the superstitious worship of images, at least in the east, the monks, who lived chiefly by that superstition, and wrote after it was restored, have spared no pains in their turn to blacken his character, and render his name infamous to the latest posterity. There is no crime, which they have not, with that view laid to his charge; no heresy, of which they have not arraigned him. He was, if they are to be credited, an Arian, an Eutychian, a Nestorian, a Socinian, a Manichee, &c., and besides, a magician, and one, who dealt with the devil, who invoked the devil, who worshiped the devil, while he would not allow the servants of God to worship the saints. Were all we read, or the hundredth part of what we read in the invectives of the monkish writers against this excellent emperor true, Maimbourg might, in drawing his character, have called him, as he does, and called him with justice, the most wicked prince that ever lived on the earth, or rather a monster, in whom centered all abominations without the least appearance of one single virtue to atone for so many vices.—(Maimb. Hist. Iconoclast. l. 3. p. 336, 337.) But with no one vice is he charged by the contemporary historians, who, had they known he was guilty of, or addicted to any, would not have failed, we may be sure, as they were all his avowed enemies, to publish them to the world. They speak indeed very reservedly of his virtues; but yet own him to have been a prince of great temperance, of uncommon resolution and courage, well skilled in war, greatly beloved by all, who served under him either in military or civil employments, and one, who defended the empire, with good success, against the Saracens and the Bulgarians, that is, with such success as would have procured him the highest encomiums from the writers of those times, had not his zeal for the purity of the Christian worship made them his enemies. His severity, or, as it is called, his cruelty to the worshipers of images, especially the monks, is the only thing the historians, who deserve any credit, have been able, with the least appearance of truth, to lay to his charge. Against the monks indeed he proceeded, it must be owned, with the utmost severity; but not till he found that he could by no other means overcome their obstinacy, and wean them from the superstition, which he was determined, at all events, to suppress, and till they, not satisfied with setting up and worshiping images in defiance of his repeated edicts, and the definition of a general council, began to disturb the peace of the empire, to stir up the people to sedition and rebellion, and had even the insolence to insult him, and in the grossest manner, to his face.—(See p. 114.) His severity to them was great, and great was the provocation they gave him. Had the protestant subjects of Lewis XIV., behaved in like manner; had they, in defiance of his edicts, pulled down and destroyed the images he wor-

shipped; had they disturbed the peace of his kingdom, stirred up the people, by seditious harangues, to rebellion, and publicly insulted and reviled him, they would not have met with better treatment from him, perhaps with worse, than the monks met with from Constantine; nor would Maimbourg, who justifies all the severities, that were practised upon that unhappy people without the least provocation, have thought that his grand monarch, when thus provoked, would have deserved to be painted as a blood-thirsty tyrant, as a monster of cruelty, for resenting such usage with the same severity it was resented with by the emperor.

As to the various heresies, which the monkish writers have charged him with; they are, most of them at least, quite incompatible with each other; and besides, Constantine condemned with the council, which he assembled, signed, and caused to be received all over the east, every heresy, that had till that time been condemned by the church. The only heresy therefore, that can justly be laid to his charge, was what a council of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops had defined, namely, that God alone is to be worshiped, and worshiped "in spirit and truth." Magic, which Constantine has been arraigned of by the monks, as well as of heresy, was, in those days, a common charge; and all were magicians and dealt with the devil, who quarreled with the monks and the clergy. Upon the whole, had Constantine as zealously promoted the worship of images as he opposed it, it is not at all to be doubted but that he would have been placed among the best of princes, if not the greatest saints, by those very writers, who have filled their histories and their legends with virulent declamations against him. His undertaking to abolish the most wicked, as he thought, as well as the most favorite superstition, that had ever crept into the church, and steadily pursuing so difficult an undertaking at the expense of his own quiet, and not without endangering both his crown and his life, must alone convince every unbiased reader that he was a most religious prince, having above all things at heart the purity of the religion he professed. He left some writings behind him, which, we may be sure, have not been suffered to reach our times. Some of them however were still extant in the time of Theosterictus, who tells us that he had read thirteen orations written by Constantine, surnamed Copronymus. But all he says of them is, that in none of them was mentioned the invocation of saints. Indeed Constantine allowed, as we have seen elsewhere, (See p. 101.) the intercession, but not the invocation of saints.

¹ Leo was born, according to Theophanes, in 750; was taken by his father, in 751, for partner in the empire; succeeded him on the 13th of September, 755, and died on the 8th of the same month, 780; so that he died in the thirtieth year of his age, having reigned four years with his father, and twenty-five alone, wanting six days. Nothing remarkable happened in his reign besides the conversion of Telerus, king of the Bulgarians, who, moved with an earnest desire of embracing the Christian religion, left his kingdom, and repaired to Constantinople, where he was received by the emperor with extraordinary marks of kindness and esteem, and baptized by the patriarch with the greatest solemnity. After his baptism the emperor, who was himself his sponsor, created him a patrician, married him to a near relation of the empress Irene, and raised him to the highest honors of the empire.—(Theoph. ad Ann. Leon. 2.)

Leo was as great an enemy to images as his father or grandfather; revoked none of their edicts, and would allow no images to be publicly set up, or publicly worshiped; but yet gave no encouragement to informers, suffered no searches to be made, in private houses, after pictures or images, and contented himself with only reprimanding those, who were arraigned or convicted of still practising the condemned superstition. He flattered himself, that he should thus more effectually wean them from their superstitious practices, than by all the severity and rigor he could use. Indeed the worst of sects have flourished the most, when under persecution, and insensibly mouldered away, when toleration and mercy took place. The famous saying, "Sanguis martyrum semen Christianorum," may, with as much truth, be applied to every religion, as it was, in times of persecution, applied to the Christian. This conduct Leo pursued, during the four first years of his reign, but afterwards

Irene governs during the ministry of her son Constantine. Causes the late emperor's brothers to be shaved and ordained.

a native of Athens, of whom I shall have frequent occasion to speak in the sequel,

changed it on the following occasion. When his father Constantine married him to Irene one of the marriage articles was, that she should neither worship images herself, nor ever suffer them to be worshiped by others. Whether she then really was, or was only suspected to be, addicted to that superstition, history does not inform us. But in this all historians agree, that at the desire of both princes she bound herself, in their presence, by a most solemn oath to observe that article most religiously so long as she lived. But, without any regard to the sacredness of her oath, she had, after the death of the emperor Constantine, images privately conveyed to her, and privately worshiped them. As in most courts there are as many spies as courtiers, and what is spoken or done there in closets is proclaimed, in a short time, upon the house-tops, Leo was soon informed of the superstitious practices of his wife, and charged her with them. But she, not satisfied with denying the charge, had even the assurance to reproach the emperor with want of confidence in crediting his lying informers rather than her, who had never deceived him. Hereupon Leo, who was better informed than she imagined, caused her closet, her bedchamber, and even her bed to be narrowly searched, and at last two images were found concealed in her pillow. Upon that discovery the emperor, provoked beyond measure in seeing his very palace turned into a temple of idols, spared no pains to find out the persons, who had had the boldness to convey them thither; and he found in the end, that the *papias*, or the person, who was trusted, during the night with the keys of the gates of the palace, had brought them in; that the captain of the guards, and the empress' two chamberlains Strategius and Theophanes, were privy to his bringing them in, and that they had all joined with the empress in the idolatrous worship she paid to those images. The emperor therefore ordered them to be immediately apprehended, to be severely whipped, and to be ignominiously conveyed on asses, through the most frequented streets of Constantinople, to the public jail. As for the empress, she boldly maintained to the last, that she was an entire stranger to the whole affair, and that the two images had been concealed in her pillow either by some, who still adhered to that superstition, but never suspected that any one would have dared to search her very bed or her bed-chamber; or by some malicious person with the wicked design of interrupting the harmony, that had hitherto reigned between her beloved husband and her, and with that harmony the happiness of both. Irene, says here Maimbourg, was not so zealous a catholic, as the holy men mentioned above. But to do her justice; if catholicism consists, as that writer supposes it does, in the worship of images, Irene chose rather to break a most solemn oath, than to abstain from that worship; which is more perhaps than those holy men would have had zeal or courage enough to have done. As Leo was too well informed to doubt of the guilt of his wife, he bitterly reproached her with the breach of her oath, with want both of religion and honor, and driving her from his presence would never afterwards see her. Maimbourg tells us that he said all the brutish and shocking things to her, that passion and rage could suggest. But even Cedrenus, his favorite author, whom he quotes, says no more than that he called her, in a passion, "a good for nothing woman," "*eam nauci esse dixit.*"—(Cedren. tom. 11. p. 469.)

Leo lived but a very short time after this quarrel; and Theophanes, the author of the Miscella, and Cedrenus give us the following account of his death. As he was passionately fond of precious stones, he took out of the church of St. Sophia a crown, which had been deposited there by the emperor Mauricius or Heraclius, and was enriched with carbuncles of an inestimable value, to wear it on occasion of some public solemnity. But while he was wearing it, carbuncles broke out on his head, and at the same time he was seized with a violent fever, which soon put an end to his life.—(Theoph. ad Ann. Leon. 5. Miscell. Cedren. ubi supra.) I will not quarrel with Baronius or Maimbourg about the truth of this account, (though many things of this nature have been related and credited by the contemporary credulous historians, that exceed all belief) but think, that considering the circumstances of the emperor's death, we need not recur with them, to supernatural causes to account for it. Natural causes are but too obvious, though entirely

and had by her, in 771, a son named Constantine, who succeeded him in 780, his mother governing, as he was under age, in his name. But in the very beginning of her regency, Theophanes says forty days after the death of the emperor, some of the senators and great officers of state, scorning to be governed by a woman, formed a design of driving out both her and her son, and placing Nicephorus one of the late emperor's brothers on the throne. But Irene, being timely informed of their design, caused all, who were concerned in it, to be apprehended, to be publicly whipped, and confined to different islands. The emperor had three other brothers, who had been all honored by him with the title of Cæsars and Nobilissimi; and these, to put them out of a condition of ever affecting the imperial crown, the empress commanded to be shaved, to take holy orders, and to administer the sacrament to the people on

dissembled by Baronius, and hinted at only by Maimbourg as groundless conjectures. That Leo was poisoned, and poisoned by his wife, I will not say is a thing past all doubt, as some have done; but neither is it a groundless conjecture. She was, as all authors agree; one of the most ambitious women we read of in history; and scrupled no crime how unnatural soever and heinous to gratify her ambition, as will appear in the sequel. But by disobliging the emperor in the manner we have seen, and thereby forfeiting his favor, and with his favor the power she had enjoyed to that time, she found herself reduced to the condition of a private person; and in that state she was likely to continue, as the emperor appeared irreconcilable, so long as he lived. But upon his death she knew that, her son being yet a child, the whole power must devolve upon her, and that, during his minority at least, she should govern uncontrolled both him and the empire. It is not therefore at all a groundless conjecture, that a woman of her unbounded ambition and spirit, and so abandonedly wicked, should have been tempted to remove the only person out of the way, that stood between her and the power she aspired to, and that being checked by no motives of religion, conscience or honor, but rather spurred on by the desire of gratifying her revenge as well as her ambition, she should have yielded to the temptation. It is certain at least, if the above-mentioned writers are to be credited, that the emperor, who was then in the flower of his age, and had ever enjoyed most perfect health, died soon after her disgrace, and that upon his death she was immediately acknowledged by her friends at court, with whom she privately corresponded, and whom she had perhaps employed as the instruments of her revenge and ambition, for regent of the empire. As for the fever, of which the emperor died, and the carbuncles attending it, which Maimbourg describes as minutely as if he had seen, examined and counted them, they might have been the effects of the poison, that was administered to him; to that at least they may be more properly ascribed than to the vengeance of heaven upon the unhappy prince for wearing a crown only a few hours, that was given to the church; or for punishing those, who were assisting to his wife in her superstitious practices and the breach of her oath. But in the deaths of all the princes, who have opposed the worship of images, or indeed any other favorite tenet of the Romish church, in what manner soever they died, the writers of that church have discovered something very extraordinary and quite unaccountable, that they might construe it into judgments and the vengeance of heaven. And with as much reason might the protestants construe into judgments the death of Henry II., of Charles IX., of Henry III., of France, of Philip II., of Spain, and, not to mention others, of queen Mary of England, who was cut off in the flower of her age at so seasonable a juncture for our great queen Elizabeth and the protestant cause.

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. Leon. 1. Miscell. l. 23.

Irene's chosen ministers. She defeats the Saracens and concludes an advantageous peace with them. She proposes a marriage between the emperor, her son, and the daughter of Charlemagne;—[Year of Christ, 782.] Her view therein. The treaty broken off and the young emperor obliged, by his mother, to marry an Armenian. She undertakes to re-establish the worship of images.

Christmas day in the church of St. Sophia, that all might know they were shaved and ordained, and consequently rendered for ever incapable of the imperial dignity. On that occasion the empress assisted at divine service with her son, attended by the great officers of state and all the nobility, to honor, with her presence, the first ecclesiastical function of the degraded Cæsars.¹

Irene's next care was to choose proper ministers, that is, ministers ready to fall in with her in all her views and designs. And she chose accordingly the patrician Staurocius for her prime minister, a man of uncommon abilities, a good commander, and one entirely devoted to her; and filled all the other great offices with persons, on whose fidelity and attachment to her person and interest she knew she could safely rely. At the same time she made it her study to oblige the army with largesses, and to gain the affections of the people and clergy with an extraordinary show of religion and piety. Swayed by her unbounded ambition she could not think of ever parting with her present power and authority; and to maintain the one and the other so long as she lived, she began early to pursue such measures as appeared to her the best calculated to answer that purpose.

In the meantime the Saracens, hearing the emperor was dead, and the empire governed by a woman, laid hold of that opportunity to break into the eastern provinces, and surprise there some cities and strongholds. But Irene immediately dispatched one of her generals against them, who, coming up with them in Asia gave them a total overthrow, and obliged them not only to retire with great loss, but to conclude a peace upon terms very advantageous to the empire.² This success greatly recommended Irene to the esteem and good will of the people, and even reconciled her to many, who had not hitherto approved of her measures.

And now she had nothing, at present, to fear from the enemies of the empire in the east. But her jealousy was roused by the fame of Charlemagne's exploits, and the rapidity of his conquests in the west; the more, as she was informed that he was at this time in Rome, and pressed by the pope to invade the dukedom of Naples, and seize on the small remains of the empire in Italy. This she was sensible he might easily accomplish; and therefore to divert him from attempting it, she resolved, as she never wanted resources, to amuse him with the proposal of a marriage between his daughter Rotrude,³ and the young emperor Constan-

tine; and she sent accordingly a very solemn embassy to Charlemagne, at the head of which was Constantine, high treasurer of the empire, to propose that match as a bond of eternal friendship and amity between the two great Christian powers. Charlemagne, flattering himself that the court of Constantinople would, upon such an alliance, quite abandon Adalgisus, or at least not encourage or support him in his pretensions to the kingdom of the Lombards, which would prevent any further disturbances in Italy, hearkened with great pleasure to the proposal, and the marriage articles were settled and agreed to on the one side and the other. But as the emperor was, at this time, only eleven years old, and Rotrude only nine, she was left in France, and an eunuch of the imperial palace, named Eliseus, was left with her to teach her the language, and the manners of the Greeks.¹ But this marriage never took place; nor indeed did Irene design it ever should. She apprehended, that should her son marry the daughter of so renowned and powerful a prince, he would probably be governed by his councils rather than by hers, and might, depending upon his protection, shake off the yoke, and govern either by himself, or as his father-in-law, who would not fail to espouse his cause, should direct him. The proposal served to divert Charlemagne from attempting, at the instigation of the pope, the conquest of Italy. But Irene, when no longer threatened with that danger, started so many difficulties, that in the end Charlemagne himself thought it advisable, which was all the crafty woman wanted, to break off the treaty. It was no sooner broken off than the unnatural mother forced her son, though extremely desirous of an alliance with Charlemagne, to marry an Armenian named Mary, of an obscure parentage, and a very mean education. The young emperor was utterly averse to that match, and earnestly begged his mother would not insist upon his taking to his bed, and his companion for life, one, to use the expression of Zonares, whom he utterly abhorred. But she was deaf to his prayers and entreaties, and apprehending her power to be in no danger from an obscure Armenian, or from her friends and relations, regardless of the happiness of her son, she obliged him, in the end, to consent to the match.²

However, she continued to amuse Charlemagne with the match between his daughter and her son, till she had put the grand design in execution, which she had formed in

¹ Greek word *εὐθεός*, signifying *red*; no doubt thinking that the word Rotrude had the same signification among the Franks.

² Theoph. Miscell. Zonar. Cedren.

³ Theoph. ad Ann. Const. 13. Eginhard. in vit. Carol. Zonar. &c.

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. Leon. 1. Miscell. l. 23.

² Theoph. ad Ann. 2. Constantin.

³ Rotrude was Charlemagne's eldest daughter, born in 773. Theophanes calls her Herytrus from the

Irene grants liberty of conscience, and recalls the banished monks;—[Year of Christ, 783.] Paul, the patriarch, resigns. The account given by the fathers of Nice and Theophanes of his resignation, evidently fabulous.

the very beginning of her regency, that of restoring, throughout the empire, the use and the worship of images. She had bound herself, as has been related above, by a most solemn oath, never to worship images herself, or suffer them to be worshipped by others. But, unmindful of that oath, and perhaps thinking it even meritorious to break it, if a woman of her character could have any notion of merit or virtue, she no sooner found herself vested with power, than she undertook to establish what she had so solemnly promised to abolish. However, she proceeded at first with great caution, revoked none of the edicts of the preceding emperors against images, but only connived at their being set up in some churches, and would take no notice of the worship, that was given them by some of the populace. Soon after, under color of granting to all an entire liberty of conscience, she declared it lawful for every one to hold, and publicly to maintain the opinion with respect to images, that should appear to them the best grounded, and at the same time recalled the monks, who in the preceding reign had lain concealed in the deserts, and whom she knew to be all most zealous promoters of the worship of images. Thus were two of Constantine's edicts revoked, both issued after the worship, as well as the use of images, had been condemned at Constantinople by three hundred and thirty-eight bishops. By the one all were forbidden, under the severest penalties, to defend, practise, or maintain a worship condemned by a general council. By the other the subjects of the empire were restrained from leading idle and indolent lives in monasteries under color of devotion, or distinguishing themselves from their fellow subjects by any particular dress.¹

An event is said to have happened at this time, which greatly served to forward the design of Irene, and encourage her to pursue it. It is thus related by Theophanes. Paul, patriarch of the imperial city, a prelate of extraordinary learning and piety, finding himself indisposed, quitted thereupon the patriarchal throne, and withdrawing to a monastery, took the monastic habit, without imparting his design, either to the emperor, or to the regent his mother. Irene no less surprised at the sudden retreat, than concerned for the loss of so worthy a prelate, repaired with her son, as soon as she heard of it, to the monastery to learn from the patriarch himself the true cause of so unexpected a resolution. But he, bursting into tears as soon as she entered his cell, cried out aloud before she could utter one word, "O that I had never accepted the episcopal dignity in a church, that was kept in slavery, and cut off from, as well as anathematized by, all the other patriarchal churches on ac-

count of her heresy."² The fathers of Nice add, that the patriarch, who lay then at the point of death, owned, that being an enemy to images, he should have undergone the fate of all other heretics, and been condemned with the devil to everlasting darkness, had he not repented of his error, and retracted it in the most public manner he could.² Irene, continues Theophanes, greatly affected with the words of the dying patriarch, sent in great haste, apprehending his end to be near, for the chief patricians and senators, to whom the holy prelate, upon their entering his cell, addressed himself thus: you have all erred, you continue to err, and there is no salvation for you, unless a general council be convened, and the error removed that prevails among you. If so, replied the patricians and senators, why did you, at your consecration, solemnly renounce the worship of images, and sign the decree condemning that worship? That is the very crime, replied the patriarch, the heinous crime, that now afflicts and torments me; that is the crime I now strive, by a sincere repentance, to atone for, which I hope God will accept, and not punish me as I deserve, for having been hitherto silent, and declined preaching the truth, as it was my indispensable duty to do, lest I should thereby forfeit your favor. These were his last words; and he had scarce uttered them when he expired, greatly lamented by all, by the good men as well as the bad, by the pious as well as the impious; that is by men of both parties, by the pious, who held the lawfulness of image worship, as well as by the impious, who denied it. For he was a most holy man, generous to the poor beyond measure, worthy of the highest respect and esteem, and one, in whom an entire confidence was placed both by the republic and the empire.³ Thus Theophanes.

Thus Theophanes; and in this account the popish writers triumph, especially Baronius and Maimbourg, as if they had carried their cause. But should we even allow the account to be true, I should be glad to know what can be inferred from it in favor of images. Is the authority of one man, how learned soever and wise, of a man at the point of death, when the understanding is commonly impaired, of weight enough to counterbalance that of all the primitive fathers, of all the learned and wise men of the catholic church from the times of the apostles down to the eighth century,⁴ of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops assembled in a general council? I said, should we allow the account to be true. But that it is not true; that, at least, it is highly improbable, though related by contemporary writers may be easily shown. Paul was raised to the pa-

¹ Concil. Nic. 2. act. 2.

² Theoph. ad Ann. Const. 9. ³ Concil. Nic. 2. act. 2.

⁴ Theoph. ubi supra. ⁵ See p. 43.

Tarasius appointed patriarch in the room of Paul;—[Year of Christ, 754.] The craft and address of Irene and Tarasius on that occasion.

triarchal dignity, according to all the historians, and Theophanes himself,¹ by the emperor Leo, in 780, the last year of his reign and his life; so that Paul, who died in 784, must have presided in that church four years under Irene. Now as he could not but know that she had nothing so much at heart as to establish the use and the worship of images, and was pursuing all the measures, that appeared to her the best calculated for that purpose, it is highly improbable, or rather altogether incredible, that he should have really believed the doctrine of image worship to be the true catholic doctrine, nay, and been even persuaded, that there was no salvation for those, who did not hold and profess it, and nevertheless have continued, to the time of his death, to profess the opposite doctrine; and that, when he knew, that he could by no other means more effectually recommend himself to the favor of Irene, in whom centered all power, than by renouncing the one, in compliance with the dictates of his conscience, and embracing the other. Had he renounced, under Leo, the worship of images merely to qualify himself for the patriarchal dignity, as is affirmed by Theophanes, he would, without doubt, have declared for that worship, as soon as the power devolved on Irene, and not continued to oppose it, as he is said to have done, against his interest as well as his conscience. As he therefore continued to oppose it, and to oppose it with great zeal, as appears from Theophanes, to the time of his resignation, it is not at all to be doubted, but that he acted therein agreeably to his opinion and conscience, and that finding Irene was determined to restore the condemned superstition, he chose rather to resign than contend with her, or be any ways accessory to so wicked a design. As for his pretended conversion, repentance and retraction, the whole was probably invented either by Irene herself, or by the good fathers of Nice; as were many other conversions, apparitions, miracles, prophecies, which, with the assistance of the monks, they obtruded on the credulous populace at a time when none dared to disprove them.²

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. 5. Leon.

² The other strange events, that are said to have happened at this time, all well calculated to promote the design of Irene, and recommend it to the ignorant multitude, the following is worthy of notice, being gravely related by Theophanes, Cedrenus, the author of the Miscella, Zonaras, Gregoras, and, we may be sure, not passed over in silence by Baronius and his transcriber Maimbourg. In the first year of Constantine's or rather of Irene's reign, near the long wall of Thrace, the wall, that was built about forty miles from Constantinople to protect that province against the sudden irruptions of the barbarians, was discovered by a peasant digging there the body of a man in a stone coffin with the following inscription in Greek: "Christ is to be born of the virgin Mary; I believe in him. O sun, thou shalt see me again under Constantine and Irene."—(Theoph. ad Ann. Constantin. 4.) This pretended discovery and prediction, as no deceit was then suspected, which plainly shows the ignorance of the age, greatly served

Paul being dead, Irene's chief care and concern was to find a fit person to substitute in his room, that is, a person both willing and able to promote her design: and as these were the only qualifications she required in the new patriarch, she was not long at a loss, whom she should choose for that dignity. Her secretary, named Tarasius, a name famous in the history of those times, was a man of uncommon abilities and address, descended from an illustrious and consular family, as zealous a friend to images as the empress herself, privy to her design, and as ready to pursue as able to contrive the most proper means of putting it in execution. Upon him, therefore, she fixed; but apprehending that, as he was still a layman, and it was strictly forbidden by the canons to raise a layman to the episcopal dignity, his election might not be approved by the people, whose concurrence she wanted, she undertook to gain their approbation and consent, before they could be acquainted with the choice she had made; nay, and to make the nomination of Tarasius, which required great craft and address, to come first from them. With that view she assembled the people in the great hall of the imperial palace of Blachernæ, and there pretending the greatest concern for the loss of the late patriarch, who she knew was by all greatly beloved, she told them, that since he had been snatched from them by death, neither the emperor nor she would take upon them to appoint him a successor, without consulting them, who were to be directed by him, in all spiritual matters, the only matters of moment, as well as they; that the emperor had called them together for that purpose, and did not at all doubt, but that, laying aside all partiality, all private affection, they would regard, in so important a choice, merit alone. She added, that indeed Tarasius was of all men in the empire the best qualified, in every respect, for so important a trust; that he was a person of too extraordinary a merit to be overlooked on such an occasion; that both she and the emperor had first of all cast their eyes upon him. At these words the whole multitude cried out with one voice, "Tarasius shall be our bishop; we choose Tarasius; he shall govern us and no other." Irene, who had, in all likelihood, privately engaged before hand some of the heads of the people, finding her design succeeded so well, resumed her discourse, and addressing

to recommend Irene to the respect and esteem of the people, and were, no doubt, invented for that purpose. With such reasonable discoveries and predictions history abounds both sacred and profane: and I see no reason why we should give more credit to this prediction, than to that, which was discovered engraved on a plate of brass a little time before the battle of Granicus, foretelling the imminent destruction of the Persian empire by the Macedonians, (Plut. in Alexand.) or to many other predictions of the like nature seasonably invented to serve some present purpose.

Irene acquaints the pope with the promotion of Tarasius and her design to assemble a general council, and invites the pope and the other three patriarchs to it.

the multitude, congratulated them on the choice they had made, extolled the merit of Tarasius; "but you must know," she added, "that he, though thus unanimously chosen both by you and by us, declines accepting a dignity, which is so ambitiously sought for by others, and will not acquiesce in our choice." Here the people cried out again, "we choose him, and he must acquiesce; we will choose no other; Tarasius is our bishop, our father, our pastor." Here Tarasius, who had attended the emperor to the assembly, rising up, returned, in the first place, thanks to the emperor and empress, styling them the guardians of the Christian faith, as well as to the people, for the good opinion they entertained of him, and the honor they had done him; then after a long descant on the importance of the trust, to which he was called; on his want of abilities to discharge it as he ought; on the unhappy divisions, that reigned in the church; on the deplorable condition of the church of Constantinople in particular, which, he said, was anathematized by all the other patriarchal churches, nay, and by all the churches both in the east and the west;¹ and lastly on the necessity of redressing such evils, and uniting in one and the same faith all Christian churches, since they were all founded on one and the same rock, Christ Jesus (not St. Peter,) and all acknowledged him for their author, after, I say, a long descant on these subjects, he told the assembly, as had, no doubt, been before hand agreed between him and Irene, that the only means of removing the evils he so justly complained of, was, to have the points, that divided them from all other churches, impartially examined, and finally determined by a general council; that if they consented to the assembling of one, he should think himself bound in conscience to acquiesce in their choice; but if they did not consent he was

unalterably determined to concern himself, upon no consideration whatever, with the government of a schismatical church, that was determined to continue in her schism, and rejected the only means of ever removing it. He had not yet done speaking when the whole assembly, declaring with repeated shouts their assent to the calling of a council, proclaimed Tarasius their pastor and patriarch; and he was accordingly ordained on Christmas day of the present year 784.¹

Irene, having thus engaged the people on her side, and with them some of the leading men in the senate, dispatched Constantine bishop of Leontium in Sicily, and Dorotheus bishop of Naples in Campania, to Rome with a letter to the pope, in the emperor's name and her own, to acquaint his holiness with the promotion of Tarasius, and the resolution, which the emperor and she had taken jointly with him, to restore the venerable images, to re-establish the practice, that had obtained in the church ever since the times of the apostles, and to assemble for that purpose a general council in the imperial city. In the letter they most earnestly entreated the pope to repair to Constantinople in person, assuring him, that, agreeably to the orders they had transmitted to the governor of Sicily, he should be everywhere received and entertained, on his journey from Rome to Constantinople as well as on his return from Constantinople to Rome, in a manner suitable to his dignity. They added, that if he did not choose to come in person, which his known zeal for the true catholic faith would not allow them to suppose, they did not doubt but he would send two legates, men of probity and learning, to assist, in his name at the council. The direction of the letter was, "to the most holy and blessed Hadrian, pope of old Rome." But in the letter he is styled "the first bishop, the bishop, who presides in the room and chair of St. Peter."² At the same time the new patriarch dispatched to Rome one of his presbyters, named Leo, with an account of his promotion, and a confession of his faith. But the letter he wrote to the pope on that occasion has not reached the present time. Constantine, Dorotheus, and Leo set out together from Constantinople; but on their arrival in Sicily, Constantine and Dorotheus were by the governor of that island sent back to Constantinople, pursuant to an order he had received from court, and Theodorus bishop of Catania, and Epiphanius, legate of the archbishop of Sardinia, were appointed in their room; which has led Baronius into a mistake,³ as if two solemn embassies had been sent to Hadrian on this occasion.

Tarasius wrote at the same time to the

¹ Tarasius was, it seems, very little acquainted with the state of the church at this time either in the east or the west. In the west all the churches, the Roman alone excepted, agreed with that of Constantinople in condemning the worship of images; and as to the use of pictures and images, they looked upon it as a thing in itself quite indifferent, as will be shown hereafter; and therefore could not excommunicate and anathematize the church of Constantinople for not using them in her worship, or not allowing them to be used. In the east, the use as well as the worship of images had been condemned but thirty years before, and consequently in Tarasius' memory, by a council of three hundred and thirty-eight bishops; and the decree condemning the one and the other continued in full force till it was tacitly revoked by Irene, as has been related above. Hadrian seems to have been better acquainted with the state of the eastern church than the new patriarch; for in his letter to Constantine and Irene he tells them, "that all the people in the east had erred about images till it pleased Providence to place them on the throne," which is as much as to say, that all the churches in the east condemned the use and the worship of images, as well as the church of Constantinople, which therefore could not, as was asserted by Tarasius, be anathematized on that account by all the other churches. But Tarasius knew that he might impose on his audience, the ignorant multitude, the most palpable falsehoods.

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. Constant. 9.

² Idem ad Ann. Const. 10.

³ Bar. ad Ann. 785. p. 369. Vide Pagi ad eund. Ann. p. 372.

The pope applauds the design of the patriarchs, and in his answer, undertakes to prove the lawfulness of image worship. The tale of Constantine's baptism.

other three patriarchs, namely, of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, to acquaint them with his promotion, and invite them to the general council, that would soon meet, by the appointment of their most religious emperors to heal the divisions, that had reigned so long in the church. His letter contains an ample confession of his faith, wherein he condemns and anathematizes, by name, all the heresiarchs, that had been condemned and anathematized by the church from the times of the apostles to his, and among these pope Honorius, "as a vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah, whose grapes are grapes of gall, and clusters bitter."¹ He admits the invocation as well as the intercession of saints and approves of the picture of our Savior represented in the figure of a lamb.²

In the meantime Theodorus, Epiphanius, and Leo arrived at Rome, and were received there with extraordinary marks of joy. The pope sent for them as soon as he heard of their arrival, and understanding from the emperors' letter, that they were resolved to restore the sacred and venerable images, and assemble for that purpose a general council, he returned thanks to the Almighty for inspiring them with so godly a resolution. Some days after he answered the letter he had received from the emperors by another of an extraordinary length, calculated to confirm and encourage them in the resolution they had taken. He begins with commending, and in a very high strain, the true catholic zeal of Constantine and Irene in undertaking to re-establish the ancient practice of the church, a practice, that had obtained ever since the times of the apostles; and compares them, on that account, to Constantine the Great and to Helena, by whom the Christian religion was first established in the empire. He tells them that no human tongue can express the joy their letter has given him; congratulates them on their being chosen by heaven for so meritorious and so great an undertaking, and to confirm them in what he calls the true catholic doctrine concerning the use and the worship of images, he undertakes to prove the lawfulness of the one and the other; nay, and to show that both had, ever since the apostles' times, prevailed in, and been approved of by the church.

To show that the use of images had been received and approved by the church ever since the times of the apostles, he begins with the reign of Constantine the Great, who came to the crown in the fourth century, and gravely relates, from the fabulous acts of pope Silvester, the following story. "Constantine," says he, "being grievously afflicted with the leprosy, dreamt one night

that the holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, appearing to him, advised him to send for pope Silvester, who, they said, lay concealed in mount Soracte to avoid the persecution, but would come, if sent for, and show him a fish-pond, in which, if he washed three times, he should be clean. Constantine no sooner awaked than he sent for Silvester, and having acquainted him with his dream, asked him what gods Peter and Paul were, and whether he could show him their pictures. The pope answered, they were no gods, but the apostles of God, and sent immediately one of his deacons for their pictures, which the emperor no sooner saw than he cried out, these are the very persons, who appeared to me, show me the pond. Silvester showed it; the emperor washed in it; was cleaned, and baptized soon after." Behold, concludes Hadrian, from the very beginning of our religion all Christians had images. As not the least mention is made by Eusebius, who wrote the life of Constantine, or by any other contemporary historian, of that emperor's having ever persecuted the Christians, or his having been affected with, and miraculously cured of a leprosy, and besides it is certain, (if Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Jerom, Ambrose, Athanasius, and the three hundred and fifty-nine bishops of the council of Rimini held under Constantine, the son of Constantine, are to be credited,) that he was not baptized at Rome, but at Nicomedia a little before his death. I should not have thought so absurd and improbable a tale, though gravely related by a great pope, worthy of a place here, had it not been to show how utterly unacquainted men were, at least the advocates for images were, in those days with the history of past times, and how distressed for want of proofs from true history to support their cause, since they were obliged to recur for that purpose to such fables and fabulous legends, as even they are now ashamed of, who maintain the same cause. Had Hadrian been but the least acquainted with the history of his own church, he would have known, that Constantine embraced the Christian religion in the time of pope Melchiades, the predecessor of Silvester, and that he appointed him one of the judges in the famous controversy between Cæcilianus of Carthage and the Donatists.¹ But should we even allow the story as told by Hadrian to be true, it would not follow from thence, that both the use and the worship of images had obtained in the church, and obtained ever since the times of the apostles, but only that the use had obtained, and not even that till the fourth century.

Hadrian having made it appear, in the manner we have seen, that the use of images prevailed among Christians from the

¹ Deut. 32: 32.

² Apud Bar. ad Ann. 785. & Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 2.

¹ See vol. I. p. 42, &c.

Hadrian's arguments for setting up images in churches. The instance of the cherubims and the brazen serpent quite foreign to his purpose, and likewise his passages from Scripture.

very beginning of the Christian religion, *ab ipsis sanctæ fidei nostræ rudimentis*, (for that is the consequence he draws from the tale related above,) undertakes in the next place to prove that such a practice was pleasing to God; and argues thus: all things, that are appointed by human discretion for the honor of God, are pleasing to him; thus Abel in honor of God offered up the first fruits, and God was pleased with his offering; Noah in honor of God built an altar, upon that altar offered sacrifice, which was acceptable to God; Jacob in honor of God erected a pillar, and God approved what he had done. Now images were appointed by human discretion for the honor of God; for in them we do not honor the gold, the brass, the marble, the colors, but the servants of God, the virgin Mary, the apostles, the martyrs, whom they represent; and the honor we give to the servants of God terminates in God. Excellent divinity! And might not the pagan philosophers, upon the same principle, and by the same method of arguing have justified, against the fathers, the use of images among them as well as the honor of worship they gave them? Their images too were appointed by human discretion for the honor of God; for it was not the gold, the brass, the marble, or the colors they honored, but the true God, or the servants of the true God represented to them in their images, as has been demonstrated elsewhere.¹ In like manner the golden calf was appointed by human discretion for the honor of God, and so were the calves set up by Jeroboam at Dan and Bethel; for in them the Jews worshiped the God of Israel, who brought them out of the land of Egypt;² and we cannot suppose them to have been all so entirely destitute of common sense as really to believe, that the images, which they had just seen made, had brought them out of the land of Egypt. Those images therefore were appointed by human discretion only as symbols of God, in which and by which he was to be honored; and yet they were not pleasing, but highly displeasing to God. I might add, that, if whatever is appointed by human discretion for the honor of God, is pleasing to him, the casting images out of the churches, and destroying them was pleasing to him, since that was appointed to be done for the honor of God, or to prevent the honor, that is due to him alone, being given to others.

The other proofs, offered by the pope in favor of images, are taken partly from Scripture, and partly from the fathers, but all alike quite impertinent and foreign to the purpose. From Scripture he urges the command given to Moses by God himself to make two cherubims, or the images of two

cherubims, over the mercy-seat; and though those images were not worshiped, nor so much as seen by the people, he concludes, that it is not only lawful for Christians to make images, but to worship them. In like manner from God's commanding Moses to make the brazen serpent, and set it up for a sign, he concludes with an exclamation, "O the madness of those, who will not worship images! the images of our Savior, of his mother, of the saints, by whose virtue the world subsists, and mankind are saved! shall we, who believe, that the Israelites were healed by beholding the brazen serpent, doubt of our being saved by beholding and worshiping the images of Christ and the saints?" Had the pope recollected that though the brazen serpent was made by God's own command, which can be said of none of his images, and wrought far greater miracles than the most miraculous of his images, yet king Hezekiah broke it in pieces, when he found the people worshiped it, and was said to have done therein "that which was right in the sight of the Lord,"³ his holiness would have taken care not to bring in or mention the brazen serpent on this occasion. But he was, it seems, better acquainted with the monkish legends than he was with his Bible. However he alleges several passages out of the Bible to show that the use of images and the worship are there approved and recommended; but to find out what relation those passages have either to the use or the worship of images, or indeed to images at all, is no easy task; and I shall leave it to the reader. The passages are; "Honor and majesty are in his presence;⁴ thy face will I seek;⁵ the rich among the people shall entreat thy face;⁶ Lord lift up the light of thy countenance upon us;⁷ in that day there shall be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord;⁸ honor and majesty are before him; strength and beauty are in his sanctuary;⁹ Lord, I have loved the habitation of thy house, and the tabernacle of thy honor.⁹ In all the New Testament the pope could find but one single passage, that he thought could any ways authorize the use and the worship of images, namely, that of St. Paul to the Hebrews, by faith Jacob, when he was dying, blessed both the sons of Joseph, and worshiped upon the top of his staff.⁹ This passage the pope, leaving out the preposition upon, reads thus: and worshiped the top of his staff. That staff he supposes to have been the staff of his son Joseph, and concludes, that as Jacob gave that honor and worship to the staff of Joseph, not for its own sake, but for the sake of him, who bore

¹ See p. 31 note (2). & p. 35. note (1)

² Exod. 32: v. 4. 1. Kings 12: v. 29.

VOL. II.—19

³ 2 Kings 18: v. 3, 4.

⁴ Psal. 45: 12.

⁵ Psal. 96: 6.

⁶ Psal. 96: 6.

⁷ Psal. 4: 6.

⁸ Psal. 26: 8.

⁹ Psal. 27: 8.

⁹ Isa. 19: 19.

⁹ Heb. 11: 21.

The passages Hadrian quotes from the fathers either impertinent or corrupted. Complaints of the uncanonical promotion of Tarasius; but is willing to approve it if by his means images are restored. His answer to the patriarch.

it; so may we honor and worship the images of the saints, not for their own sake, but for the sake of those, whom they represent. But the meaning of the apostle is obvious, and one would think that no child, who can read, could mistake it, namely, that Jacob, being on his death-bed, set up leaning on the top of his staff to support his weak body, while he blessed his children, and worshiped.

As for the fathers, I shall not trouble the reader with the many passages the pope alleges out of their writings in support of his cause, but only observe, I. That though in the beginning of his letter he undertakes to show that images had been both used and worshiped in the church ever since the apostles' times, yet for so ancient a practice he quotes not a single father, who lived before the fourth century, but several, who flourished in the fifth, in the sixth, and some, who wrote even as late as the seventh. II. That the passages, he alleges out of the genuine works of the fathers, prove no more than that images were used, from the latter end of the fourth century to the beginning of the seventh, as mere ornaments, as helps to memory, as books for such as could not read. III. That some of his texts are strangely altered and corrupted, and some quoted from spurious pieces. Among the spurious pieces we may well reckon the epistle of St. Basil to the emperor Julian, wherein that saint makes the worship of images an article of his creed, and inserts it next to the remission of sins in the following words, "for the obtaining of which I honor, worship, and adore the images of our Savior, of the virgin Mary, of the apostles, prophets, and martyrs, agreeably to the apostolic tradition; and such a practice ought not to be forbidden." This is the only pertinent text the pope alleges; but the piece, from which it is quoted, is now rejected by the learned of all persuasions as unquestionably spurious.¹ And this is all the pope had to offer in behalf of his apostolic tradition concerning the use and the worship of images.

In the remaining part of his letter Hadrian loudly complains of the promotion of Tarasius, raised, in defiance of the sacred laws and canons of the church, from a layman to the patriarchal dignity, and appointed to teach what he himself had not yet learnt. He thinks it no less absurd and preposterous that a layman should be trusted with the care and the direction of souls, than that an ecclesiastic, who had never borne arms, and was utterly unacquainted with the military art, should be trusted with the command of an army. He nevertheless declares himself ready to acquiesce in the election of the new patriarch, however uncanonical, and to acknowledge him for his fellow bishop, how-

ever unequal in other respects to so great a charge, provided he zealously concurred with his most pious and catholic sovereigns in promoting the catholic cause, in extirpating the heresy that had so long prevailed, and in restoring the sacred and venerable images to the honor and worship, that had ever been paid them. Zeal for images was the only qualification required at this time in a bishop; and indeed the bishops, who assisted at the council, which we shall soon have occasion to speak of, seem to have had no other. But if an unexperienced layman is no more to be trusted with the care of souls, than an unexperienced ecclesiastic is to be trusted with the command of an army, zeal for images could no more qualify the layman for the one than it could the ecclesiastic for the other. The pope closes his letter with entreating the emperor, and his most religious mother Irene, as they tendered the salvation of their souls, to cause the council, that had condemned the holy images, to be condemned and anathematized, to defend and maintain the primacy of the Roman church, the head of all Christian churches; to oblige the bishop of their imperial city to quit the haughty and presumptuous title of universal patriarch, and lastly to order the patrimonies of St. Peter, which their predecessors had seized, to be forthwith restored. A most shameless demand in one, who possessed so many rich cities and provinces, of which his predecessors had robbed the emperors and the empire.¹

At the same time the pope answered the letter he had received from the new patriarch. The direction was "Hadrian, bishop and servant of the servants of God, to his beloved brother the patriarch Tarasius." He freely tells him that he was grieved to hear of his promotion, but that he is entirely satisfied with his confession of faith, wherein he receives the six general councils, and promises to worship and to adore the holy images; that nevertheless he dares not approve of his consecration, as it is contrary to the known laws of the church, but upon condition that he undertakes to restore the ancient practice of the catholic church.²

Constantine and Irene had pressed the pope, as we have seen, to repair in person to Constantinople, and flattered themselves that his zeal would have surmounted all difficulties. But Hadrian, recollecting that he had employed all his interest with Charlemagne to get the Greeks driven quite out of Italy; that the emperors had not yet yielded, but still continued to claim as their own the countries he possessed, and that they must consequently look upon him not only as an enemy, but as an usurper and rebel, and might treat him accordingly, not-

¹ See Cave's Life of St. Basil, p. 222.

² Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 2.

² Idem ibid.

Hadrian declines assisting at the council, but sends legates to it. No other bishops from the west invited to it. Three eastern patriarchs not present either in person or by their deputies. The monks, their pretended deputies not sent by them, nor authorized to act in their name. The letter of the monks of Palestine to Tarasius.

withstanding the zeal they pretended for images, he thought it advisable not to put it in their power, but to consult in the first place his own safety. Excusing himself, therefore, on account of his age, from undertaking so long a journey, he appointed Peter, archpriest of the Roman church, and the abbot of the monastery of St. Sabas, named likewise Peter, to assist at the council with the character of his legates in his room; and by them he sent his answer to the letters of the emperor and the patriarch.¹

No bishops from the west, besides the pope, were invited to the council either by the empress or the patriarch; and none assisted at it, besides the pope, either in person or by their deputies. It therefore entirely consisted, though styled œcumenical, of the pope's legates and the eastern bishops; nay, and of such only of the eastern bishops as were subjects of the empire. As for the three patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, and the bishops under their jurisdiction, Tarasius, it is true, wrote and sent deputies to acquaint them with the design of his most religious sovereigns, of putting an end to the unhappy divisions of the church by a general council, and invite them to it; but with what success the reader may learn from Baronius. The deputies, says the annalist, sent by Tarasius to the three patriarchs, being told, on their arrival in Palestine, by the monks there, that Theodore of Jerusalem was dead; that the Christians were most cruelly persecuted in Egypt and in Syria by the new caliph Aaron; that their journey to Alexandria and Antioch would give great jealousy to the Saracens, and in all likelihood prove fatal not only to them, but to all the Christians in those parts, they laid aside all thoughts of proceeding further. However, to satisfy, in some degree, the empress and the patriarch, the monks, assembling in the desert, chose two of their body, John and Thomas, to represent the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch in the council, and testify to the fathers their orthodox belief with respect to the point in dispute, the worship of images.² From this account of Baronius, and it is entirely agreeable to what we read in Theophanes and all the other contemporary writers, it is manifest, that none of the above-mentioned patriarchs assisted at the council either in person or by their deputies or legates, the patriarch of Jerusalem being then dead, and the monks, who are said to have represented the other two, being sent by their brethren the monks, and not by the patriarchs, who knew nothing of them or the council. And yet these monks are styled, throughout the acts of the council, the legates of the

eastern patriarchs; nay, and they had the assurance to subscribe themselves the legates of the three apostolic sees, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; and their subscriptions are commonly produced to show that the patriarchs were all unanimous in defining the lawfulness of image worship, and condemning the council, that had declared such a worship unlawful, and idolatrous.

As the two monks, says here Maimbourg pretending to solve a difficulty, which he thinks none had been able to solve before, as the two monks, John and Thomas, were not sent by the patriarchs, but by the monks of Palestine without their knowledge, some writers have concluded, that the patriarchs were no ways concerned in the council. But these writers were not aware, that the council did not meet till a year and more after the arrival of the monks at Constantinople, and that the patriarchs had time enough, and might, during that interval, have found means to authorize the monks to act in their name, and to vest them with the necessary powers for that purpose: and that they did so is very certain.¹ And that they did not so is very certain; for by no other means could the patriarchs have empowered the monks to act in their name, but either by letters; and the letters would have been read in the council, or by new deputies; and they would have appeared in the council. But it is certain, that no letters were read in the council from the patriarchs, that no deputies from them appeared either at Constantinople or at Nice. It is certain at least, that no mention is made of either in the acts of the council, or by any of the contemporary writers, not even by Theophanes, who was present, and has omitted nothing, that could any ways redound to the honor of an assembly, which he has taken so much pains to recommend to posterity, and but too often at the expense of truth. Besides, the two monks themselves declared in the council, that they, though ignorant inhabitants of the desert, though unexperienced, though idiots, had been chosen by their brethren to testify the orthodox belief of those, who dared not so much as to speak of such matters, much less to receive or to write letters concerning them.² An incontestable proof that the patriarchs neither did nor could authorize by deputies or by letters, the two monks to act in their name, during the interval between their arrival at Constantinople and the meeting of the council. And thus has Maimbourg solved a difficulty, which no man had been able to solve before him.

The two monks brought with them a letter from their brethren in the desert, to Tarasius,

¹ Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 2. Anast. in Præf. Concil.

² Baron. ad Ann. 785. p. 353.

¹ Maimb. Hist. Icon. l. 3. p. 422, 423.

² Concil. Nic. 2. act. 3.

The letter of the patriarch of Jerusalem to the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, a mere forgery. The council meets at Constantinople;—[Year of Christ, 786.]

wherein they recommend to his holiness their deputies, who, they say, will inform him of the orthodoxy of the patriarchs; acquaint him with their having diverted his legates from pursuing their journey to Alexandria and Antioch, since it was impossible for them to reach those cities, and they would, by attempting it, not only expose their own lives to imminent danger, but the lives of all the Christians in those parts;¹ entreat his holiness to proceed undaunted in so pious and meritorious an undertaking, that of restoring, by a general council, the use and the worship of images, notwithstanding the absence of the three patriarchs, which did not prevent the sixth council, and would not prevent the seventh from being universally received as œcumenical. They conclude with declaring for the use and the worship of images, as an apostolical tradition, and protesting, that they receive only six general councils, and condemn that, which was held under Copronymus against images, and is by some styled the seventh.² The direction of the letter was, "To our most holy and blessed lord, Tarasius, archbishop of Constantinople and universal patriarch, the high priests and other priests in the east, greeting." They style themselves the high priests, and other priests in the east, personating therein the patriarchs, and the bishops under their respective jurisdictions. And truly Baronius, in exhibiting their letter, styles it in the margin, the letter of the patriarchs to Tarasius;³ and as such it was received, read and applauded in the council, though it is said in the letter itself, that the patriarchs neither dared to write, nor to receive letters, nor even to utter a single word concerning such subjects.

The deputies of the monks brought another letter with them, supposed to have been written by Theodore of Jerusalem to Cosmas of Alexandria, and Theodore of Antioch, on occasion of his promotion to the episcopal dignity. In that letter Theodore in the first place professes to worship the saints and their images, to adore and embrace their saving relics, especially the bones of the martyrs, ascribes to them, out of a spurious piece fathered on Athanasius, the power of working miracles and curing all sorts of diseases, but derives that power from Christ, who, according to him, dwells in those bones. II. He acknowledges only six general councils, and anathematizes that

which condemned images, and by the enemies of images is called the seventh. III. He taxes with ignorance, and condemns as heretics all, who pretend that images are not to be worshiped because the works of men's hands, since the cherubims, the ark, the mercy seat, though the works of men's hands, were nevertheless worshiped, as he takes it for granted, by the Israelites.¹ This absurd epistle is said to have been written by Theodore of Jerusalem, to Theodore of Antioch, and Cosmas of Alexandria, upon his being promoted to the patriarchal dignity, and is therefore styled a synodical epistle, that is, an epistle written by a new bishop, and in a full synod, to his fellow bishops. But Theodore was raised to the patriarchal see of Jerusalem in 735;² and at that time neither was Theodore patriarch of Antioch, nor was Cosmas patriarch of Alexandria, the former having been vested with that dignity in 752, and the latter in 742.³ The letter therefore could not, as is evident, have been written to either of them, but was in all likelihood forged by the monks, unacquainted with the state of those churches to impose on the bishops of the council, and persuade them, that the three patriarchs (for they pretended to have the answers of the two patriarchs entirely agreeable to the letter of Theodore,) held and professed the doctrine of image worship. But should we even allow these letters to be genuine, it would not follow from thence that the said doctrine was held by the present patriarchs, whose orthodoxy the monks were sent to testify before the council, but only that it had been held and professed by some of their predecessors. For at this time Theodore of Jerusalem, Cosmas of Alexandria, and Theodore of Antioch, were all three dead, and their sees, if not vacant, held by others. I say, if not vacant; for they are marked by Theophanes in his chronological tables as vacant at this time. In the acts of the council Theodore of Jerusalem, the pretended writer of the letter, is said to have died lately;⁴ but from history it appears that he was dead fifteen years before, Eusebius, who succeeded him, being possessed of his see in the year 770.⁵

The bishops were required in the summons, that was sent them, to repair with all speed to Constantinople; and the legates of the pope, as well as the pretended legates of the three other patriarchs, arriving in that city about the latter end of July, 786, the council was appointed to meet for the first time on the 17th of August, and the spacious basilic of the holy apostles was chosen for that purpose. There they met at the time appointed; and the patriarch Tarasius having,

¹ Christianus Lupus, one would think had never seen this letter, though in the acts of the council, nor so much as heard of it. For he supposes the legates of Tarasius to have got to the patriarchs, and the two monks to have been sent by the patriarchs themselves as their legates *a latere*, and magnifies the courage and zeal of the legates from Constantinople, "for venturing through a thousand deaths to get to those patriarchs, (Lup. not in Canon. Concil. Sept. p. 1119.) when it is said in the letter itself, that it was impossible for them to get to them, and that they were diverted by the monks from attempting it.

² Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 3. ³ Bar. ad Ann. 785. p. 383.

¹ Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 3.

² See Pagi Critic. in Annal. Bar. ad Ann. 767.

³ Theoph. ad Ann. Const. 10. Pagi ad Ann. 751. 742.

⁴ Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 5. ⁵ See Pagi ad Ann. 767.

The council obliged by the soldiery and citizens to break up. Irene pursues her design. The troops that opposed the council disbanded.

according to custom, opened the sessions with an harangue, of which I can give no account, the decree forbidding a general council to meet with the consent of the patriarchs, was ordered to be read. But in the mean time the emperors guards, who had served under Constantine Copronymus, and were all, the officers as well as the private men, most zealous Iconoclasts, hearing that the council was met, not to examine, but to condemn the faith of that emperor, and with his faith, his council and memory, flew to arms, surrounded the church, and crying out, that they would not suffer the memory of so good and so religious a prince to be thus dishonored, nor the idolatry to be brought back, which he had so happily banished, threatened the patriarch and the other bishops with immediate death, if, desisting from so wicked a purpose, they did not that instant break up and disperse. The empress, who was present with the emperor, alarmed at so sudden a tumult, which she had neither foreseen, nor in the least apprehended, sent immediately some of the great officers of the crown, who attended her, to appease it. But the soldiery, instead of obeying, insulted them as idolaters, as enemies to God, to the church, to the empire. Hereupon Irene, observing the consternation and panic of the bishops ready to vote, but not at all inclined to die for the cause, and satisfied that the soldiery, now joined by a great number of citizens, were not to be reclaimed, gave the fathers leave to retire and yield for the present; which they did very readily without being hurt, insulted, or any ways molested by their furious and inhuman enemies, as Theophanes is pleased to call them.¹ How different from this was the treatment the imperial officers met with, and the patriarch himself from the worshippers of images, even from the women, when they first attempted to pull them down?²

The assembly being thus dissolved, the eastern bishops returned all to their respective sees. The pope's legates too, not thinking themselves safe amidst the Iconoclast soldiery, were for quitting Constantinople, and returning with all haste to Rome. But the empress, with much ado, persuaded them, and likewise the two monks, who were to represent the eastern patriarchs, to put off their journey for a while, assuring them that she wanted not the means of checking the insolence of the soldiery, and bringing the design she had formed, jointly with the patriarch, in spite of them, to a happy issue. Accordingly, with that view she appointed Stauratius, in whom she placed an entire confidence, governor of Thrace, and at the same time gave him the command of the oriental legions quartered in that province, charging him to render himself, by all means,

acceptable to them, and having once gained their affections, to dismiss such of the soldiers and their officers as he thought might oppose her design, and appoint others in their room, who would promote it, acting therein with great prudence and circumspection. In that trust Stauratius acquitted himself so well, that he could, in little more than six months time, assure the empress, that in the whole corps there was not a single man, who would not concur with her, and assist her, to the utmost of his power, in the execution of her design. Upon this intelligence the crafty empress immediately gave out, that the Saracens had unexpectedly broken into Asia; that they committed there unheard-of cruelties, and that the emperor was determined to march against them without delay, in person, and head his army. Orders were accordingly issued for all the troops to put themselves in motion; the emperor's equipage was conveyed across the straits into Bithynia, and the guards commanded to attend it, as it was their duty, to the pretended place of the general rendezvous, whither they were told the emperor would follow them with all possible speed. But no sooner had they left the city than the oriental legions entered it, on their march, as was supposed, into Asia. But they were stopt there by the empress; and the guards, upon their landing on the opposite shore, received an order, signed both by the emperor and the empress, acquainting them that they had no further occasion for their service, and commanding them to deliver up their arms, and retire, on pain of being treated as rebels and traitors, to their respective homes. As they were quite destitute of money as well as provisions, and sensible that they could not withstand the whole strength of the empire, which they knew would be employed against them, they obeyed, delivered up their arms, and disbanded: and Irene, not satisfied with thus getting rid of them, ordered their wives and children, with all who were any ways related to, or connected with them, to quit the city forthwith, and retire to the countries where they were born.¹ These brave veterans had served, and with great reputation, under Constantine Copronymus, as well as his son Leo, in all their wars; and thus were their long and faithful services in the end rewarded. But they, as true to God as to their sovereigns, would worship God alone, would suffer no other objects of worship to be set up in his room, and were therefore left in their old age to starve, more worthy of a place amongst martyrs in the calendar, than any of the insolent monks, who suffered for their disobedience to the law of God, and laws of the empire.

And now Irene, trusting in her new guards,

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. Const. 7.

² See p. 55.

¹ Theoph. Ad Ann. Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 2.

The council meets at Nice ;—[Year of Christ, 787.] First session. Who presided. The emperor's letter read.

all zealous friends to images, and ready to concur with her in all her measures, began to think of assembling the council anew. But apprehending that their meeting in the metropolis, where the Iconoclast party was still very strong, might be attended with fresh disturbances, she thought it advisable to transfer it to some other place; and the place, that appeared to her the most proper, as well as to the patriarch, was the city of Nice in Bithynia. The image-worshippers were there by far the stronger party of the two, and sure to prevail, were any opposition offered, by blows, if arguments failed them. Besides, the empress flattered herself, that the very name of Nice, a name so famous in the annals of the church, might recommend a council held there, and in some degree prejudice people, at least the undistinguishing multitude, in its favor. Fresh orders were therefore issued by Tarasius, and sent in the name of the emperor and the empress to all bishops requiring them to repair to Nice, and there pursue the great work, which they had begun, but the enemies of truth had interrupted, at Constantinople. At the same time messengers were dispatched after the legates of the pope, who, not thinking themselves safe at Constantinople, and suffering their fear to get the better of their zeal, had left that city to return to Rome. The messengers overtook them in Sicily; and they, upon hearing that the mutinous soldiery were disbanded and dispersed; that others were substituted in their room, on whose zeal and protection they might entirely depend, and that the council was to meet, not at Constantinople, but at Nice, where there was nothing to fear, consented to return. By the time they reached Constantinople the bishops had, pursuant to their summons, all got to Nice; and thither Tarasius, who had waited for the legates at Constantinople, repaired, soon after their arrival, with them, with the great officers of the empire, who were to assist at the council in the emperor's name, and the two monks, who were to personate the three eastern patriarchs, and had been entertained in the imperial palace ever since the dissolution of the council, and greatly caressed by the empress.

All things being now ready for the opening of the council, the fathers met for the first time in the great church of St. Sophia on the 24th of September of the present year. At this assembly were present, according to some, three hundred and fifty bishops, according to others three hundred and sixty-seven, and three hundred and seventy-seven; a number sufficient to determine any truth, were truth to be determined by numbers. The council was opened with a short speech by Tarasius, wherein he exhorted the holy bishops, assembled in the Lord, not to examine the points in dispute with care and

attention, and impartially decide them, but to exert themselves manfully against the late heresy. Here F. Pagi, to prevent us from falling into a great mistake, and concluding that Tarasius presided at the council because he opened it, takes care to inform us, that in truth the pope's legates presided, but that as Tarasius was a man of great address, of consummate experience in the management of affairs, and far better skilled than they in the Greek tongue, they yielded to him the whole management and direction of the council. Indeed that the council was entirely managed and directed by Tarasius is very certain; and that he presided at it either alone, or jointly with the legates of the pope, and the pretended legates of the eastern patriarchs is no less certain. For the patriarch Photius, in his book of the Seven General Councils, says in express terms, that the direction and presidency of this council was given to Tarasius, to the pope's legates, and the legates of the three other patriarchs.¹ What Photius writes is confirmed by the anonymous author of the *Liber Synodicus*; for that writer too names Tarasius, the pope's legates, and the two monks, as all presiding at the council;² and it is to be observed, that both these writers name Tarasius in the first place, and consequently as the first or chief president. To the testimony of these two writers I shall add the unexceptionable testimony of Tarasius himself, who speaking, in the first session, of the tumult, that happened the preceding year at Constantinople, tells the fathers that it happened when they were already assembled, while he presided, *præsidentibus nobis in venerabili templo*, &c. If he presided at Constantinople, it is not to be doubted but that he likewise presided at Nice, the council of Constantinople and that of Nice being one and the same council, only transferred from one place to another. I might add, that he probably presided alone, it being quite improbable that had the pope's legates, and the two monks shared that honor with him, he would, by not mentioning them, have assumed it all to himself.³

When Tarasius had ended his speech, the imperial commissioners Petronius, John, and Nicephorus, who had succeeded Tarasius in the employment of first secretary, and afterwards succeeded him in the patriarchal dignity, produced a letter from Constantine and Irene to the council, and desired it might be read; which was done accordingly. In that letter they declared that they had assembled the present council with the approbation and

¹ Phot. de Sept. Synod. p. 57.

² Bibliothec. Jur. Canon. p. 1210.

³ Du Pin in his account of this council says in one place, that the legates of the pope were placed the first, and Tarasius next to them; and in another, that the legates of Hadrian did not think it advisable that certain articles of his holiness' letter should be read in a council, at which Tarasius presided.—(Du Pin Biblioth. eccles. t. 6. p. 138, 139.)

Some bishops abjure their former doctrine, and are allowed to sit in the council.

consent of all the patriarchs, whereas of the five patriarchs three knew nothing of it, as has been shown above;¹ that the resignation of the late patriarch, and his death-bed repentance because he had received the council, that condemned images,² having made a deep impression on their minds, they had thereupon resolved to recall the banished faith, and with that view raised Tarasius to the patriarchal dignity, who had suggested to them the assembling of a general council, as the most effectual means of obtaining so desirable an end; that they had accordingly assembled a general council from all parts of the globe, a toto terrarum orbe;³ that it was incumbent upon them, now they were assembled, to cut off all errors and novelties in the practice and faith of the church, as the prince of the apostles cut off the ear of the perfidious Jew; to root out and condemn to hell-fire every tree bearing fruit of contention, and thus put an end to the unhappy disputes, that had so long rent into parties and factions both the church and the empire.⁴ The letter was received by the whole assembly with loud acclamations, with repeated wishes of long life and prosperity to their most religious sovereigns, who deserved so well of the orthodox faith, of the catholic church, of all true Christians.

In the next place several bishops, namely, Basilus of Ancyra, Theodorus of Myra, Theodosius of Ammorium, and others, who had condemned images, or received the council that condemned them, presented themselves to the fathers, begging they might be allowed to abjure that heresy and take their place in the council. For in this mock council none were allowed to sit, who had ever condemned images, till they had solemnly abjured that opinion as a heresy: which was declaring it heresy not to worship images, when they had not yet examined whether it was heresy or not, nor heard a single argument or reason for or against that opinion. The fathers readily complied with the request of the penitent bishops; and Basilus of Ancyra abjured his opinion the first in the following words: "I admit the intercession of our immaculate lady the mother of God, of the holy angels, of all saints, and beg them to intercede for me; I receive with all honor, salute, and honorably honor, honorabiliter honoro, their holy and precious relics, believing I shall thus partake of their holiness. I likewise salute, honor, and embrace the venerable images of our Savior, of the virgin Mary, of the apostles, prophets,

martyrs, and of all the saints. I condemn, abhor, and most sincerely renounce the false, wicked and abominable synod, that condemned images, and caused them to be taken down and cast out of the churches. I most sincerely anathematize all, who break images; who apply to the venerable images what is said in Scripture against idols; who call them idols, or say that we approach them as gods, who reject the doctrine of the fathers, and the tradition of the church, saying with Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches and Dioscorus, that they receive no doctrine but what they find in the Old or New Testament."⁵ Basilus ended his retraction, and his anathemas with one against himself, if he ever willingly or unwillingly renounced or impugned the doctrine, which he now professed.¹ The retraction of Theodorus of Myra and Theodosius of Ammorium differed but very little from that of Basilus; only Theodosius declared that he received, embraced, and adored the holy and adorable images; that he received, embraced and adored the relics of saints, and anathematized all, who did not teach and inculcate the doctrine of image-worship. The retraction of these three bishops was received with great applause by the fathers, and as it was by all judged sincere, they were allowed to sit with the rest in the council. Seven bishops more presented themselves in order to recant, and be thereupon admitted into the council. But as they had distinguished themselves by their zeal against images, and were supposed to have been the authors of the disturbances, that obliged the council to break up the preceding year at Constantinople, the fathers were divided in their opinions with respect to them, some being for degrading them, others for receiving them by a new imposition of hands, and some for admitting them into the council, without any other ceremony, upon their owning themselves heretics, and renouncing their former wicked sentiments with respect to images as a heresy: and this opinion prevailed in the end; but their abjuration and reception were put off to the next session. Thus by this very numerous, very wise, very holy, very learned council, as Baronius, Maimbourg, Natalis style it, was it declared a wicked heresy, and abjured as a wicked heresy, not to worship images, when they had not yet examined, nor begun to examine whether it was a heresy, or not. But Irene was bent upon having the holy images restored; Tarasius, though a layman, had been raised by her to the patriarchal dignity, because a zealous friend to the holy images; the pope, offended at the uncanonical election and ordination of a layman, had declared, that he approved of his election only upon condition that he got the holy images restored; so that the holy images were to be restored at

¹ See p. 147.

² See p. 141.

³ At this council assembled from all parts of the globe not one person assisted, besides the legates of the pope from Italy, France, Germany, Spain, Britain, or Africa; nay not one, except the two monks and the pope's legates, who was not a subject of the empire; and the empire was confined, at this time, within very narrow bounds, and but a very small portion of the globe.

⁴ Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 1.

⁵ Concil. Nic. 2. Act. 1.

Second session—Gregory of Neocæsarea recants. Hadrian's letter read. Third session—Gregory admitted to the council. The letter of Tarasius to the eastern patriarchs, and theirs to him, read. Fourth session—Proofs alledged from Scripture by Tarasius in favor of images, and by the pretended vicar of the eastern patriarchs.

all events : and the most effectual means of obtaining that end was to declare at once all enemies to images heretics, and by excluding them from the council till they had abjured their wicked heresy, prevent all dangerous inquiries, debates, and opposition.

In the second session, held two days after the first, that is, on the 26th of September, Gregory, bishop of Neocæsarea was introduced by the imperial commissioners in order to abjure his heresy, and take his place in the council. He made his abjuration accordingly, protesting, that he received, honored and adored the venerable images, and unfeignedly repented as a most wicked action his having ever opposed them. However as he had been of all the Iconoclasts the most active in pulling them down and breaking them, and besides was said to have cruelly persecuted all under his jurisdiction, who favored, or were suspected to favor that cause, his reception was put off till his case should be further considered, and he ordered to present, in the next session, a confession of his faith written and signed by himself. Gregory being dismissed, Hadrian's letter in answer to the emperor's was read, approved and received with all the misinterpretations of Scripture, all the false or impertinent allegations from the fathers, and the legendary tales it contained.¹ His letter to Tarasius was likewise read and approved. And thus ended the second session.

The council met again on the 29th of September, when Gregory of Neocæsarea, having presented a confession of his new faith, was, after repeated submissions and protestations, confirmed in his dignity, and allowed, with the seven bishops mentioned above, all, no doubt, sincere converts to the worship of images, to take his place in the council. In the next place was read the letter of Tarasius to the eastern patriarchs,² the answer of the monks of Palestine to that letter, which passed in the council for the answer of the patriarchs themselves,³ and the supposed letter of Theodore of Jerusalem to the two patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch.⁴ These letters were approved by all, and received as containing the true catholic, orthodox, and apostolic faith ; and anathemas were thereupon thundered by the pope's legates, in the name of the three hundred and eighteen bishops, who had formerly met in the same place, that is, in the name of the three hundred and eighteen bishops of the first council of Nice, against all, who did not profess the same doctrine, and did not agree with the most holy pope Hadrian, with the holy patriarch of new Rome, and the other holy patriarchs in the adoration of images. The anathemas, thun-

dered by the legates, were approved and confirmed with loud and repeated acclamations by all, who were present, and thanks returned to the Almighty for thus uniting the east and the west, the south and the north in one council and one faith, when the eastern patriarchs knew nothing of the council, as has been shown,¹ and the western bishops condemned it as soon as they heard of it, as will be shown hereafter.

And now that the good fathers had obliged several bishops, who had opposed the worship of images as unlawful, to abjure that opinion as a wicked heresy, and had anathematized all, who held it, as heretics, it was high time for them to examine whether it was a heresy or not, since they pretended to have met for that purpose, or, at least, to prove that it was. And this they attempted in the two following sessions, but with what success I shall leave the reader to judge. As the Iconoclasts urged the Scripture and the divine prohibition " thou shalt not make to thyself any graven images," &c. against the use as well as the worship of images, in the fourth session, held on the first of October, Tarasius undertook to prove from Scripture the lawfulness of the one and the other. But the only passages he alledged were those, in which mention is made of the cherubims shadowing the mercy-seat;² and from them he argued, if cherubims shadowing the mercy-seat, were allowed under the law, may not we have the images of Christ, of his holy mother, of the saints and the martyrs shadowing our altars under the dispensation of the Gospel? This stale argument, if it deserves the name of an argument, had been a thousand times answered by the Iconoclasts : they had shown, as often as it was urged against them, a wide difference between the cherubims and the images they opposed, namely, that the cherubims were made by God's express command, which could be said of no images of our Savior or the saints ; that the cherubims were not worshiped, and therefore could not be alledged to authorize the worshiping of images ; that they were not even seen by the people, but kept concealed from their sight in the holy of holies, and therefore could not so much as authorize the use of images in the places of worship, the holy of holies, where they were kept, being no place of worship, since none were allowed to worship there, nay nor to look into the place.³ John, the pretended vicar of the eastern patriarchs, added, that Jacob set up a pillar, and that he wrestled with an angel in the form of a man, concluding from thence that Christians may set up images, as if there were no difference

¹ See p. 144.

² See p. 144.

³ See p. 147.

⁴ See p. 148

¹ See p. 147.

² Num. c. 7. v. 8, 9. Exod. c. 25. v. 17, 18. Ezek. c. 41 : v. 18, 19. Heb. c. 9 : v. 5.

³ See p. 61. note (2).

Passages of Scripture strangely misinterpreted. The bishops themselves sensible that their doctrine was not to be proved from Scripture. Testimonies from the fathers.

between a pillar and an image, and may likewise paint angels in the form of men; which was altogether foreign to the purpose, the Iconoclasts not thinking it unlawful to paint angels and saints, but only to worship either them or their pictures. The same monk observed that the agreement between Hadrian and Tarasius, between the Roman church and the empress Irene in the present dispute about images, had been foreseen by king David, and foretold in the following words, "mercy and truth," that is Hadrian and Tarasius, "are met together, righteousness and peace," that is, the Roman church and Irene, whose name in Greek imports peace, "have kissed each other."¹ The other texts they allege from Scripture are no less foreign than these, that is altogether foreign, to their purpose, namely, "Nathan bowed himself to the king with his face to the ground."² Abraham bowed himself to the people of the land, even to the children of Heth;³ show me thy face,⁴ thy face will I seek.⁵ From the first two passages they argue; if it is lawful to bow to men, it cannot be unlawful to bow to images, to the holy and venerable images of our Savior, of his blessed mother, &c.; that is in other words, if we may lawfully bow down to men to honor them, we may lawfully bow down to images to worship them; which is arguing from civil honor to religious worship; from the civil honor we give, and are no where forbidden in Scripture to give to men, to the religious worship, which, in many places of Scripture we are expressly forbidden to give to images. Had Nathan bowed to David to worship him, or Abraham to the children of Heth to worship them, both had been guilty of idolatry. As bowing is lawful when only a mark of civil honor, respect or esteem; so is kissing when only a mark of friendship and kindness; and as the one is unlawful when an act of religious worship, so is the other: of this distinction, however obvious, the learned fathers or the council were not aware, else they had not concluded from its being lawful for parents to kiss their children and the images of their children, and for children to kiss their parents and the images of their parents, that it was, in like manner, lawful for Christians to kiss the images of their Savior and his mother. This argument they frequently urge in the present and following sessions; and Leontius, one of the bishops of the council, thought it of such force that starting up when he first heard it, "now tell me," said he, insulting the Iconoclasts and improving the argument, "tell me, thou, who thinkest nothing, that is made with hands, nothing that is created, is to be adored; shalt thou kiss thy wicked wife, and may not I kiss the image of the blessed

virgin?" The Iconoclast, whom he thus addresses, did not, I suppose, worship his wife when he kissed her, nor kiss her by way of worship. But to kiss an image is to worship it according to this very council, kissing being reckoned by them, as well as bowing, amongst the acts of worship due to images. As to the other two texts of Scripture quoted above, by the word face in those texts, and wherever else it occurs in Scripture, the council most impertinently understands the image of Christ; so that according to them "show me thy face" is as much as to say show me thy image; "thy face will I seek," thy image will I seek; "the rich shall entreat thy face," or "pray before thy face," the rich shall entreat thy image, or pray before thy image. And these are the only passages three hundred and fifty bishops could find in holy writ to satisfy the world, that it is not only lawful to use images, but to bow down to them, and worship them, notwithstanding the divine prohibition, "thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them."

Their obliging, in the very beginning of the first session, Basilus of Ancyra to anathematize all, who should say they received no doctrine but what was taught in the Old or New Testament, plainly shows that they were themselves sensible of the doctrine, which they wanted to define, was taught in neither, and that it was not so much to prove their doctrine from Scripture that they alledged the few passages quoted above, as that they might not be thought to own, as they would had they produced none, that it could not be proved from Scripture. When arguments from Scripture were urged against them by their adversaries, their common answer was, that all heretics and patrons of heresy have ever founded their heresy on the Holy Scriptures, alledging such passages from thence as are capable of staggering or misleading the unwary and the ignorant. But we must except the patrons of image worship, and do them the justice of clearing them from that imputation, not one passage being alledged by them capable of misleading, or staggering in the least even the most ignorant.

The Scripture being soon laid aside, the voluminous works of the fathers were brought in; and of testimonies from them the good bishops were as prodigal as they had been sparing of testimonies from Scripture. To examine them all would be an useless as well as a troublesome task; and therefore I shall only observe here, I. That not one father or Christian writer of the first three centuries was quoted by the council to witness their apostolical tradition, or a tradition, that came, as they boasted, from the preaching of the apostles. Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Athanasius, Asterius and Basil, flourished in the fourth century;

¹ Psal. 85: v. 20.

² 1 Kings c. 1: v. 23.

³ Gen. c. 23: v. 7.

⁴ Canticle.

⁵ Psal. 27: v. 8.

No fathers quoted of the first three centuries. Passages from the fathers of the subsequent centuries only prove the use of images lawful. To kiss and adore different things. No proof from the councils for the worship of images.

Cyril of Alexandria, Antipater of Bostra and Nilus, the monk, in the fifth; Leontius, the monk, Joannes Jejunator, patriarch of Constantinople, and Simeon Stylites, in the sixth; Sophronius of Jerusalem, Anastasius, the monk, Anastasius, patriarch of Antioch, and Leontius Cyprius, in the seventh; Germanus of Constantinople, Damascene, the two popes Gregory II. and III., in the eighth. And these, though the earliest among them, lived near three hundred years after the apostles, are the only evidences they brought in to witness their apostolical tradition, or a tradition, that had obtained in the church ever since the times of the apostles. Their not quoting any of the fathers of the first three centuries is a plain proof, they could find nothing in them that seemed in the least to favor their opinion, or could be so misinterpreted as to favor it; and they had, as was observed by the author of the Caroline books, a particular talent at misinterpreting, mangling and corrupting authors to make them say what they thought they should have said. As they could therefore find nothing in the writings of the apostles, of their immediate successors, or of those, who succeeded them for the first three hundred years of the Christian religion, that favored in the least the doctrine of image worship, they would have argued very absurdly in concluding that doctrine to have been taught by the apostles, even though the fathers of the fourth and the following centuries, that is, the fathers, whom they quote, had all taught it to a man.

But that none of them taught it, excepting those of the eighth century, when that superstition first began to obtain; that in the very passages quoted out of the fathers there is not so much as a distant hint of any worship given to images by those fathers or by any in their time, will undeniably appear to every reader, who can prevail upon himself to peruse the tedious acts of this council. All they say is, that pictures are pious representations; that they were pleased and affected with the sight of them; that they wept in beholding the picture of Christ's passion; that the painters, who drew such pieces, were piously employed; that they represent to us the battles of the martyrs, put us in mind of them, and stir us up to tread in their footsteps; that the walls of churches should rather be painted with histories of the Old and New Testament than with horses, dogs and hares; that all creatures have a natural reverence for man because he is the image of God. No protestant, however zealous for the purity of the Christian worship, could, I believe, scruple to subscribe these propositions; and yet the fathers of the council putting, as they frequently do, more in the consequence than was in the premises, conclude from them that

images are to be worshiped. Gregory Nazianzen, it is true, speaking of an image bestowed on it, as the council observes, the epithet of venerable. But unluckily the image, on which he bestowed that epithet, was not the image of our Savior, of the virgin Mary, of any martyr or saint, but of Polemon a pagan; whence it evidently follows, that by the word venerable, Gregory either did not mean worthy of veneration and worship, or if he did, that he thought the image of a pagan worthy of veneration and worship.

But Maximus, say they, in the account he gives of an agreement between him and Theodosius, tells us that the book of the Gospels, the cross, and the images of our Savior, and his mother being brought in, they both laid their hands on them, and kissed them to confirm the agreement they had made: and whatever we kiss, that we adore. But Maximus lived in the seventh century, in 660, according to Bellarmine,¹ and therefore, is no good evidence for a tradition pretended to be derived from the apostles. Besides, kissing and adoring are with all, but the bishops of this council, two very different things; and those, who utterly deny that any adoration is due to the Gospels, yet when they take a solemn oath, kiss without scruple the book. The passages they quote from Leontius of Cyprus, is the most favorable of all to their cause. But he too lived as late as the seventh century,² is an obscure author, and some think that the work, they quote and ascribe to him, was never heard of before the time of this council. To conclude all that can be gathered from the passages of the fathers quoted in the council is, that images were used in the fourth and the following centuries, and that in the opinion of those fathers, some advantages attended the use of them. This is evidently the most that can be gathered from the passages they quoted: and yet Tarasius and the legates of the pope satisfied, or pretending to be satisfied, it had been made undeniably to appear from the writings of the fathers, that not only the use but the worship of images had obtained in the catholic church ever since the times of the apostles, anathemas were thundered by the whole assembly against all, who should say that to worship images was an innovation, or was not grounded on an uninterrupted tradition (though they had not quoted a single father of the first three centuries) from the earliest ages of the Christian religion to the present.

When they had done with the fathers, the councils were brought in, which they boasted were all on their side, but nevertheless contented themselves with only alledging the

¹ Bellar. de Script. Eccles. p. 113.

² Idem ibid. p. 111.

Fabulous legends quoted and incredible stories. The images of Berytus and Edessa. The story of a monk haunted with the spirit of fornication.

eighty-second canon of the quinisext council, allowing Christ, who, to the time of that council had been painted in the figure of a lamb, to be thenceforth represented in the form of a man. But the quinisext council was held in the latter end of the seventh century, in 691, and consequently too late to evidence an apostolical tradition. Besides, by that canon, Christ was allowed to be represented in his humanity, but no kind of worship was there allowed to be given, or said to be due to that representation; nay, the very canon they quote shows, that so late as the end of the seventh century even the representing of Christ in his humanity, or in the form of a man, was a new thing, or what had never before been allowed. As for the preceding councils, it was owned by pope Gregory II. that there was nothing more in them of images, than of eating and drinking,¹ and by the great patron of images, Germanus of Constantinople, that the worshipping them was a point, which the preceding councils had all left undiscussed and undetermined: and truly of images not the least mention is made in any of the general councils, except the quinisext, nor indeed in any other whatever, except that of Eliberis, which condemned even the use of images in all places of worship.² But the worship of images, say the learned prelates, was not forbidden in any of those councils. Neither was the worship of the pagan deities, or even of the devil, forbidden in any of those councils; and are we to conclude from thence, that they approved of our worshipping them? The reason, why none of them forbid the worship of images is obvious; images had not begun to be worshiped in the time even of the latest of those councils, as has been demonstrated elsewhere;³ and they could not forbid what was not yet practised. A heresy must be broached before it can be condemned, and a practice introduced before it can be forbidden.

In the last place were brought in the lives of the saints, with heaps of monkish legends to corroborate the testimonies alledged from the Scripture, the fathers, and the councils; and out of those fabulous pieces were read miracles without number, said to have been wrought by images. The story of our Savior's image crucified at Berytus by the Jews was believed by the good fathers, and when it was read drew tears from the eyes of the whole assembly. Of this ridiculous tale I have spoken elsewhere,⁴ but cannot help taking notice here of the surprising ignorance or stupidity of these good fathers. On the one hand they suppose the miracle wrought by that image, namely, the conversion of the Jews upon their seeing blood issue from it, to have been wrought at this

time, or not long before the council, and call it "a new miracle, a miracle wrought just now."¹ On the other hand they will have it to have been related by St. Athanasius, who died three hundred years before the council, and father upon him the piece out of which it was read. The image of our Savior, supposed to have been sent by our Savior himself to Abgarus, king of Edessa,² was not forgotten on this occasion: and the miraculous deliverance of that city by means of such a palladium, when Chosroes besieged it, was read as it is related by Evagrius,³ and applauded by the whole assembly as an unquestionable truth, though of the supposed miraculous deliverance not the least mention is made by Procopius, who lived in those days, and has related all the remarkable events of that war, nor by any other writer whatever. The image indeed was extant in the time of the council; for Leo, reader of the church of Constantinople, assured the fathers that he had been at Edessa, and had seen it there "honored and worshiped by the faithful." But it was not extant in the time of Eusebius, who was at Edessa three hundred years before, and there saw the pretended letters from Abgarus to our Savior, and from our Savior to Abgarus;⁴ but not the image, else he would have mentioned the image as well as the letters; nay, it is evident from his thinking it unlawful to paint Christ, as we have shown he did,⁵ that he either never had heard of that image, or that he looked upon all that was said of it as a mere fable. I should quite tire the reader were I to relate the many absurd, childish, and ridiculous tales, the many dreams of old monks, and old womens' stories, that were read out of obscure and fabulous writers, or gravely told by some of the bishops of this venerable assembly to convince the Iconoclasts, that images had ever been worshiped in the catholic church, and that God had, by stupendous miracles, approved of that worship. To some of them, however, I must allow a place here, that from them the reader may judge of the rest, as well as of the sense, wisdom, penetration and learning of those, who not only were not ashamed to relate such idle and incredible stories, or hear them related in such an assembly, but grounded chiefly upon them a definition of faith.

Out of the Pratum Spirituale, a book only fit for the entertainment of children, was read the following story. An old monk, who had been haunted with the spirit of fornication ever since his youth, finding the unclean spirit continued to assault him, without intermission, even in his old age, began to lament his hard fate, and addressing

¹ See p. 65.

² See. p. 39.

³ See p. 28. &c.

⁴ See p. 129. note (1).

¹ Con. Nic. Sess. 4. p. 231. ² See p. 29. note (2).

³ Evagr. l. 4. c. 27.

⁴ See p. 29. note (2).

⁵ See p. 41. note (1).

Other tales no less absurd than that of the monk, approved by the council. One of the bishops of the council miraculously cured by an image.

the devil, "how long," said he, "wilt thou plague and torment me? Depart from me now; thou hast been with me even to old age." Hereupon the devil appearing to him said, "swear to me that thou wilt tell no man what I shall say to thee, and I will assault the no more." The monk swore as the devil directed him, and thereupon the devil, satisfied he should compass his end, the damnation of the old monk, more effectually by diverting him from the worship of images, than by tempting him to uncleanness, said to him, "worship no more this image," the image of the virgin Mary with her Son in her arms, "and I will tempt thee no more." The monk desired time to consider of it, and discovered the next day to the abbot Theodore, notwithstanding the oath he had taken, all that had passed between him and the devil. The abbot commended him for breaking his oath, and at the same time assured him, that "he had better go into all the stews in the city than forbear worshipping Christ and his mother in their images;"¹ that is, if he could not redeem himself from the temptation by any other means but by either renouncing the worship of an image, or satisfying his lust with all the harlots in town, he ought to let loose the reins to his lust. The answer of the abbot, that would have raised the indignation of any other Christian assembly, and would have been rejected with the utmost abhorrence, as uttered by the devil of fornication himself in the disguise of an abbot, was received by the council, by a council of three hundred and fifty or three hundred and seventy bishops, with general applause; nay, the assembly was so well pleased with the whole story, that they ordered it to be read again in the following session.

Out of the same book were read two other tales, and both approved and applauded by the council. John the anchorite, a very great man, as he is called, lived in a cave at Sochas in Palestine, where he had an image of the virgin Mary with Christ in her arms. Before that image the holy anchorite kept a candle constantly burning; and when his devotion prompted him, as it frequently did, to undertake a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, to mount Sinia, or to any other more distant sanctuary, he used to commit the care of his candle to the virgin Mary, charging her not to let it go out, lest she and her son should be left in the dark. The virgin acquitted herself of her trust with great fidelity; for though the holy man was absent sometimes two, sometimes four, and sometimes six months, he found the candle burning, and not wasted in the least, at his return. The

other story was of a woman, who having dug a deep pit to find water, and finding none, was ordered in her sleep to lay the image of the abbot Theodosius at the bottom of the pit; which she did, and the pit immediately filled with most excellent water. Of this miracle the fathers thought no man could doubt but a Mahometan or a Jew, since the person, who relates it, saw the well, and drank of the water. The true criterion, or mark of distinction between true and false miracles is, according to St. Irenæus,¹ that true miracles are done for the benefit of mankind. And what mighty benefit was it to mankind that a pit should be filled with water for the convenience of a silly woman, or that a candle should be kept constantly burning to light nobody?

When these and many other no less absurd, ridiculous and incredible stories were read out of the different legends the bishops had called for, a monk, named Stephen, acquainted the council that he could produce fifteen volumes more, all upon images, and all filled with miracles wrought by images to confound the Iconoclasts, and confirm the catholic doctrine. But Tarasius, perceiving the fathers grew tired, and well they might, answered the monk, that the catholic doctrine wanted no further confirmation. However, Manzus, one of the bishops of the council, rising up, begged leave to add to the many miracles wrought by images in others, one wrought in himself, and told them, that he was cured of a very dangerous disease by laying an image of our Savior on the part affected. And yet Tarasius had owned in this very session, that no miracles were wrought by images in their days, because miracles were signs for unbelievers, and not for believers. This session ended with a solemn declaration made by the whole council, that they honored, worshiped, and adored the holy and venerable images. Let no man be offended, said Tarasius, at the word "adoration or worship," or urge against it the command quoted by our Savior, "thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve:" for in that command the word *only* is applied to service, and not to worship; and therefore, though we may not serve images, yet we may worship them. Had the devil understood the Scripture as well as Tarasius, he might have answered our Savior, by the command, "thou shalt worship," &c., you are not required to worship, but to serve God only, and therefore may, without transgressing it, fall down and worship me. The distinction between service and worship was received by the council with an uncommon and general applause, the bishops all crying out aloud, "we worship images, but do not serve them; we may worship images, though we

¹ "Expediit autem tibi potius ut non dimittas in civitate ista Lupanar, in quod non introeas quam ut recuses adorare Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum cum propria matre in sua imagine," were the words of the abbot.—(Concil. Nic. 2. p. 269)

¹ Iren. advers. hæres. 11. 56.

Fifth session—Iconoclasts declared worse than Jews, Mahometans, &c. Conference between a pagan and a saint read in the council, and a dispute between a Christian and a Jew.

may not serve them," as if they never had heard of the divine prohibition, "thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image; thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them." They closed the session with a peal of anathemas against all in general, who did not salute, honor, worship, and adore the holy and venerable images, and against the emperor Leo in particular, his son Copronymus, and the impious assembly of judaizing bishops convened by the latter for the destruction of images, and the exaltation of the kingdom of satan.

The fifth session, held on the 4th of October, was opened by Tarasius with a declamation, or rather invective, wherein the Iconoclasts were compared to the Jews, Samaritans, pagans, Mahometans, Manichees, &c., when he had done, they were declared by the whole assembly worse than Jews, Samaritans, or Mahometans, because they destroyed images ignorantly, being strangers to Christianity; whereas the Iconoclasts knew the will of their Lord. Here they should have shown where the will of their Lord, that images should be set up, and should be worshiped, was revealed to them. In the Old Testament to set up images, or worship them, is expressly forbidden, and that prohibition is nowhere revoked in the New Testament. The Iconoclasts therefore thought, and had reason to think so, that it was the will of their Lord they should destroy them, at least when they began to be worshiped, as good king Hezekiah was commended in Scripture for destroying the brazen serpent, though made by God's own command, when it began to be worshiped.¹

In the next place was read a sermon of John, bishop of Thessalonica, containing an account of a conference between a pagan and a saint that is a worshiper of images. The pagan is there introduced speaking thus: "Do not you Christians paint, in your churches, the images of your saints, nay of your God, and worship them? And why may not we too paint the images of our gods and worship them? We do not take our images to be gods, nor do we worship them as gods, but in them and by them we worship the incorporeal powers, whom they represent." The saint answers, "We Christians make images of holy men, who had real bodies; we paint our God in the form of a man, the form in which he appeared amongst us; but you make corporeal images of incorporeal beings." "And so do you" replies the pagan, "for you paint angels, who are intellectual and incorporeal beings." "You pagans indeed," answers the saint, "teach that angels are, as well as our souls, incorporeal and invisible: but the catholic church teaches us, that they have bodies, subtil bodies of air and fire, accord-

ing to that, 'he makes his ministers a flame of fire.' They are indeed said to be incorporeal, but only comparatively, because they have not such gross bodies as we have." Thus the saint; and his answers were all approved by the council as containing the true doctrine of the catholic church. Indeed we need not wonder at their fathering on the church the doctrine of image-worship, when we find them so little acquainted with the doctrine of the church as to father upon her that of the materiality of souls and of angels.

In the same session was read a dispute between a Christian and a Jew, in which the Jew is introduced upbraiding the Christian with a breach of the commandment expressly forbidding us to bow down to images, or to worship them. The Christian answers, "The images you see are made to put us in mind of the benefits of Christ; the images of the saints represent to us their combats and victories. We do not worship them as Gods, but pray God to save us by their intercession. We do not worship or adore a wooden image or a picture, but we glorify our Lord Jesus Christ. O Jew, even Moses made two cherubims, and a brazen serpent." When, or by whom this piece was written we know not; but what was quoted out of it makes rather against the council than for it, since the Christian there confines the use of images to their putting us in mind of the benefits of Christ, and their representing to us the combats of the martyrs, and expressly declares that he does not worship them. "We do not worship or adore a wooden image or a picture," says the Christian; "we salute, honor, worship and adore the holy images," says the council. The use of images for memory or instruction, which alone the Christian defends in that dialogue or dispute, is in itself innocent and lawful; and the emperor Leo would no more have destroyed them, had they been only employed for those purposes, than good king Hezekiah would have destroyed the brazen serpent, had it only served for a memorial of the miracle, that God had been pleased to work by it. Cyril of Jerusalem condemned indeed, as the council observes, Nabucodonozor for destroying the cherubims in the temple. But between the cherubims and the images pleaded for by the council there was this no small difference, which the learned fathers were not, or pretended not to be, aware of; namely, that the cherubims were made by God's express command, and were not worshiped, nor so much as seen by the people; whereas their images were not made, to say no more, by God's command, and were both seen and worshiped, contrary to his command, by the people. Had they even been made as well as the cherubims, by an

¹ Kings c. 18. v. 3. 4.

Passages from the fathers against images how answered by the council, and how the passages from Scripture. Sixth Session—An image brought in and adored by the council.

express command of God, the worship that was given them, would have justified the breaking them, as the worship, that was given to the brazen serpent, justified the breaking it, though it was made by God's own command. However from the words of the Christian in the above-mentioned dialogue, and those of Cyril against Nabucodonozor, it was concluded by the whole assembly, that the Iconoclasts were no Christians, but Jews or Samaritans (it not being, according to them, faith in Christ, but the worship of images, that makes a Christian) guilty of the same crime, for which the wicked king Nabucodonozor was condemned by the holy bishop of Jerusalem.

Lastly were read in this session, and answered, as was pretended, some passages out of the many, that might have been alledged from the fathers, against the worship of images. But the answers were for the most part, the very same with those, that are given in our days by the Roman catholic divines to elude the testimonies of the Scriptures and the fathers, namely, that they speak only of the images of the heathens, or of the worship of images as practised by the heathens; and these answers the reader will find fully confuted in the foregoing volume.¹ To the plain testimony of St. Epiphanius forbidding any images of saints, (not images of the heathenish deities) to be brought into the churches or churchyards, lest the faithful should be diverted from their devotions by gazing upon them, their only answer was, that they did not believe Epiphanius could have disapproved of such a practice. They had never heard, it seems, of his letter to John of Jerusalem, wherein he gives an account of his having found in a church, and torn to pieces a vail, on which was painted the image of Christ or of some saint, as has been related elsewhere;² nor of his book on heresies, where he condemns the Carpocratians for having an image of Jesus and worshiping it.³ To the testimony of Eusebius holding it unlawful to paint Christ, they had nothing to reply, but that Eusebius was a heretic and an Arian; though in the very passage, that was quoted, he acknowledged the divinity of Christ in the plainest terms.⁴ But had he even been an Arian, his authority ought nevertheless to have been of as much weight with the council, as the authority of a catholic, the Arians being as orthodox with respect to images as the catholics themselves: nay, they quote him themselves for an apostolic tradition,⁵ either forgetting that he was an Arian, or thinking that his being an Arian did not in the least invalidate his authority in a point, that had no connection with Arianism. Had an impertinent Icono-

clast asked the good fathers, why in one place they thought the authority of Eusebius of great weight, notwithstanding his Arianism, and in another thought it of no weight on account of his Arianism? They could have given no other answer, but that in the one place he was for them, and was against them in the other.

When the second commandment was alledged, and other passages out of the Scripture forbidding the worship of images, they were angry that words, spoken long ago to the Jews, should be applied to the Christians, as if the precepts of the decalogue were not binding with respect to the Christians, and our Saviour had come to destroy the law, and not to fulfil it. And now the council having made it appear, in the manner we have seen, that the doctrine of image-worship was entirely agreeable to the Scriptures, the fathers and the councils; that it had been confirmed by innumerable miracles, and opposed by none, since the times of the apostles to the present, but by Jews, Samaritans, Saracens, and the worst of heretics, Sabas, abbot of Studium, moved that the restoration of images might be decreed by the holy and œcumenical council, and the pope's legates that a venerable image should be brought into the council, and an honorary adoration should by all be paid to it. The council agreed to both motions: but the issuing the decree, and the ceremony of the honorary adoration were put off to the next day, and the session ended, as usual, with a peal of repeated anathemas against all, who refused to salute, honor, worship and adore the holy and venerable images.¹

The next day, the fifth of October, the fathers met again, when an image of our Savior being brought into the council, agreeably to the motion of the legates, the whole assembly paid it an honorary adoration, as it was styled, or an adoration of honor, consisting in all the outward acts of adoration and worship they would have given to Christ himself, had he been present. This ceremony was attended with a litany of anathemas against all who did not salute the holy and venerable images, who broke them, who called them idols, who thought it idolatry to worship them, or did not curse the impious council that condemned them, and all who sat in it. When this ceremony was over, they undertook to answer the reasons and arguments alledged against images by the council of Constantinople; with what success we have seen elsewhere.² The acts of the council of Constantinople were read by Gregory, bishop of Neocæsarea, who had assisted at it, and the answers to them, which they had drawn up beforehand and divided into six tomes or sections,

¹ See p. 34. &c.

² See p. 39, 40.

³ Epiph. contr. hæres. l. 1. hæ. 27.

⁴ See p. 41. note (1).

⁵ Sess. 6.

¹ Concil. Nic. 2. sess. 5.

² See p. 98, &c.

Seventh session—Their decree and definition of faith. The decree confirmed by the empress and the emperor, and images set up anew. The council of Nice no general council. It consisted only of the subjects of the empire and the pope's legates.

by the two deacons, John and Epiphanius. The answers, however absurd and impertinent, were approved and applauded by all, and the wicked council, that had attempted to banish Christianity, and introduce Judaism in its room, anathematized anew all, who did not condemn, curse and reject it.

In the seventh session, held on the 13th of October, they came to the definition of faith; and it was decreed, that images not only of Christ, but of the virgin Mary, of the holy angels, and of all the martyrs and saints, should be set up in places of worship, on the highways, and in private houses; that they should be used on the sacred utensils to put us in mind of those, whom they represented; that they should be worshiped and adored, not with that adoration and worship, that was due to God alone, but with an honorary worship, or a worship of honor, and lastly that all, who disapproved or opposed such a worship as unlawful, should be deposed, if ecclesiastics or bishops, and excommunicated, if monks or laymen. The decree was signed by all the bishops amidst repeated wishes of long life and happiness to the new Constantine and the new Helena, and repeated anathemas against all, who did not agree to the definition of the holy œcumenical council, who did not salute, honor, worship and adore the holy and venerable images. The decree being signed, letters were written by Tarasius, in the name of the council, to Constantine and Irene, to pope Hadrian, and to all the bishops of the catholic church, with a copy of the definition of faith, which the church universal, represented by them, had approved, and all true Christians were bound to receive as dictated by him, who promised to be with his church "even unto the end of the world." At the same time it was ordained, that the day, the 13th of October, on which the decree of faith was happily issued, should be for ever kept as a festival, to return thanks to the Almighty for the extirpation of the worst of heresies, and the restoration of the catholic faith and Christian piety.

In the meantime Irene, who had taken care to be daily informed of all that passed in the council, thinking it would add no small weight and authority to their definition and decrees, were they confirmed in her presence and the presence of the emperor, sent an order to the patriarch, upon the receipt of his letter, enjoining him to repair, as soon as he conveniently could, with all the bishops, to the imperial city. The order was readily complied with; and the bishops meeting on the 23d of October in the great hall of the imperial palace of Blanchernæ, the emperor and the empress came into the assembly, attended by their guards, by the magistrates, and by all the great officers of state, and being seated on a high throne,

when the noisy and unbecoming acclamations of the bishops allowed them to speak, they desired the decree of faith issued by the holy œcumenical council might be read so as to be heard by all. It was read accordingly; and the empress addressing herself, as soon as it was read, to the bishops, asked them whether the decree they had heard was issued with one consent, whether they all agreed to it, and had freely signed it? The bishops answered, "we all agree to it; we have all freely signed it; this is the faith of the apostles, of the fathers, of the catholic church; we all salute, honor, worship and adore the holy and venerable images; be they accursed, who do not honor, worship and adore the adorable images. Long live the new Constantine, long live the new Helena." When the noise ceased, Tarasius presented the decree to the empress, who having signed it, and made her son sign it, returned it to the patriarch amidst the loud acclamations of the bishops, echoed on all sides by the populace in the avenues to the palace and in the streets. Thus ended this famous council; and the assembly was no sooner dismissed, than by an order from the empress images were set up anew, not only in all places of worship, but in the squares, in the streets, and over the gates of the imperial palaces and the city, the superstitious multitude crowding everywhere about them, and paying them now that their superstition was authorized by a general council, all the external acts of adoration and worship, that ever were paid by the grossest idolaters to their idols. And thus was the worship of images, which the three preceding emperors Leo II., Constantine IV., and Leo III., had taken so much pains to extirpate, restored by a woman, who had bound herself by a solemn oath never to worship images, nor suffer them to be worshiped in the empire.

Two things occur to be examined relating to this council before I have done with it. 1. Whether it may truly be called a general council, and was received as such by the catholic church. 2. What kind of worship it defined to be given to images. As to the first, they constantly style themselves the holy œcumenical council; or, as if that were not enough, the catholic church. But that they had no kind of right to either of these titles may be easily shown. For in the first place the assembly entirely consisted of the pope's legates, and the subjects of the empire, not one bishop from Africa, France, Germany, Spain or Britain, having been so much as invited to it, or known anything of it, till they heard, with the greatest surprise and astonishment, of the decree they had issued. The three eastern patriarchs knew no more of it, as has been shown,¹

¹ See p. 147.

The council of Nice not free, nor received in the west as a general council. The doctrine it established repugnant to Scripture. What worship the council defined to be given to images. The images themselves to be worshipped.

than the western bishops, nor did their suffragans: and no council can, according to Bellarmine himself,¹ be truly called a general council, much less the catholic church, unless preceded by a general invitation, and notified before-hand in all the greater Christian provinces; nay this very council would not allow, as Bellarmine observes,² that of Constantinople against images to be called a general council because it was not preceded by a general invitation. The absence of the patriarchs was with the council of Nice another exception against the council of Constantinople. But that exception too was common to both, unless it be said that the presence of one patriarch does not entitle a council to the appellation of general, but the presence of two does. 2. No assembly can deserve the name of a council, of which every member is not allowed an entire freedom to speak and to vote according to the best of his judgment. Thus had the present council, instead of removing to Nice, continued at Constantinople, and there been forced by the Iconoclast soldiery to confirm the council against images, such a confirmation, as it was not free, would not have been received, however unanimously agreed to, as the decision of a general council. Now the Iconoclasts were no more free at Nice, than the Iconolaters or worshippers of images would have been free had they continued at Constantinople. The empress, the pope, the patriarch had conspired to restore images at all events; Tarasius, a man of great art, address, and experience in the management of affairs, was, in defiance of the canons, raised to the patriarchal dignity as the most capable of carrying that design into execution; the pope had approved of his uncanonical election upon condition that he got the holy images restored; the council was assembled, not to examine whether it was lawful or not to use images and to worship them, but to establish the use and the worship of them; none were allowed to sit in it, who did not hold and profess the doctrine of image-worship, or if they had at any time held the opposite doctrine, did not publicly abjure it as a wicked heresy; and was that a free council? 3. It was not received as a general council in any of the eastern patriarchates besides that of Constantinople, as Baronius himself ingenuously owns,³ was condemned in the west as a false synod of the Greeks by a council of three hundred bishops, and rejected in Britain as establishing "a doctrine, that was contrary to the true catholic doctrine, and utterly abhorred and detested by the catholic church;"⁴ nay so very little was it regarded in the west, that we do not find it once quoted in the

disputes, that happened in the succeeding centuries about images, when the definition of a council, acknowledged for a general council, would have proved decisive. Some of the more ancient schoolmen, and Aquinas, the "angelic doctor," among the rest, far from quoting it on the subject of images, have determined expressly against it; a plain proof that they either knew nothing of such a council, or paid it no kind of regard; and either sufficiently shows that it was not ranked in their times amongst the general councils. 4. The doctrine the council established was evidently repugnant to the doctrine of the Scripture and the primitive fathers, and only grounded, as was observed by the author of the Caroline books, which I shall soon have occasion to speak of, on apocryphal tales, on apparitions and visions, on monkish dreams, and old womens' stories, more fit to be related by nurses for the entertainment of children, than by bishops to establish a dogma of faith. Upon the whole, no man can peruse, with the least degree of attention, the acts of this council without being tempted to question, I will not say the infallibility, but even the common sense of those, who composed it. It was surely an assembly of the most ignorant, superstitious, and credulous men, that ever met; and I most sincerely pity the hard fate of the learned men, who, in these enlightened ages, are bound to defend, and expose themselves by defending, what in those dark times, ignorance, superstition and credulity produced.

As for the worship, which the council defined to be given to images; what worship that was; what we are to understand by the ambiguous terms of honorary adoration, or adoration of honor, we can only learn from the practice of the church, in which that definition is received as an oracle of faith, or from the sense, in which those terms have been understood and expounded by the most eminent divines of that church. Now standing to the practice of the church and of all good catholics, by honorary adoration was meant that we should uncover our heads to images, that we should kiss them, kneel and bow down to them, burn lights and incense before them, and in short give to the images, not only of our Savior, but of every canonized saint, all outward marks of the worship and adoration, that is due to God. That this is the practice of the church of Rome is well known to all, who have but ever set foot in a popish country, and these very acts of worship are specified by the council of Trent as decreed before by the council of Nice.¹

These external acts of worship are, by the definition or decree of the council, to be given not only to the objects, which the im-

¹ Bellar. de Concil. & Eccles. l. 2. c. 17.

² Idem. *ibid.*

³ Bar. ad Ann. 863. n. 6.

⁴ M. Westmonast. ad Ann. 793.

¹ Concil. Trid. sess. 25.

The images to be worshiped with true and real worship. Great disagreement amongst the popish divines about worship given to images. Whatever worship is given to images, those who give it guilty of idolatry in the opinion of some of their divines.

ages represent, but to the images themselves, as the definition of the council has been understood and explained by their greatest divines. Some of them indeed, namely, Durandus, Holcot, Picus Mirandula and a few more have taught, that by the definition of the council images are to be worshiped, but only improperly and abusively, as they put us in mind of the objects they represent, and we thereupon worship those objects before them. But their opinion is by all the rest censured as repugnant to the definition of the holy œcumenical council; and to make good their censure they alledge the following, in my opinion, unanswerable reasons. 1. Improper and abusive worship is, in truth, no worship at all; and hence it follows, that if the council only defined an improper and abusive worship to be given to images, the heretics, whom they condemned for saying that images were not to be worshiped, would have spoken more properly than they, and been unjustly condemned. 2. As we cannot at all be said to love a beautiful creature, though the sight of it puts us in mind of the Creator, and excites us to love him, unless our love terminates upon the creature as well as the Creator; so neither can we at all be said to worship an image, though it puts us in mind of the saint it represents, and excites us to worship him, unless our worship terminates upon the image as well as the saint. 3. The council declared that images are to be worshiped, but not with the worship of Latria: Now if the council had meant no other worship but that of the object in the presence of the image, there had been no occasion to accept the worship of Latria, since the most perfect Latria may be given to Christ in the presence of his image. 4. The heretics, whom the council condemned, namely, the Iconoclasts, did not hold it unlawful to worship an object worthy of worship in the presence of an image, or when we were put in mind of the object, and excited to worship it by the sight of an image, but to worship the image itself; and it was not to prevent the people from worshipping in the presence of images, but to prevent them from worshipping the images, that they broke and destroyed them. The council therefore, in condemning them as heretics declared it was heresy not to worship the images themselves. These are the reasons alledged by the most eminent divines of the church of Rome to show, that the worship, which the council defined to be given to images, was true and real worship, and consequently, that the opinion of those, who taught, that images were to be worshiped only improperly and abusively, was repugnant to the definition of the council. And now whether we stand to the practice of that church, or to the explanation of her ablest divines, it must be owned that the council

by the terms of honorary adoration, or adoration of honor meant true and real worship, and defined it to be given to images, anathematizing, that is cursing and damning, all, who dissented from them either in practice or in doctrine. And hence it is evident that when a Roman catholic tells us they do not worship images, he either knows not the sense of his church, or shamefully prevaricates, not caring that the protestants should know it. Here indeed he may deny they worship images, and with the famous bishop of Meaux explain away the worship, which the council defined to be given to them, till it is reduced to the respect or the reverence, which the protestants show to the sacred utensils or the Bible, thus he may, I say, explain away that worship here without any other danger than that of being looked upon as grossly prevaricating to palliate a doctrine which he is ashamed to own, and cannot defend. But let him take care to alter his language in Spain and in Italy lest something worse should befall him.

That images are to be worshiped with true and real worship is, as we have seen, the received and avowed doctrine of the church of Rome; but with what kind of true and real worship, whether with Latria, Hyperdulia, Dulia, or with some other worship, for which no name has yet been coined, the church has not defined, nor can her divines well determine. Some are of opinion, that the image is to be worshiped with the very same worship, that is given to the prototype; so that, according to them, the image of our Savior is to be worshiped with Latria, the image of the virgin Mary with Hyperdulia, and the images of the other saints with Dulia. Others will not allow the same worship to be given to the image, that is given to the prototype, but stand up for a different and distinct worship, though none of them can tell what that worship is. I shall not trouble the reader with the arguments, if we may so call them, that are alledged by either side to support their own and impugn the opposite opinion, but only observe, that choose what side you will, you are arraigned by the other of idolatry. To worship the image with a worship distinct from that, which we give to the prototype, is to worship the image as separated from the prototype, and for its own sake; and that is rank idolatry; say they of the one side. To worship the image with the same worship we give to the prototype is to worship the image of our Savior, or of the Trinity with Latria or the supreme worship, that is due to God alone; and that, say those of the other side, is rank idolatry. And thus they, who worship images, must necessarily be guilty of idolatry, according to some of their own divines, whether the worship they give them be the same with, or

Charlemagne the third time at Rome ;—[Year of Christ, 787.] Ravages the dukedom of Benevento. Is persuaded by the pope to yield to St. Peter the places taken from that duke. The duke dies, and his son suffered to succeed him contrary to the advice of the pope ;—[Year of Christ, 788.] Places yielded to St. Peter.

distinct from, that which they give to the prototypes; and it must be the one or the other. As we can therefore by no other means be, in the opinion of all, free from the heinous sin of idolatry, but by giving no kind of worship whatever to images, he must be more senseless than the very stocks and stones he worships, who does not see what party he is to take, and quite regardless of his eternal happiness, if he does not take it. Thus far of the second council of Nice; and I have dwelt the longer upon it, which I hope the protestant reader will excuse, as I thought it necessary he should be rightly informed of the whole proceedings of that assembly, which some writers have taken so much pains to disguise, and at the same time should know upon what principles the worship of images which has occasioned such disputes and divisions in the church, was first established; what kind of worship was established to be given to them, and who were the men that established it, making it damnation not to worship images, when it had been, for the space of seven hundred years, damnation to worship them.

While the bishops were all thus employed in new-modelling the Christian worship in the east, the pope was wholly intent in the west on enlarging his temporal dominions, and improving the generosity of his friend and great benefactor Charlemagne to the advantage of his see. That prince came this year, the third time, to Rome, and was there received and entertained with great magnificence by the pope. That journey he undertook to surprise Arichis, duke of Benevento, who had conspired with the Greeks to drive the French quite out of Italy, and was soliciting the other Lombard princes to join in the undertaking. But as the design was not yet quite ripe for execution, no sooner did the duke hear of the unexpected arrival of Charlemagne at Rome, than he sent his son Romald with rich presents to excuse it in the best manner he could, and assure the king that he should thenceforth have no occasion to complain of his conduct. Charlemagne was inclined to accept his submission and forgive him; but being diverted from it by the pope, to gratify his holiness he entered the duke's dominions laying them everywhere waste with fire and sword, took several cities, and advancing to the very gates of Benevento would have made himself master of that metropolis, had not the bishops interposed, and prevailed upon him to set bounds to his revenge, and forgive the duke upon his renewing, with all his subjects, the oath of allegiance he had taken to him, and delivering up to him his son Grimoald with what number of hostages besides he should think fit to require. These terms being agreed to by the king, he withdrew his troops, and returning to Rome celebrated

there the festival of Easter, which fell this year, 787, on the 8th of April.¹ During his stay in that city, Hadrian, who let no opportunity of aggrandizing his see pass unimproved, persuaded him not only to confirm the donation of his father Pepin, but to add to it the cities he had taken, in this expedition, from the duke of Benevento, namely, Sora, Arces, Aquinum, Arpinum, Theanum, and Capua; nay, from the letters of Hadrian it appears that Charlemagne before he left Rome yielded several other places to St. Peter, which had formerly belonged to the Tuscan Lombards. But he was no sooner gone than Arichis, renewing his alliance with the Greeks, began to concert measures, in conjunction with them, not only for recovering the cities, that had been lately taken from him, but for placing Adalgisus on the throne of his father Desiderius, and restoring the kingdom of the Lombards. Of this the pope was informed by a priest of Capua named Gregory; and he immediately acquainted Charlemagne with it.² But in the meantime the death of Arichis put an end to all his designs; and of that event too the pope gave immediate notice to Charlemagne, assuring him, at the same time, that the Beneventans only waited the arrival of Grimoald, son of the late duke, who was kept as an hostage in France, to begin hostilities, under his conduct, and advising him by no means to allow him to return, which, he said, would alone defeat all their measures.³ Charlemagne however, not hearkening to the suggestions of the pope, no sooner heard of the death of Arichis than he set Grimoald at liberty, and gave him leave to return home and take possession of the dukedom of his father, upon his promising to side, on all occasions, with the French against the Greeks; to oblige his Lombards to shave after the French manner; to put in the public writings and on the money the name of Charles in the first place and his own after it, and to dismantle the cities of Salerno, Acerenza, and Consa, which his father had fortified. The pope, finding Charlemagne had acted therein contrary to his advice, wrote to him to assure him, that it was not because he bore any ill will to Grimoald that he had given it, but because he apprehended that the presence of so bold and enterprising a youth might, at this critical juncture, prove extremely prejudicial to the interest both of the French and St. Peter. From the same letter it appears, that the pope had already got possession of all the places in Tuscany that Charlemagne had yielded to him the preceding year, except Populonia and Rosellæ. These were Castellum Felicitatis, Urbevetum, Balneum Regis, Ferentum, Viterbium, Marta, Tus-

¹ Annal. Met. & Loisel. & Eginhard.

² Cod. Carol. ep. 88.

³ Idem. p. 90.

The Greeks defeated in Italy by the French. The treaty of marriage between the young emperor and the daughter of Charlemagne broken off. The council of Nice confuted by Charlemagne;—[Year of Christ, 790.] The Caroline books.

cania, Populonia, Soana, and Rosellæ, some of them cities in those days of great note. As for the cities in Campania mentioned above, the Beneventan Lombards had, it seems, retaken them all or most of them; and Grimoald, the new duke, resided, at this very time, in Capua boasting, says the pope, that he had been preferred to St. Peter.¹ He kept nevertheless with great fidelity to his engagements with France. For Adalgisus landing this year in Calabria with a powerful army sent by Irene to drive the French quite out of Italy, Grimoald, and Hildebrand, duke of Spoleti, joining with all their forces the few troops, that Wingisè, the French general had brought with him from France, engaged the Greeks and gained a complete victory over them with very little loss on their side. John, the Greek general, was taken prisoner and put to a cruel death; but Adalgisus had the good luck to make his escape, and get safe to Constantinople, where, laying aside all thoughts of any further attempts of this kind, he passed in peace and in quiet the remaining part of his life.² This war was attended with an open rupture between Charlemagne and Irene, and the treaty of marriage between the young emperor Constantine and Rotrude, the daughter of Charlemagne, betrothed to that prince ever since the year 781, being thereby entirely broken off, the unnatural mother obliged her son to marry an Armenian, named Mary, of a very mean birth and a meaner education, in spite of his warm and repeated remonstrances against such a match.³ This violence she used with him, and the despotic power she assumed over him even when he was of age, and exercised throughout the empire, obliged him, in his turn, to use violence with her; and thence arose the disturbances I shall soon have occasion to relate.

Charlemagne, though thus engaged in war with the Greeks, and at the same time with several other nations, did not suffer his attention to be so engrossed by military affairs as to neglect those of religion; nay, to do him justice, he took no less pains to establish the Christian religion, though not always by the most Christian means, in the countries he conquered, than he took to conquer them. In his own kingdom he made it his study, as appears from the capitulars he published at different times, to reform the abuses that had crept into the church, to maintain the catholic faith in its greatest purity, and to suppress all new and heretical doctrines or opinions. Amongst these he reckoned the doctrine of image worship, established by the late council of Nice; and therefore, no sooner had he perused the acts

of that council, transmitted to him perhaps by the pope, than equally amazed at the ignorance of the Greeks, and shocked at their unaccountable proceedings in making the worship of images an article of the Christian faith, and damning all who did not worship them, he either undertook himself, or encouraged others to undertake a confutation of that council and its doctrine. The work contains one hundred and twenty heads of accusation against "the false synod of the Greeks," or, as Hadrian styles them, "reprehensions," and is divided into four books known by the name of the "Caroline Books;" for whether they were written by Charlemagne himself, with the assistance of the famous Alcuin, who was formerly his preceptor, as some think, or at his desire, by the bishops and the learned men of France, which is the opinion of Du Pin, and seems to be insinuated in the preface prefixed to the work, it is certain that he adopted that performance, and declared himself the author of it, by constantly speaking in the first person as if he himself had composed it. He was, as all agree, who speak of him, a prince of uncommon learning, well acquainted both with sacred and profane history, and had particularly applied himself to the study of the Holy Scriptures, a study at this time generally neglected; so that he was, at least, equal to such an undertaking. The work was begun when the acts of the council were first sent into France; but it did not appear till the latter end of the present year 790; so that three years were spent by Charlemagne, or by those whom he employed, in composing it. Indeed Charlemagne passed the whole year 790 at Worms, without engaging, as his secretary informs us,¹ in any military expedition, perhaps that he might be at leisure to put the last hand to that work. It contains a full confutation of the doctrine established by the Greek synod, as well as of the grounds upon which they established it, with many very severe and cutting reflections on the empress, on Tarasius, on other particular members, and on the council in general, for introducing a practice evidently repugnant to the Scriptures, to the fathers, to the tradition of the church, and blasphemously fathering such a practice on the holy apostles, and their immediate successors, as if they had practised and taught what it is plain from their writings they utterly abhorred. "The acts of that council," says Charlemagne in the preface, for he is the person who speaks, "the acts of that council, destitute of eloquence, nay, and all sense, having reached us, we have thought ourselves bound to confute the many gross errors they contain, that should they infect the hands into which they may fall, or the ears that may hear them, this our treatise

¹ Cod. Carol. ep. 86.

² Annal. Loisel. Eginhard. in Annal. ad Ann. 788.

³ Theoph. ad Ann. 788. Eginhard. in Annal.

¹ Eginhard. in Annal.

Charlemagne finds fault with the councils both of Constantinople and Nice. Mistaken with respect to the doctrine of the council of Constantinople. Confutes one by one the arguments of the fathers of Nice. That council confuted at the same time by Alcuin in the name of the bishops of England. The doctrine of the Adoptionarians.

might serve as an antidote against so dangerous an infection."

He finds fault with the council, that was convened by Constantine, as well as with that which was convened by Irene, and with respect to both expresses himself thus; "some years since was held a council in Bithynia destitute of all discernment, discretion and prudence, for not distinguishing between images and idols, they ordered the images, which the ancients had placed in the churches by way of ornament, or only for instruction, to be cast out and destroyed as so many idols, applying to them what is said in the Scriptures of idols, and impudently boasting that their emperor Constantine had delivered them and the church from idolatry. Another council was held three years ago, likewise in Bithynia, consisting partly of those who assisted at the first, and partly of their successors. But though the sentiments of the latter are diametrically opposite to those of the former, they too have grossly erred. The second council anathematizes the first, and obliges us to adore the images, which the other would not so much as allow us to look at. Those of the second, not distinguishing between our having images and our worshiping them, ignorantly argue from the passages in the Scriptures and the fathers, where images are only mentioned, that we must worship and adore them. We avoid both extremes; neither do we worship images, nor do we destroy them. We worship God alone, and have due veneration for the saints according to the ancient tradition of the church. We suffer their images in our churches to serve as ornaments and helps to memory. But as for the absurd synod, that commands us to worship them, we utterly reject it, and have undertaken to confute it article by article, where it is intelligible, and not too absurd to be worthy of our notice." Thus Charlemagne in his preface.

But he had not, it seems, a right notion of the doctrine of the council of Constantinople. For the fathers of that assembly did not think the use of images unlawful in itself, nor did they confound images, in general, with idols. But finding by experience, that they could not allow images, and prevent the multitude from turning them into idols by worshiping them, they ordered them on that consideration, and on that alone, to be cast out of the churches and destroyed. The emperor Leo himself was not at first averse to the use of images as ornaments, or even as helps to devotion and to memory. For at the same time that he forbid them to be worshiped, he ordered them to be placed higher in the churches, that, as men were divided in their opinions about them, they might neither be worshiped nor abused; and it was the superstition of

the people, that obliged him in the end, against his inclination, to destroy them, as the superstition of the Israelites obliged the good king Hezekiah to destroy the brazen serpent, though made by God's command;¹ so that Charlemagne and Leo, the first Iconoclast emperor, differed only in this, that the one thought images should rather be destroyed, than the people be exposed to the danger of idolatry; and the other, that the people should rather be exposed to the danger of idolatry than images be destroyed.

In the treatise itself, Charlemagne answers one by one, and indeed with a great deal of erudition and learning, the arguments, that were alledged by those of Nice in favor of image worship; shows that the passages they quoted from the Scriptures and the fathers were all either falsified and corrupted, or quite foreign to their purpose; ridicules, as unworthy of any other answer, the many absurd and incredible tales they gravely related and pretended to credit, and charges them all along with ignorance, superstition credulity, insincerity, and above all, with pride and presumption, in daring to impose upon the whole church definitions and decrees, when they were but one part of the church; "what rage and madness was it," says he, "for one church to anathematize all the other churches, for a part of the church (and what a part?) to anathematise the whole! It was cursing without reason, anger without power, damning without authority." He leaves no argument, no authority, no reason, that they had alledged, undiscussed or unanswered; and concludes that whether he considers the persons, who composed that assembly, or their method of proceeding, the doctrine they established, and the grounds, on which they established it, he cannot help looking upon them as the avowed enemies of truth, as men, who to gratify Irene had acted contrary to the dictates of their own consciences, and conspired with her to abolish Christianity, and bring in anew paganism in its room.

The council of Nice met with no better reception in England than it did in France. For Offa, king of the Mercians, having communicated a copy of it to the English bishops, that had been sent him by Charlemagne, with whom he lived, at this time, in great friendship; those bishops, not satisfied with declaring the doctrine it contained contrary to the faith, and a doctrine to be abhorred by the catholic church, engaged Alcuin to write against it, and owning the work when it was finished, caused it to be presented by him in their names, to Charlemagne. Thus M. Westminster,² Hoveden,³ and Dunelmensis.⁴ "This work of Alcuin confuting,"

¹ See p. 27.

² M. Westm. ad Ann. 793.

³ Hoveden. Annal. apud Spelman. Concil. t. 1. p. 305, 306.

⁴ Dunel. decem Script. Col. 111.

The Adoptionarian doctrine professed, maintained and propagated by Felix of Urgeland Elipandus of Toledo. Arguments for and against that doctrine.

says M. Westminster, "the doctrine of image worship with the authority of the Holy Scriptures, has not reached our times, or has not, at least, yet appeared amongst the other works of that learned writer."

The zeal of the English bishops and the commendable endeavors of Charlemagne to prevent, as he expresses it, the contagion from spreading, that is, to prevent the doctrine of image worship, defined in the east, from being received in the west, were attended with the wished for success. For that doctrine was not only rejected, and rejected with horror and detestation, in France and in England, but soon after condemned in a council, that had a much better claim to the title of a general council than that of Nice, I mean the council of Frankfort. But to inform the reader on what occasion that council was assembled (for it was not assembled to decide any controversy about images, most of the western bishops approving the use, and all condemning the worship of images) we must return back to the year 783, when the question, for the determining of which, the council met, was first moved, or rather was revived; and it was revived on the following occasion. Elipandus, bishop of Toledo, mispending his time in theological speculations instead of employing it to instruct his flock in the plain and practical doctrines of the Gospel, started this question to himself, "whether Christ, as man, should be called the natural or the adoptive Son of God, the Son of God by nature or by adoption?" And not trusting to his own judgment, he wrote to Felix, bishop of Urgel in Catalonia, who had been his preceptor, desiring him to resolve it. Felix answered, "that Christ, as God, was the natural Son of God, or the Son of God by nature, but as man was and ought to be called the adoptive Son of God, or the Son of God by adoption." Felix, not satisfied with delivering and explaining that doctrine in a long letter to Elipandus, wrote afterwards several other letters to confirm it with the authority of the Scriptures and the fathers; insomuch that, as he was a prelate of a most unexceptionable character, he gained in a short time many, and some of them men of learning, over to his opinion. On the other hand Elipandus, a man greatly respected on account of his dignity, being bishop of the first see in Spain, and no less revered by all for his eminent sanctity and the austerity of his life, spared no pains to propagate the same doctrine, as if no man could be saved, who did not know and profess it. Thus partly by their writings, partly by preaching and disputing they daily brought over great numbers to their party, in the different provinces of Spain, and amongst the rest Ascarius, bishop of Bracara, and an abbot, named Fidelis, a man of great learning in those days.

The doctrine, which Felix and Elipandus, strove with so much zeal to propagate and establish as a catholic truth, was with no less zeal opposed by others, in Spain chiefly by Etherius bishop of Uxama and Beatus presbyter, as rank heresy, the very same heresy, that had been condemned in Nestorius. For should we allow, said they, Christ to be, as God, the natural Son of God, and the adoptive Son of God, as man, from thence it would follow, that in Christ there are two Sons of God, the natural and the adoptive, and consequently two persons, whereas in Christ there is, as has been defined by the church against Nestorius, but one person, the person of the Word, the Son of God by nature, and at the same time God and man: in other words, one person cannot be the natural and adoptive son of one and the same father; and therefore if we allow Christ to be the natural and adoptive Son of God, we must, in opposition to the council of Ephesus, acknowledge in him two persons. The argument, on which the Adoptionarians (for so they were called,) laid the chief stress, was, that the humanity of Christ was not begotten of the substance of the Father, and consequently that Christ was not, nor could he be called, as man or according to his humanity, the natural Son of God. The Antiadoptionarians answered, that the whole person of Christ was begotten of the substance of the Father, and consequently that he was, and ought absolutely and simply to be called the natural Son of God, though the whole of his person, comprising his humanity as well as his divinity, was not begotten of the substance of his Father: thus amongst us mortals the whole man, said they, is, and is absolutely and simply called the Son of his Father, though the soul, and consequently the whole of the man is not of the seed of the father. That Christ consisted of the human and divine nature; that he was true God and true man; and of the substance of the Father, according to his divinity, but not according to his humanity, both parties allowed; nay the Adoptionarians anathematized Nestorius as well as their adversaries, striving with many metaphysical distinctions and subtleties to reconcile their doctrine with the definition of Ephesus; so that, in effect, the only point in dispute was; whether, consistently with that definition, Christ might be called, as man, the Son of God by adoption, and, as God, the Son of God by nature? The Adoptionarians maintained the affirmative, and the opposite party the negative. If the former argued amiss, as I think they did, all, that can be said of them, is, that they were bad logicians, but yet good catholics, since they denied no one article of the catholic faith. But in religious disputes we constantly find the contending parties charging each other

The Adoptionarian doctrine examined in a council at Ratisbon;—[Year of Christ, 792.] Charlemagne assembles a council at Frankfort;—[Year of Christ, 794.] The doctrine of the Adoptionarians condemned in it, and likewise the council of Nice.

with all the absurd, heretical and contradictory doctrines, that appear to them any ways deducible from the opinions they impugn. In the present dispute the Adoptionarians were charged by their adversaries with holding the doctrine of Nestorius, and acknowledging with him two persons in Christ; and their adversaries were charged by them in their turn with holding the doctrine of Eutyches, and confounding with him the two natures in Christ: for how can we, said Elipandus, call Christ, as man, the Son of God by nature, unless we suppose the human nature to have been changed into, or absorbed by the divine?

As the Adoptionarians gained daily new proselytes in spite of the opposition they met with from Etherius and Beatus mentioned above, Charlemagne appointed a council to meet in his palace at Ratisbon, in 792, and commanded Felix, as he was his subject, Catalonia being then under the dominion of France, to repair to that place and there give an account of his doctrine. He obeyed; but instead of gaining over to his opinion any of the bishops, who composed that assembly, as he had flattered himself he should, he was himself, or pretended to be, convinced by them of his error, and abjured it accordingly in their presence, and in the presence of Charlemagne, who from Ratisbon sent him to Rome, where he acknowledged and publicly retracted his error anew in the presence of the pope.¹ As his conversion was judged sincere, he was allowed to return to his see. But whether it was sincere or not, he was soon after his return persuaded by Elipandus to retract his former retraction; and he began to propagate and to preach with more zeal than ever the doctrine he had abjured at Ratisbon and Rome. As for Elipandus, he was so entirely satisfied of the truth of that doctrine, that he wrote a long letter to Charlemagne to convince him that the fathers, especially his holy predecessors in the see of Toledo, had all professed it, and at the same time to beg he would cause it to be examined by the bishops and the divines, not doubting but, if they could divest themselves of all partiality and prepossession, they would all approve and receive what many of them now seemed inclined to condemn and reject.

This letter determined Charlemagne to assemble a great council; and he accordingly appointed a council to meet, in the summer of the present year 794, at Frankfort on the Main. It consisted of about three hundred bishops from France, Italy, Germany, and probably from England; for the English bishops, too were invited to it by Charlemagne, as appears from the letter he wrote to Elipandus after the council.² The

two bishops Theophylact and Stephen assisted in the pope's name with the character of his legates. For though Hadrian had already examined and condemned the doctrine of Elipandus and Felix in a letter he wrote to the bishops of Spain, he was not against its being examined anew by a council. The bishops met in the royal palace at Frankfort; and Charlemagne not only was present, but opened the council himself with a speech to the fathers, giving them an account of the doctrine they were met to examine, and exhorting them to take the Scripture for their guide in delivering their opinion concerning it. When he had done, the letter, which Elipandus had sent to him, containing the authorities and reasons, on which he grounded his opinion, was read, examined, and condemned by all who were present, to a man, as plainly reviving the heresy of Nestorius, which the church had anathematized in the council of Ephesus. Charlemagne himself acquainted Elipandus with this sentence, and the whole proceedings of the council, exhorting him with great zeal and tenderness to acknowledge his error, to submit his judgment to that of so many bishops, and to join the apostolic see, as well as the churches of France, Germany, and Italy in the confession of the catholic faith.¹ But Elipandus, paying no kind of regard to the authority of the council, or the exhortations of Charlemagne, continued still to maintain the same doctrine; and some years passed before an end could be put to the present dispute, as we shall see in the sequel.

The doctrine of the Adoptionarians being thus condemned, the council undertook, in the next place, to examine the acts of the council of Nice; and having carefully examined them, they unanimously condemned the worship, that was there decreed to be given to images. This we learn from the second canon of the present council, the words of which are; "the question concerning the new synod of the Greeks, that was held at Constantinople about worshipping images, was then debated; in that council it was written that they should be anathematized, who did not pay that service or adoration to the images of the saints, which they paid to the Divine Trinity; hereupon our most holy fathers, refusing by all means to pray to them, or pay them service, despised and unanimously condemned it."² Such a canon or decree issued by a council, that was lawfully assembled, that consisted of three hundred bishops, and at which assisted the legates of the pope, with whose approbation it was convened, has greatly embarrassed the advocates for images, and the patrons of the council that defined it;

¹ Alcuin. adverse. Elipand. l. 1. & Eginhard. in Annal.

² Apud Bar. ad Ann. 794.

¹ Alcuin. & Paulin. in Lib. advers. Elipand.

² Concil. t. 7. p. 1057.

No council held at Constantinople between the council of Nice and that of Frankfort. Whether the council of Frankfort mistook the meaning of the council of Nice. They understood their meaning and condemned their doctrine.

and they have left no means unattempted they could think of to reconcile the one council with the other, and thus save the authority of both. As the council, condemned by the council of Frankfort, is called in the canon that condemns it, the council of Constantinople, some, and among the rest Surius and Binius, the first editors of the councils, have concluded from thence, that the fathers of Frankfort, far from condemning the council of Nice, confirmed it, and condemned the council that was held at Constantinople under Copronymus. And from them, no doubt, was borrowed the title, that is still prefixed to the council of Frankfort in the Louvre edition, namely, "the council of Frankfort, in which the heresy of Felix was condemned the third time by the bishops of the whole kingdom of the Franks, of Italy, Gaul and Germany, in the presence of Charlemagne, and the legates of pope Hadrian, Theophylact and Stephen, and the acts of the second council of Nice about images were confirmed in 794. But that the fathers of Frankfort condemned the worship of images as well as the council establishing that worship, and consequently confirmed the council of Constantinople under Copronymus, so far as it condemned the same worship, is manifest beyond all dispute from the words of the canon quoted above, and besides is attested by all the contemporary writers.¹ They called, it is true, the council they condemned, the council of Constantinople; and the reason why they so styled it is obvious: it was begun and was ended at Constantinople, as has been related above. Some, to screen the council of Nice, have placed another, which they suppose to have been held at Constantinople, between

that and the council of Frankfort; and that, say they, was the council of Constantinople condemned at Frankfort, it having been there defined that the same worship should be given to images that was due to the Divine Trinity.¹ But that council is a mere invention of their own, not the least mention being made of it by any historian whatever; and besides it is evident from the authors I have quoted, that, whether any council was held or not between those of Nice and Frankfort, the council condemned at Frankfort was that of Nice.

Sirmond, Petavius, and with them the more modern writers, ashamed to recur to such poor subterfuges, ingenuously own the council of Nice to have been condemned by that of Frankfort, but yet, unwilling to give up either, stiffly maintain the definition of the one to be entirely agreeable to that of the other. To make good this paradox, they tell us that the author of the Caroline books, as well as the council of Frankfort, by a mistake in matter of fact, (for neither does the infallibility of the pope, nor that of a general council extend to matters of fact,) into which they were led by a bad translation of the council of Nice, ascribed to that council a doctrine, which they neither held nor defined, and thereupon condemned, at the same time, the doctrine and the council. The doctrine they ascribed to them was, that "Images are to be worshiped with the very same worship we give to the Divine Trinity." This doctrine, say they, shocked Charlemagne, or the author of the Caroline books, as well as the fathers of Frankfort; and they condemned so horrid a blasphemy, together with the council that had, as they took it for granted, defined it. But the fathers of Nice, abhorring that doctrine as much as the fathers of Frankfort, only defined a "relative, inferior, and honorary worship" to be given to images; and that kind of worship the council of Frankfort did not condemn, and may be consequently said to have rather approved. Thus Sirmond, Petavius, De Marca, Natalis Alexander, and Maimbourg.

But in the first place the author of the Caroline books could not possibly mistake the meaning of the council, nor could the fathers of Frankfort; as if the worship of Latria had been there decreed to be given to images, or it had been defined that the same worship should be given to images that was given to the Trinity. Indeed, the Nicene bishops spoke very ambiguously with respect to some points, but always distinguished, and in such terms as no man could misunderstand or misconstrue, the worship they gave to images from that, which was according to them, due only to God, declaring in every act, "that they did not look upon their

¹ "The synod," says Eginhard, a contemporary writer, "that a few years before was assembled at Constantinople under Irene and her son Constantine, and was by them called not only the seventh, but a general council, was rejected by all," (Eginhard. *Annal.* ad Ann. 724.) namely, by all the western bishops assembled at Frankfort. Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, who lived in the ninth century, writes thus of the council of Frankfort. "In the time of Charlemagne by order of the apostolic see, and the summons of the emperor, a general synod was called in France, where, according to Scripture and the tradition of the ancients, the false synod of the Greeks was rejected and utterly made void. Thus by the authority of this council the veneration of images was somewhat checked." (*Hincmar Rhem. contr. Laud.* c. 20. *apud Goldast.*) "The false synod," says Regino, "which the Greeks had convened for adoring images, was rejected by the bishops;" (*Regin Chron.* ad Ann. 794.) and Uspergensis, "the synod, which was assembled a few years before under Irene and her son Constantine, and which they called the seventh and a general council, was rejected by all." (*Ab. Ursperg. Chron.* ad Ann. 793.) "In the council of Frankfort," says Aventinus, "under Charles the Great, the decrees of the Greeks for adoring images were reversed." (*Avent. Annal. Boiar.* l. 4. p. 253.) The same thing is asserted by all the other contemporary historians and annalists; (*Vide Hist. Franc. Script.* tom. t. 2, & 3.) and all speak of the council, that was assembled under Constantine and Irene, that is of the second council of Nice, though styled by some the council of Constantinople.

¹ *Annal. Eccl. Franc.* ad Ann. 794.

The council of Frankfort condemned the very worship that was defined by those of Nice, and all kind of worship. Hadrian supposes the worship defined by the one council to have been condemned by the other.

images as gods; that they did not worship them as the pagans worshiped their idols; that they did not give them the worship that was due only to God, but an inferior, relative and subordinate worship." Thus in their very definition they all protested, that "by an honorary worship they did not mean true Latria, which is due only to God;"¹ and Tarasius, in hearing the pope's letter read, declared, that he received it and the doctrine it contained, the worship of images, "reserving faith and Latria to God alone."² In like manner spoke all the rest, as appears from the acts: and who can believe that three hundred bishops, after perusing those acts, (for we may well suppose they perused them, and with some degree of attention,) should have thought that "true Latria," or the worship, that was there said to be due only to God, was commanded to be given to images?

But the Latin translation, say the advocates for the council of Nice, which Charlemagne perused, and the fathers of Frankfort, was very different from the Greek original. In the Latin translation, for instance, Constantine bishop of Constantia in the island of Cyprus, is introduced saying, "I receive and embrace with honor the holy and venerable images, and pay them the same service of adoration I pay to the Trinity;" whereas in the Greek original he says quite the contrary, "I embrace with honor the holy and venerable images, but give the adoration of Latria to the Trinity alone."³ Now from the words of Constantine, as Charlemagne and the fathers of Frankfort read them in the Latin translation, they concluded that he thought the same adoration should be given to images, that was given to the Trinity, and that the rest of the council, as none of them offered to contradict him, all consented to what he had said. And it was upon that mistake that the council of Frankfort condemned that of Nice. This they urge as an irrefragible proof, or rather demonstration that the fathers of Frankfort mistook the meaning of the fathers of Nice, and condemned not the worship that was, but the worship that was not decreed at Nice, to be given to images. But from the very passage in the Caroline books, where notice is taken of what was supposed to have been said by the bishop of Cyprus, it is evident that the author of those books, and consequently the fathers of Frankfort, well knew that those of Nice had not decreed the same worship to be given to images that was, according to them, due to the Trinity. For in that very place the author of those books observes, that in those words Constantine "contradicted the rest;" that "he betrayed unawares what the rest strove to conceal," namely, their giving to images

the worship that was due to the Trinity; that "in words indeed they denied their giving the same worship to images and to the Divine Trinity, but that their actions belied their words."⁴ From these words it is evident beyond all dispute, that Charlemagne knew the fathers of Nice had not defined the same worship to be given to images that was, according to them, due to the Trinity, since he charges the bishop of Constantia, saying he gave them the same worship, with contradicting all the rest. I might add, that had Charlemagne and the western bishops misunderstood the meaning of the council, the pope's legates, who were present, and knew, as we may well suppose, what kind of worship had by the Nicene synod been commanded to be given to images, would have taken care to acquaint them with it, and not suffered them to condemn, upon such a mistake, a council approved by the pope.

In the second place it was not the worship of Latria alone with respect to images, that Charlemagne and the western bishops rejected and condemned, but religious worship in general, or religious worship of every kind or degree. Of this no man can doubt, who has ever but dipped into the Caroline books; for there Charlemagne condemns "adoration, service, veneration, worship of all kinds, *omnimodum cultum*, particularly praying, bowing, kneeling to images, burning incense to them, or lights before them;"⁵ he calls it temerity to compare images to the cherubims in the temple, to the mercy seat, or to the ark;⁶ will not allow the same honor or reverence to be due to them, that is due to the sacred utensils or to the Bible;⁴ styles all kind of adoration, that is given to images, "superfluous, vain, superstitious, highly absurd, *fummæ absurditatis, sacrilegious*;"⁵ will have all to conform to the doctrine of pope Gregory the Great, that is, to "retain images as helps to memory, or for instruction, but to avoid by all means giving them any kind of worship."⁶ Let images," says he, "be retained, provided all adoration be excluded;⁷ images are so far useful as they put us in mind of the objects they represent, but God alone is to be worshipped."

Third; Hadrian, in his answer to the Caroline books, of which I shall soon have occasion to speak, no where charges the author of those books, or the fathers of Frankfort, with mistaking the meaning of the fathers of Nice, but defends the worship that was defined by the one council, as condemned by the other. Had the disagreement between the two councils been only owing to a mistake, would not Hadrian have rectified

¹ Lib. Carol. 1. 3. c. 13.

² Lib. Carol. 1. 2. c. 21. 23, 24, 25. 28, 29, 30.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid. 1. 2. c. 29, 30.

⁵ Ibid. 1. 2. c. 21. 24, 25. ⁶ Ibid. c. 21. 23.

⁷ Ibid. c. 21.

¹ Concil. Nic. Sess. 7. ² Ibid. Sess. 2. ³ Ibid. Sess. 3.

The canon of Frankfort not grounded on a mistake. Charlemagne not prompted by revenge to condemn the council of Nice. The worship of images not looked upon by the fathers of Frankfort as an indifferent thing.

that mistake? Would he not have informed the western bishops that the worship, which they rejected and condemned, was not the worship, which the Greeks had approved and defined? Would he have undertaken to prove, as he did in a long apology, the lawfulness of a worship inferior to that of Latria, had he thought that they, against whom he undertook to prove it, condemned no other worship but that of Latria?

Fourth; The western bishops and churches all persisted in rejecting the council of Nice and the doctrine it had defined, as will appear in the sequel, even after Hadrian, in his answer to the Caroline books, had explained that doctrine so as to leave no room to doubt of the meaning of the council: a convincing proof or rather demonstration, that it was not, as is pretended, because the fathers of Frankfort misunderstood the meaning of those of Nice, that they condemned their council and doctrine.

But the very canon of Frankfort, say the writers mentioned above, is evidently grounded on a mistake, it being there said, that the same worship was commanded, under an anathema to be given to images, that was given to the divine Trinity; whereas the fathers of Nice declared in twenty places, that they gave to images only an honorary adoration, reserving true Latria to God alone. But, 1. If they declared in twenty places, that they reserved true Latria to God alone, how could Charlemagne and three hundred bishops mistake their meaning, and think they had commanded what they called worship of Latria to be given to images? 2. From the Caroline books, which were received and approved by the fathers of Frankfort, it is manifest, that they did not admit the distinctions used by the Nicene synod of Latria and Dulia, of relative and absolute, of inferior and supreme or superior worship, but thought religious service, adoration or worship, of what kind soever or degree, was due to God or was worship of Latria, and consequently that to pay any service, adoration or worship whatever to images was paying to them that service, adoration, or worship, which they paid to the divine Trinity.

But Charlemagne, says Natalis Alexander, was highly provoked against Irene for breaking off the match between her son and his daughter; and it is highly probable that to be revenged on her he undertook to confute her council, and assembled a council in the west to condemn it; that is in other words, Charlemagne did not really think the doctrine, that was defined at Nice, an absurd, impious, sacrilegious, detestable doctrine, epithets, which he bestows on it in twenty places in his work, but nevertheless represented and confuted it as such to be re-

vengeed on Irene, who had caused it to be defined; and he prevailed on the western bishops to prostitute their consciences to his revenge and condemn it. And it is highly probable, that Charlemagne, whom these very writers extol on all other occasions as a most religious, a most Christian prince, a most zealous defender of the catholic faith, should, on this occasion, have acted so anti-christian a part? That the western bishops, blindly concurring with him, should have all sacrificed to his peevish humor their honor, their reputation, their conscience? We must think very meanly both of him and of them to entertain such a notion. Had the match been broken off by Irene, and not by Charlemagne himself, as Eginhard his secretary tells us it was,¹ the provoked prince wanted not other means of being revenged on her more effectually than by villifying the holy images, which I suppose were not against the match, by excluding them not only from all worship, but even from the honor or reverence, that he thought due to the utensils of the church, and degrading them into mere ornaments. He might at this very time have invaded her Italian dominions, and seized them almost without opposition: and he had thus more effectually been revenged on the perfidious Irene than if he had even turned Iconoclast, and caused all the holy images to be broken in pieces and cast into the flames.

Lastly, The patrons of image worship and of the council of Nice urge the following words out of the last chapter of the Caroline books, "we allow images to be made, but oblige no man to worship them." From these words they conclude, that Charlemagne, and consequently the fathers of Frankfort, looked upon the worship of images as an indifferent thing, and only quarreled with those of Nice for commanding that worship under an anathema, and thus making it necessary. But first that one council should think and define a thing necessary to salvation, and another think and define it an indifferent thing, is no trifling disagreement. 2. An indifferent thing is what a man may lawfully do or omit as he pleases; and could Charlemagne, after he had labored throughout his work to prove the worshiping of images a vain, superstitious, sacrilegious, and idolatrous practice, repugnant to the divine law, close it with declaring he looked upon that worship as an indifferent thing? Thus he had undone at once all he had been doing in four books. As that passage therefore evidently contradicts all the rest, and besides, is not to be found in the first edition of the work, we may well suppose, with the learned Spanheim and others, that it has been since foisted in.

To conclude; from what has been hitherto

¹ Vide Spanhem. sect. 7. p. 479.

¹ Eginhard. ad Ann. 783.

The council and doctrine of Nice evidently condemned at Frankfort. Hadrian undertakes to answer the Caroline books, but courts with great address the favor of Charlemagne. Latria now given to images though not allowed by the council of Nice.

said it is, I think, evident beyond all dispute, in spite of the cavils, that have been yet urged to the contrary, that the council condemned by the western bishops assembled at Frankfort was the second council of Nice; that the one council condemned the very same doctrine, which the other had defined, and consequently that the doctrine of image worship, though approved and zealously recommended by the pope, was condemned by a council that had as good a claim, to say no more, to the title of a general council as that, which defined it.

The fathers of Frankfort thought it advisable before they parted, to acquaint the pope with their proceedings; and they sent him accordingly their definition, and with it the Caroline books as containing the reasons, why they had condemned the doctrine of image worship, and the council that had defined it. As Hadrian had received that council, he thought himself bound to defend it; and that task he undertook, addressing his defence or apology to Charlemagne, whom he frequently commends, and treats throughout the work with the greatest regard and esteem. He pretends to answer one by one the objections urged by him and the western bishops against those of Nice; but that his answers, far from being satisfactory, "contain many things that are quite absurd, many that are incongruous, and many that deserve to be censured," was the judgment passed upon his apology by the Gallican bishops in the council of Paris, which I shall have occasion to speak of hereafter; and the learned Du Pin, in the account he gives of that piece, entirely agrees with them.

Hadrian was, it seems, under some apprehension that from his defending the Greek synod, Charlemagne should conclude him a friend to the Greeks and the emperor; and therefore, to remove any suspicion of that kind, he took care to declare in his preface, that it was not to support the interest of any person whatever, but only to maintain the ancient practice and tradition of the holy Roman church, that he had undertaken the defence of the Greek synod. He even excuses to Charlemagne his having received it at all, telling him, that as by that synod the heresy of the Iconoclasts was condemned, the Greeks would have relapsed into their heresy, had he not received the council that condemned it; which was, in some measure, declaring that he received it for what it had condemned, rather than for what it had defined. He adds, that though he received the council, he had yet returned no answer to the letters that had been sent him seven years since from Constantinople concerning it; that with respect to the article of images, he was entirely satisfied with the conduct of the emperor, but had, in other respects, great reason to complain of him, as he still with-

held the patrimonies of St. Peter, which his Iconoclast predecessors had unjustly seized; that he would therefore write to him, if his royal excellency approved of it, and thank him for what he had done in the cause of images, but at the same time insist on his restoring the patrimonies, which his ancestors had usurped, and declare him a heretic if he did not restore them; that is, to gratify Charlemagne he was ready to declare the emperor a heretic, though entirely satisfied with him as to his orthodoxy. But he could no more prevail on the king with his complaisance, than with his arguments, to change his opinion. Charlemagne still continued, and so did the western bishops, to reject the doctrine of image worship, with the council that had defined it; and neither was received in the west till several ages after, as will appear in the sequel.

I cannot help observing, before I dismiss this subject, that though the fathers of Nice declared over and over again, that they reserved Latria to God alone, that images were not to be worshiped with Latria, but with an inferior, relative, and subordinate worship; it is nevertheless now the general opinion of the divines of the church of Rome, that images and the prototypes, or those whom they represent, are to be worshiped with the very same worship, and consequently that the cross, the images of the Trinity, (now allowed, but formerly forbidden,¹) and those of Christ are to be worshiped with Latria, that is with the very same supreme Divine worship, with which Christ himself and the Trinity are worshiped. This opinion they ground on the practice of the church in the worship of the cross,² owning thereby that the church adores the cross with Latria, and concluding from thence, that as the cross is adored with Latria, on account of its relation to Christ, the images of Christ and the Trinity are, on the same account, to be adored with the same adoration. Now, if it is not idolatry to give the same supreme divine worship to a piece of wood, or a painted canvass, that we give to God, I should be glad to know the true meaning of that word. To say, that they only are guilty of idolatry, who take something to be God that is not God, and worship it as such, is clearing from that guilt all the wiser pagans, who

¹ See p. 64.

² Especially in the service of Good Friday, when the whole church addresses the cross thus, "Behold the wood of the cross; come let us adore it;" and their actions agreeing with their expressions, they all fall down and adore it, praying to it in the most express and formal terms of prayer: "O crux ave spes unica, hoc passionis tempore, piis adauge gratiam, reisque dona veniam." In the Roman pontifical, where the rubric determines the order of procession at the reception of an emperor, it is said, the "legate's cross shall be on the right hand, because Latria is due to it, and the emperor's sword on the left:" (Pontific. Rom. edit. Rom. p. 672.) so that it is the sense of the church, that the cross should be worshiped with Latria.

Hadrian dies ;—[Year of Christ, 795.] His character. His death greatly lamented by Charlemagne.

did not take their images for gods, as has been shown,¹ and restraining it to mere fools and idiots, since none but mere fools and idiots can think, as was observed by Celsus, that the wood or stone of an image made and governs the world ; that an image made by a smith or a carpenter, is the Creator of the world, the Maker of the very man who made it, and of the very wood or metal of which it was made.

Hadrian did not live to see what reception his answer to the Caroline books met with from Charlemagne and the western bishops. He died soon after he had finished it, and his death happened on the 25th of December, 795,² after he had presided in the Roman see twenty-three years, ten months, and seventeen days. He was a man of very uncommon parts, of great address, of an extraordinary discernment in affairs of state, and, in short, an able politician, but no divine, if we may judge of his knowledge in divinity from his writings, especially from his answer to the Caroline books, and his letter to Constantine and Irene concerning the worship of images ;³ two pieces, that show him very little conversant in history, and less conversant in Scripture. As the temporal grandeur of the papal see was entirely owing to the generosity of the French princes and nation, and wholly depended on the continuation of their protection and favor, Hadrian made it his study, during the whole time of his long pontificate, to gain the good will of that nation, and of the great prince, who was then at the head of it, espousing his interest with great zeal, as it was inseparable from his own, against their common enemies the Greeks and the Lombards. Thus by his policy and address he not only maintained, but considerably extended, as has been related, the temporal power and dominion, which his predecessors had acquired.

His death was greatly lamented by the Romans and the people of Italy, but by none so much as by Charlemagne, who burst into tears, when he first heard of it, and wept, says Eginhard, as if he had lost a brother, or the most beloved of his children. Not satisfied with the common tribute of tears, he caused prayers to be every where offered up for the repose of his soul, distributing great alms for that purpose, and sending considerable presents even to the chief churches of England, not that he entertained the least doubt of the happiness of that blessed soul, as he declared in his letter to Offa at this time king of Mercia, but to show his faith, and the sincerity of his affection and friendship for one, whom he so tenderly loved ;⁵ nay,

to transmit to posterity a lasting testimony of that sincere affection and friendship, he

of the torments of purgatory that he distributed alms, and caused prayers to be offered up. The custom of praying for the dead obtained in the church at least as early as the time of Tertullian ; for he, I think is the first who speaks of it.—(Tertull. de Coron. Milit. c. 3. & de Monogam. c. 10.) After him it is particularly mentioned by Cyprian, (Cyprian, ep. 37. vel 22. ad Cler. ep. 34. vel 39. & 66. vel 1.) Arnobius, (Arnob. l. 4. p. 181.) the author upon Job under the name of Origen, (Orig. in Job.) by Origen himself, (Orig. in Roman. l. 9. t. 2.) by Cyril of Jerusalem, (Cyril Catech. Myst. 5. n. 6.) by Epiphanius, (Epiphani. hæres. 75.) and, I may say, by all the ancient fathers. But that such a custom was not grounded on the belief of purgatory, as if the souls, for which they prayed, were detained and tormented there for the sins they had not expiated in their life-time, is manifest from their praying for the most holy men and the greatest saints, for the patriarchs, the prophets, the apostles, the martyrs, the confessors : (Epiphani. hæres. 75.) nay, it appears from the ancient liturgies ascribed to Basil, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen and Cyril, that they prayed for the virgin Mary herself, (Apud Usher. Answer to the challenge, p. 138. & Dallæm de Pænis & Satisfac. l. 5. c. 8.) whom no papist will allow to have ever touched at purgatory. In the Greek liturgy of Chrysostom it is said : "we offer unto thee this reasonable service for the faithful deceased, our forefathers, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, and apostles, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, religious persons, and every spirit perfected in the faith ; but especially for our most holy, immaculate, most blessed lady, the mother of God, and ever virgin Mary.—(Chrysost. liturg. t. 4. p. 614.) We must therefore either allow that praying for the dead does not infer purgatory, or that the greatest saints, the prophets, the apostles, the martyrs, nay and the virgin Mary herself, went all first to purgatory, or at least were supposed by the church to be in purgatory, since she prayed indifferently for them all.

As for the grounds and reasons of that ancient practice, they were various according to various opinions, that obtained in those days. Many of the fathers were of opinion, as is well known, that the souls of all the just, except the martyrs, were detained in some place invisible to mortal eye, which they called Hades, Paradise, Abraham's bosom, where they were happy, but expected a more complete happiness at the end of all things. They, who held this opinion, may be supposed, in praying for the dead, to have prayed that the souls of the just, thus sequestered for a time, might at last be admitted to perfect happiness in heaven. Others thought, that by the prayers of the church the glory of the saints was increased, and the pains of the damned, in some degree, mitigated and lessened. "The prayers of the church," says St. Austin, "serve to render the damnation of the wicked more tolerable."—(Aug. Enchirid. ad Laurent. c. 110.) Of the same opinion were Prudentius.—(Pruden. Cathem. car. 5. de Cereò Pasçal.) Paulinus, (Paulin. ep. 19.) the author of the questions to Antiochus under the name of Athanasius, (Athanas. quæst. ad Antioch. quæst. 34.) and Chrysostom. (Chrys. hom. 3. in Phil. hom. 21. in Act. & hom. 32. in Math.) who advises men to pray for the dead, because it would bring some comfort to them, though but little, and though none at all, yet it would be accepted by God, as a pleasing sacrifice from those, who offered it. Many other reasons occur in the ancients, on which they grounded the practice of the church in praying for departed souls ; they prayed that God would receive them to himself ; that he would deal with them according to his mercy, and not in strict justice according to their merits ; that as the soul is but in an imperfect state of happiness till the resurrection, the just might rise the last day to an endless state of consummate happiness ; that thus they manifested their faith of a future resurrection, and in the mean time maintained a kind of communion between the members of Christ yet alive, and those, that were departed only, and not lost by death.—(See Bingham Antiquit. of the Christian church, l. 15. c. 3. sect. 15, 16.) There is not among the many reasons, alledged by the fathers to justify the practice of the church in praying for the dead, the least intimation, or distant hint of purgatory, or of a place, where the departed souls are confined and tormented, till they have paid the utmost farthing, or are prayed out of those inexpressible torments by their friends. And who can

¹ See p. 31. note (2).

² The French annalists all place the death of Hadrian on the 25th of December, 796 ; but with them Christmas day was the first day of the new year.

³ See p. 114. ⁴ Eginhard. in vit. Carol.

⁵ Malines. de gest. Reg. Angl. l. 1. c. 4.

If he entertained not the least doubt of the happiness of that blessed soul, it was not to deliver it out

Charlemagne writes Hadrian's epitaph, and sends it to Rome. His public works. He enriches the churches of Rome. Wrote numberless letters.

wrote his epitaph himself, setting forth, in Elegiac verse, all the good qualities with all the great works of his deceased friend.¹ That epitaph he caused to be engraven in gold letters upon marble, and sent it to Rome to be there set up at his tomb in the Vatican; and to that day it is to be seen at the door of that church. To the epitaph, were added in prose, the time of his pontificate, and the day of his death in the following words: "Pope Hadrian of blessed memory sat twenty-three years, ten months, and seventeen days, and died on the 7th of the kalends of January," that is on the 26th of December; where he is said to have died on the day on which he was buried. For that he died on Christmas day, and consequently on the 25th, and not the 26th of December, is attested by all the historians of those times. But as men were then commonly buried the very day they died, (and so was Charlemagne himself) the day on which they were buried, is often called the day of their death, though they happened to be buried one or two days after their death; and their exequies were scarce ever put off any longer, unless something intervened to prevent them.²

What we read in Anastasius of the generosity of Hadrian to the poor, of his magnificence in repairing and embellishing the churches and cemeteries of Rome, in rebuilding the walls, and restoring the ancient aqueducts of that city, far exceeds any thing we read, not only of his predecessors, but of the greatest princes of those times. There was scarce a church, a monastery, or an oratory in Rome, that did not partake of his generosity. On the ornaments of the Vatican basilic alone he is said to have employed two thousand five hundred and eighty pounds weight of gold, besides an immense quantity of silver and precious stones of all sorts. Among the other presents or offerings he made to that church was a chandelier of workmanship capable of holding one thousand three hundred and seventy candles. It hung before the chancel; and Hadrian appointed it to be lighted

believe, that if such a doctrine had been known, the fathers would have all forgotten to alledge it as a reason of their praying for the dead? It would certainly have better justified the practice of the church than any reason they alledged.

¹ Among the other verses are the following more tender than elegant.

"Post patrem lacrymans Carolus hæc carmina scripsi;
Tu mihi dulcis amor, te modo plango, pater.

Nomina Jungo simul titulis, clarissime nostra,

Hadrianus, Carolus, rex ego, tuque pater.

² Vide Pagi Critic. Bar. ad Ann. 795. n. I.

four times a year, namely, on the festivals of Christmas, of Easter, of the holy apostles, and on the day of the Roman pontiff's ordination. He expended, in repairing the ruinous walls of the city, one thousand one hundred pounds weight of gold, and larger sums on the aqueducts and other public ornaments or necessary works; insomuch that Rome is said to have, in great measure, recovered under him its ancient lustre and grandeur.¹ It was the generosity of Charlemagne that enabled Hadrian to perform such extraordinary works. For Eginhard tells us, that on the church of St. Peter, Charlemagne heaped, to use his expression, immense quantities of gold, of silver, of precious stones, and made rich presents to the popes without number, having nothing so much at heart as to see the city of Rome restored, by his means, to its ancient authority, and the church of St. Peter enriched with his wealth above all other churches.² This wealth was the plunder of the different nations Charlemagne had conquered, especially of the Saxons and the wealthy nation of the Huns, whom he almost entirely rooted out; and it was perhaps to atone for his cruelty and injustice that he thus shared the booty with St. Peter and the pope.

Hadrian wrote a great number of letters to different persons, and on different subjects, which have been carefully collected by Ludovicus Jacob in his *Bibliotheca Pontificia*; and to him I refer the reader.

In the time of Hadrian, Offa, king of Mercia, having treacherously murdered Ethelbert, king of the East Angles, undertook a pilgrimage to Rome to atone for that crime, and at the same time to obtain of the pope a confirmation of the privileges he had granted to the monastery of St. Alban, which he had built and richly endowed upon the pretended miraculous discovery of the body of that saint, after it had lain concealed five hundred years and upwards. The pope received the king with the greatest marks of respect and esteem, applauded his devotion to the proto-martyr of his kingdom, and readily confirmed all the privileges, immunities and exemptions he had granted to the new founded monastery.³ That he did not, as is pretended, during his stay at Rome, make his kingdom tributary to the pope and St. Peter, has been shown elsewhere.⁴

¹ Anast. in Hadrian. ² Eginhard. in vit. Carol.
³ Westmonast. ad Ann. 794. & M. Paris in vit. Off.
p. 26. ⁴ See p. 25.

Leo III. chosen. Acquaints Charlemagne with his promotion. To whom the Romans swear allegiance. The custom of sending keys to princes. Immense treasures sent by Charlemagne to Rome. How employed by the pope.

LEO III., NINETY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, IRENE, NICEPHORUS, MICHAEL RHANGABE.—CHARLEMAGNE, LEWIS THE DEBONNAIRE, *Emperors of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 795.] In the room of Hadrian was raised to the see Leo, the third of that name, presbyter of the Roman church, a native of Rome, and the son of one Azuppius. He was chosen, with one consent, by the nobility, the clergy, and the people, the day after the death of Hadrian, the 26th of December, and ordained the next day,¹ which in 795, fell on a Sunday.

Leo was no sooner ordained than he wrote to Charlemagne, to acquaint him with his promotion, sending him at the same time, the keys of the confession or tomb of St. Peter, the standard of the city of Rome, with several other presents, and desiring him to appoint some lord of his court to repair to Rome in order to receive of the Roman people, in his name, their oath of allegiance.² Upon the receipt of this letter Charlemagne dispatched the abbot Angilbert, one of his chief favorites, with a letter to the new pope, wherein he expressed great satisfaction at his being raised, with the approbation of all, to the pontifical dignity, as well as at his assuring him of his obedience and fidelity. In the same letter he exhorted his holiness to edify the church by his good example and a strict observance of the canons, assuring him, that on his side, he was resolved to execute the treaties he had made with his predecessor, to entertain a strict union with him, and ever to defend as Roman patrician, the holy catholic church and the apostolic see of St. Peter.³ From these letters we may, I think, well conclude with De Marca, that the Roman people acknowledged Charlemagne for their liege lord and sovereign; nay, that the pope himself owned him for his liege lord as well as they, since he promised him obedience and fidelity, and consequently that though the pope received the revenues, though he appointed the magistrates, the judges, and other officers in Rome and the other cities yielded by the kings of France to the apostolic see, the sovereignty or supreme power was nevertheless lodged in those princes. It is certain at least, that they exercised a sovereign power in Rome, that they called Rome their city, that the people of Rome styled them their lords, "domini nostri," and that the popes themselves acted on all occasions as depending upon them. As the keys of heaven were supposed to be kept by St. Peter, who was there-

fore styled the door-keeper of heaven, and the key-bearing apostle, Claviger, keys were made of gold, of silver, or other metal, and being laid on the tomb of St. Peter, were sent from thence to all princes indifferently, who had in any manner well deserved of the church. But the standard of Rome was sent only to the Roman patricians, or to those, who were to defend the church against schismatics, heretics, and infidels. Thus was it sent by Stephen II. to Pepin, by Gregory III. to Charles Martel, by Hadrian to Charlemagne, and by the succeeding popes to such princes as engaged, or were to engage in war with the enemies of the church.

Charlemagne sent to the new pope, together with his letter, most magnificent presents, the spoils of the Huns, whose rich metropolis, named Ringa, Henry, duke of Friuli, had lately taken and plundered. As the duke was sent against them by Charlemagne, whose vassal he was, to him he delivered up the whole treasure; and Charlemagne, reserving nothing for himself, distributed part of it amongst his officers and those of his court, but sent the far greater share to the pope. The present was designed for Hadrian; but the king, hearing at the same time of his death, and of the promotion of Leo, sent it to the new pope to be employed by him in repairing and adorning the churches of Rome, especially that of St. Peter.¹ And thus, to do Leo justice, it was by him employed as soon as he received it. For he caused a censer of gold to be made for the church of St. Peter weighing seventeen pounds, covered the shrine of the apostle with plate of gold, weighing forty-nine pounds, and enriched with a great number of precious stones, added to several other less considerable ornaments, three crowns of silver weighing three hundred and seven pounds, repaired the roof, and rebuilt the porches quite gone to decay. In like manner he rebuilt or repaired twenty other churches, and enriched most of them with ornaments and utensils of great value. To the church of St. Mary ad Præsepe, he gave a ciborium of silver, that is, the vessel, in which the sacrament was kept, weighing six hundred pounds, and three crowns of silver weighing one hundred and fifty-five, to the church of St. Laurence without the walls three statues of silver weighing fifty-four pounds, and to that of St. Susanna, where he was ordained,

¹ Anast. in Leon. III.

² Eginhard. Annal. ad Ann. 796.

³ Epist. Carol. Leon. Inter Epist. Alcuin. ep. 84.

¹ Eginhard. in Annal.

The pope's Triclinium in the Lateran palace. The see of Canterbury restored by Leo to its ancient jurisdiction;—[Year of Christ, 797.]

sacred utensils of all kinds, enriching it besides with pictures, with statues, with precious stones, with crosses, some of gold, some of silver, and other ornaments without number; so that it became at once one of the richest and most magnificent churches in Rome. Leo, having thus with the treasure sent him by Charlemagne, renewed, embellished, and enriched most of the churches of Rome, employed the remaining part of that treasure in building a most magnificent hall, or banqueting room, "triclinium," in the Lateran palace, called from him "aula Leonina," and "basilica Leonina." It far exceeded in grandeur and ornaments all the other buildings of Rome. Anastasius takes particular notice of the pillars of porphyry most curiously wrought, of the many vases, all of the most scarce and valuable marble, of the walls covered from top to bottom with marble of different colors and kinds, and of several representations in mosaic work of an elegant taste. Of these one is to be seen to this day, in which St. Peter is represented sitting with three keys lying on his knees. On his right hand is Leo, and Charlemagne on his left, both kneeling. To Leo he gives with his right a pall, and with his left the standard to Charlemagne. Over Leo are these words in Latin, "our most holy lord pope Leo," and the following over Charles, "to our lord king Charles," with these under both, "St. Peter grant life to pope Leo, and victory to king Charles." This representation was, no doubt, designed by the pope as a memorial for after ages, of his sending the standard to Charlemagne, and his thereby acknowledging him Roman patrician, and protector of the city of Rome and the church. Thus did Leo employ the first year of his pontificate; for these great works are related by Anastasius as begun soon after his election, and completed in one year's time.¹

The same year, 796, Renulph, king of Mercia, hearing of the death of Hadrian, and the promotion of Leo, dispatched to Rome an abbot named Wada to congratulate the new pope on his election, and at the same time to propose to him the restoring of the see of Canterbury to its ancient jurisdiction. For Offa, late king of Mercia, being highly provoked against the people of Canterbury, and thinking it besides inconsistent with the dignity of his crown, that the bishops of his kingdom should acknowledge the bishop of any other for their metropolitan, had obliged them to withdraw their obedience to the archbishop of Canterbury, and own the bishop of Lichfield, the metropolis of the kingdom of Mercia, for their metropolitan; nay, he had even obtained of pope Hadrian a pall for his new archbishop. Thus the bishops of Hereford, Worcester, Leicester

and Synnacester in the kingdom of Mercia, and the bishops of Helmansted and Dunmoe in the kingdom of the east Angles, which Offa had annexed to his crown, became suffragans to the archbishop of Lichfield. But as this occasioned a misunderstanding among the English prelates, which Kenulph apprehended might end in a schism, he wrote this year to the pope, soon after his accession to the crown by the above-mentioned abbot, the following year by others, and lastly by Athelard, then archbishop of Canterbury, entreating his holiness to suggest to him what he thought most proper to be done on the present occasion; but at the same time telling him, that as Austin, of blessed memory, had first preached the Gospel to the Saxons in England, as he died at Canterbury, and his body lay there, that city had, with the approbation of all, been distinguished with the metropolitical dignity; that king Offa being at enmity with the people of Canterbury, and the venerable Lambert, then archbishop of that city, had curtailed the jurisdiction of that see, and divided the diocese into two; that pope Hadrian had, at the request of the king, granted a pall, a grant quite unprecedented, to the bishop of the Mercians; that he indeed blamed neither, believing both now reigned in heaven with Christ and his saints, but only entreated his holiness to examine impartially the letter, which Athelard had written to him, in an assembly of his brethren concerning the division of his diocese.¹ The king's letter is filled with expressions of the highest esteem and greatest respect for the pope; was written in the name of all the bishops and nobility of his kingdom, as well as his own, and accompanied with a present of one hundred and twenty mancusas, a coin about a mark in value. With this letter was dispatched to Rome, Athelard himself, who prevailed in the end upon the pope, as he was a man of great address and uncommon abilities, to restore the see of Canterbury to its ancient jurisdiction. The pope's letter in favor of Athelard and his see is dated the 15th of the kalends of February, or the 18th of January, in the second year of the reign of the emperor Charles, and in the tenth indiction,² that is, in the year of Christ 802, those chronological marks answering that and no other year. The learned collector, therefore, of the English councils was certainly mistaken in making Adulph, archbishop of Lichfield, sign, as a private bishop, the council of Bacaceld, held, according to him, in 798,³ since he was not reduced to that condition till four years after, when the jurisdiction of the see of Canterbury was again extended to all the churches of England.

¹ Concil. t. 7. p. 1109. De Gest. Angl. continuat. l. 1. c. 12. & apud Bar. ad Ann. 795.

² Malmes. de Pontif. p. 210.

³ Concil. Brit. vol. I. p. 317.

Felix of Urgel and Elipand of Toledo condemned in a council at Rome;—[Year of Christ, 799.] Felix appeals to Charlemagne, and convinced by Alcuin of his error renounces it the fourth time, but embraces it anew and dies in that persuasion.

In the latter end of the year 798, or more probably in the beginning of the year 799, Leo assembled a council in the church of St. Peter, at Rome, on the following occasion. Felix, of Urgel, notwithstanding he had renounced his opinion concerning the adoption of Christ, first in the assembly of Ratisbon, and afterwards in the presence of pope Hadrian at Rome,¹ and had been condemned by all the western bishops in the council of Frankfort, had, at the persuasion of Elipand of Toledo, retracted his former retractions, and begun anew to preach the same doctrine. Hereupon Charlemagne, unwilling to recur to violence till all other means had proved ineffectual, charged Alcuin, the most learned man of his time, to write both to Felix and Elipand, and try to convince them of their error. Alcuin wrote accordingly but his letter was answered by Felix, not with the brevity of an epistle, to use his expression, but with the prolixity of a book, calculated to establish his former opinion, as entirely agreeable to the doctrine of the Scriptures and the fathers. His book, or epistle, as well as Alcuin's letter, which had given occasion to it, and a treatise against the Adoptionarians consisting of three books, which Paulinus, patriarch of Aquilea, had lately published, were, at the desire of Alcuin, sent by Charlemagne to Rome, to be examined there by the pope in a council. A council was accordingly convened by Leo in the Vatican, and the letter of Felix being read and examined, the doctrine it contained was condemned by the pope and the fifty seven bishops, who composed that assembly, as heretical and blasphemous, and Felix anathematized, if he did not sincerely repent and retract it.

The acts of the council were immediately transmitted to Charlemagne, who thereupon ordered Leidrate of Lions, Nefrid of Narbonne, with several other bishops, abbots, and some of the most learned men of his clergy, to repair to Urgel, to hold a council there, and summoning Felix to appear at it, acquaint him with the sentence lately pronounced at Rome against him, and depose him, if he obstinately persisted in his error. The bishops, arriving at Urgel, acquainted Felix with the judgment given by the pope and his council, as well as with the order they had received from the king, threatening to put the one and the other, without delay, in execution, if he did not, in their presence, own his error, and publicly abjure it. Felix begged he might be first conducted to the king, not doubting, he said, but that he should appease his wrath, and entirely satisfy him, however prejudiced against him by the misrepresentations of his enemies. The bishops granted him his request; and being sent to Aix-la-Chapelle, where Charlemagne then was, he begged he might be

heard once more, and allowed to alledge, in his presence, and in the presence of such bishops and men of learning, as he should think fit to name, what he had to offer in favor of his opinion, assuring him, that truth was the only object he had in his view, and that, if they could but convince him of the truth, he would that moment own and embrace it.

Felix had already thrice renounced his opinion, and as often embraced it anew. Charlemagne, trusting to his repeated protestations, and ascribing his obstinacy chiefly to ignorance, resolved to comply once more with his request. He therefore assembled the neighboring bishops, and at the same time ordered Alcuin, of whose integrity, knowledge and learning he entertained, and very deservedly, the highest opinion, to repair to Aix, and attend the council, which, at the request of Felix he had appointed to meet in that city. The bishops met in the royal palace, and the point in dispute, namely, "whether Christ, as man, was the Son of God by nature, or only by adoption," being argued for five whole days by Felix and Alcuin, in the presence of the bishops, of the king, and all the great officers of state, and passages without number quoted on both sides from the fathers and councils, Felix yielded in the end, acknowledged his error, abjured it the fourth time, and, to convince the world of the sincerity of his conversion, published a confession of his faith, declaring therein that his other retractions were all only pretended, but that this was, as he should answer it the last day, unfeigned and sincere, being owing to no other force but that of truth and conviction. This confession of faith he addressed to the clergy of his diocese, exhorting such of them, as he had by his authority or his writings wickedly seduced and led astray, to follow his example, and return, together with him, to the Unity of the church.¹

But this conversion either was not more sincere than the three other, or he afterwards changed his mind, and was thereupon deposed and banished to Lions, where he died while Agobard was bishop of that city, leaving a writing behind him, wherein he endeavored by way of question and answer to establish the opinion, which he had so often, and so solemnly abjured. That writing Agobard undertook to confute with the testimonies of the fathers,² for both parties pretended to have the fathers plainly on their side. But the authority of the king was with many of far greater weight than that of the fathers; and it was more by his authority than by the authority of the fathers, that the sect of the Adoptionarians was, in

¹ Alcuin. advers. Elipand. l. 1. Confess. fidei Felic. apud Alcuin. p. 998. Anonym. in vit. Alcuin.

² Agobard. lib. contra Fel. Ado. in Chron.

Character of Felix. The two nephews of the late pope conspire against Leo. They seize him and use him with great barbarity. Is rescued by the duke of Spoleti. His eyes and tongue falsely said to have been pulled out and miraculously restored.

the course of a few years, utterly suppressed. Felix was a man of an unblemished character, and generally looked upon as a saint till he forfeited the good opinion that the world entertained of him, by obstinately adhering to his own opinion, and refusing to submit his judgment to that of the church. Alcuin himself speaks of him as a man of learning:¹ but with all his learning he could never comprehend how Christ, as man, could be, or be called the Son of God by nature. As for Elipand, of Toledo, he is said to have acknowledged his error at last, and sincerely abjured it.² His conversion, and that of most of his followers was chiefly owing to the zeal and labors of Alcuin, who wrote, at the request of Charlemagne, first seven books against the Adoptionarians addressed to Felix, and afterwards four addressed to Elipand.

Peace was thus restored to the churches of Spain; but that of Rome was in the mean time disturbed by an unheard of attempt. Hadrian had raised his two nephews Paschalis and Campulus, to the two chief employments in the church, (and this is the first instance of nepotism that occurs in the history of the popes) and they ruled, during his pontificate, with an absolute sway. That extravagant power, which they probably used no better than most of the popes' nephews have done since their time, Leo undertook to control, though it is not to be doubted but that the unanimity, with which he was chosen the very day after the decease of his predecessor, was owing chiefly to them, who were, in a manner masters of the suffrages of the people as well as the clergy. They had flattered themselves that Leo would, out of gratitude, allow them to enjoy the same unlimited power under him they had enjoyed under their uncle, nay, that he would himself be governed entirely by their councils. Being thus disappointed, and provoked beyond measure at their disappointment, they formed the wicked design of murdering Leo, and getting another chosen in his room, who should better acknowledge his obligations to them. They chose for the execution of their design the 25th of April, the day of a solemn procession, at which the popes used annually to assist. As Leo was therefore repairing that day from the Lateran palace to the place, where the procession was to begin, Paschalis met him on his way, but not in an attire proper for the occasion, which he excused, pretending to be indisposed, and not in a condition to attend the procession. Soon after came Campulus, and both attended the pope, the one on the one hand, and the other on the other, entertaining and diverting him till they came to the monastery of St. Stephen and

St. Silvester, where a great number of armed men rushing out with a heinous noise from the neighboring houses, surrounded the pope, and, after beating him till they thought him ready to expire, held him wallowing in his blood on the ground, while Paschalis and Campulus endeavored to put out his eyes, and pluck out his tongue. The conspirators spared his life, being moved to compassion, as we are told, in seeing him reduced to so miserable a condition; but shut him up in the monastery mentioned above, and from thence conveyed him in the dead of the night lest his friends should attempt his rescue, to the monastery of St. Erasmus, where they kept him closely confined. But his first chamberlain Albin, having gained the abbot of that monastery, privately conveyed him, with the assistance of his friends, over the walls of the city to the Vatican, where he was received and entertained with the greatest humanity by the abbot Wirad, who resided there with the character of envoy from Charlemagne. In the mean time, Winigisus, duke of Spoleti, informed of what had happened, hastened to Rome at the head of his army, and delivering the pope out of all danger, carried him, in a kind of triumph, to his own dominions.

That Leo's tongue and eyes were really pulled out, and miraculously restored to him, as he afterwards both spoke and saw, is asserted, not only by Anastasius, who lived some time after, but by several writers, who lived at that very time, and by Alcuin among the rest,¹ in whose authority Pagi would have us to acquiesce as quite decisive.² But neither did Alcuin, nor indeed any of the writers quoted by Pagi, ever see, or tell us they ever saw the pope without his tongue and his eyes: so that it was only by report they knew that both were pulled out; and therefore their authority can by no means be admitted as decisive, no more than the report, upon which it was grounded. They believed it indeed; but in that credulous age miracles were become common, and as commonly believed even by men, in other respects, of the greatest sagacity, as any daily event or occurrence of life. Of this miracle Leo himself takes no kind of notice; and who can believe that had so stupendous a

¹ Of this miracle Alcuin speaks thus in a poem he wrote on the journey, which, after this attempt, Leo undertook into Germany, to acquaint Charlemagne with it by word of mouth. Leo, says he, at their first meeting.

"Verbera commemorans, extinctum lumine vultum
Narrat, & abscissam liquido de gutture linguam:
Nunc medicante Deo sanatum & ab omnibus istis
Esse malis," &c.

And a few lines after,

"Exquirat Carolus casus, auditque laborum
Diversos, scelerosis populi impia facta stupescit:
Miratur geminas jam dudum luce fenestras
Extinctas, & nunc reparatum lumine vultum,
Truncatamque loqui miratur forcipe linguam;
Alter in alterius configunt lumina vultus."

² Pagi Gest. Pont. Rom. vol. 2. p. 7.

¹ Alcuin. ep. 15. ad Carol.

² Tamayus in Catalog. Episcop. Toletan.

Leo repairs to Charlemagne. How received by him. Returns to Rome and is well received by the Romans. His trial. The chief conspirators seized and imprisoned. Charlemagne sets out for Italy;—[Year of Christ, 800.] His reception at Rome. He assembles a council to try the pope.

miracle being wrought in his favor, he would not have urged it as an incontestable proof of his innocence against the aspersions of his enemies charging him with many enormous crimes, and pretending it was their zeal for the honor of the see of St. Peter that prompted them to attempt on his life?

From Spoleti the pope wrote to Charlemagne to acquaint him with the attempt, that had been made on his life, and the cruel treatment he had met with; and soon after set out for France to implore the protection of the king against the inveterate hatred of his enemies, whom nothing less would satisfy than his utter ruin and destruction. But being informed, on his journey, that the king was then encamped at Paderborne, he repaired thither, and was met, as he approached the place, first by Hildivald, the king's chaplain, afterwards by Pepin, king of Italy, and lastly by Charlemagne himself, who received him, both bursting into tears at their first meeting, with all possible marks of respect, veneration, and friendship. During his stay at Paderborne, he gave the king a minute account of the conspiracy, that had been formed against him, of the wicked designs of his enemies, and the barbarous treatment he had met with at their hands. The king assured him of his protection; but being then upon the point of entering Saxony, (and this was the twenty-eighth year of the Saxon war) he advised him for the present to return to Rome, appointing several bishops, and some of the chief lords of his court to attend him on his journey, and protect him against any further attempts of his enemies. Leo, thus attended, set out from Paderborne, was received and entertained in all the cities, through which he passed as St. Peter himself, and being met, as he approached Rome, by the whole clergy, the senate, the militia, and all the Roman nobility, he was conducted by them amidst the loud acclamations of the people to the Vatican, where he performed divine service with great solemnity, all, who were present, receiving the sacrament at his hands. The next day, the 29th of November, he entered the city, and took possession anew of the Lateran palace.¹

Some days after the bishops and lords, who had attended him from France, assembling in the great hall, which Leo had built in the Lateran palace, summoned the conspirators, and all, who had any thing to lay to the charge of Leo, to appear before them, being commissioned by the king to hear their complaints, and do them justice, if any ways injured by the pope or his ministers. Some appeared, and among the rest Paschalis and Campulus, charging the pope with several crimes, which historians have

not thought fit to specify; but not being able to make good their charge, the commissioners, fully satisfied of the innocence of the pope, and the malice of his enemies, after they had spent a whole week and more in hearing and carefully examining every complaint that was brought against him, ordered the two chief conspirators, Paschalis and Campulus to be seized, and sent them to prison.¹

In the mean time Charlemagne, having quieted the Saxons for the present, and held a general diet of the states at Maience, set out from thence, at the request of the pope, with the flower of his army for Italy. Being arrived at Ancona, he detached his son Pepin with the greater part of the army against Grimoald, duke of Benevento, who, as he was informed, had privately entered into an alliance with the Greeks, and marched himself with the rest towards Rome. The pope, attended by his clergy and the Roman nobility, met him at Nomentum in Sabina about twelve miles from Rome, dined with him there, and having, in a private conference, informed him of the present situation of affairs in the city, returned the same day to the Lateran. The next day, the 24th of November, the king advanced with his army to Rome, and dismounting from his horse at the Vatican, was received by the pope, who there waited his arrival with all the Roman clergy, and introduced by him into the church, the clergy singing, as he entered the basilic, hymns of thanksgiving for his safe arrival, which were echoed on all sides with repeated shouts of joy by the people. He spent seven whole days in acquainting himself with the state of Rome as well as with the situation of affairs in Italy, in examining every circumstance of the attempt, that had been made on the life of the pope, and receiving daily new informations concerning that attempt. Having thus heard all the conspirators could alledge against the pope, or plead in their own defence, he appointed all the archbishops, bishops, and abbots then in Rome, the whole body of the Roman clergy, and all the Roman nobility, as well as the great officers of state, who attended him, to assemble in the church of St. Peter; and there sitting on the same throne with the pope, told the assembly; that the wicked attempt made on the life of his holiness, and the unheard of cruelty of his enemies had filled him with horror; that it was chiefly to inform himself thoroughly of so horrid and unprecedented an attempt that he was come into Italy; that the conspirators, to lessen their own guilt, charged the pope with many most heinous crimes, but whether justly or unjustly it was incumbent upon them to inquire, since it was for

¹ Anast. in Leon. III. Eginhard. ad Ann. 799. Anonymus Lambec.

¹ Anast. in Leon. III. Eginhard. ad Ann. 799. Anonymus Lambec.

The clergy decline judging Leo, and he clears himself by an oath. Charlemagne raised to the imperial dignity. The account historians give of that event.

that purpose he had called them together. At these words the archbishops, bishops, and abbots "cried out," says Anastasius, "all with one voice; we dare not judge the apostolic see, the head of all churches: by that see and its vicar we are all judged, and they by none." Hereupon Leo, addressing the assembly, told them, that for their satisfaction he was willing to justify himself, and would the next day, in the manner his predecessors had chosen to justify themselves on the like occasion. The assembly therefore being met the next day in the same place, the pope, holding the book of the Gospels in his hand, took, in the presence of all, the following oath; "so may I, on the last day, partake of the promises made to all in the Gospels, as I am innocent of the crimes laid to my charge." And now the king declaring himself, as well as the assembly, entirely satisfied and fully convinced of his innocence, the hymn *Te Deum*, &c., was sung by all with the greatest solemnity to thank the Almighty for thus restoring their much injured pastor to his see, and together with him peace and tranquillity both to the church and the city.¹ As for Paschalis and Campulus, the chief authors of that wicked attempt, they were by the whole assembly sentenced to death. But, at the earnest desire and request of the pope, their lives were spared, and they only banished, with all their accomplices, to France.²

What happened, soon after this trial in Rome, is the most remarkable event of Charlemagne's life, and has rendered the memory of pope Leo III., more famous, than that of all other popes, in the annals of France, I mean the promotion of Charlemagne to the imperial dignity, commonly called the translation of the empire to the French, but very improperly, since the empire was not thereby translated, nor taken from the Greeks and given to the French, but only the title of emperor, extinct ever since the time of Augustulus in the west, was revived and given to Charles.³ This great event is thus related, and very concisely, by the contemporary writers; "Charles passed the winter at Rome, says the anonymous annalist published by Lambecius, who wrote at this very time, and as there

was then no emperor, the empire being governed by a woman, (namely, by Irene) the pope, the other bishops, and the whole people of Rome thought it proper and just that Charles, king of the Franks, who held Rome formerly the seat of the emperors, and all the other places in Italy, Gaul and Germany once held by them, should be distinguished with the same title. They acquainted Charles therewith; and he being, at their request and desire, consecrated by Leo on the festival of the nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ, took upon him the title of emperor."⁴ Anastasius only tells us, that the same assembly, the assembly mentioned above, meeting soon after again in the basilic of St. Peter, the pope placed a most precious crown on the king's head; and that thereupon the whole Roman people crying out three times aloud, to "Charles Augustus, crowned by the hand of God, great and pacific emperor, life and victory," he was appointed emperor of the Romans, and anointed, together with his son, by the holy pontiff on Christmas-day.² In the same manner, and almost in the very same words, is this transaction related by all the contemporary historians to a man. Some of them only add, that the new emperor being placed, after he had received the holy unction, on a throne, the pope and the Roman people, adoring him, or prostrating themselves before him, thus acknowledged him, as they had formerly acknowledged the other emperors, for their lord and their sovereign; that the pope having presented him with the imperial robes, he returned, attired as emperor, from the church to his palace, amidst the loud acclamations of the people crowding from all parts to see him, and that thenceforth laying aside the title of Roman patrician, he constantly styled himself Augustus and emperor.³ Eginhard, who was Charlemagne's secretary, and had probably attended him to Rome, assures us, that he was no ways privy to the design of the pope and the Roman people; nay, and that far from being pleased with, or proud of his new dignity, he declared, that had he foreseen, or in the least suspected what had happened, he would have forborne appearing at church even on so solemn a day. However that be, certain it is, that he would never afterwards part with that title; but strove, with frequent embassies and letters filled with the kindest expressions, to appease the emperors of the east complaining of his assuming it as an unsufferable usurpation; nay in the very letters he wrote to them on that subject he constantly styled them his brothers, as being equal in dignity to him.⁴

¹ Anast. in Leon. III. Eginhard. in *Annal. Anonymus apud Lambec. Annal. Laurisham. Mossiac. Monach. San Gall. l. 1. c. 18.*

² *Idem ibid.*

³ Some coins or medals of Charlemagne are still to be seen with this legend, "Renovatio Imperii," "the revival of the empire;" and so it is called by Sigonius, the title of emperor of the west, says that writer, which had failed, about three hundred years before, in Momyllus Augustulus, was revived by the pope, that the Roman church might have a defender, or guardian against infidels, heretics and seditious men, an office, which the emperors of the east had long since utterly neglected, and in a manner resigned.—(*Sigon. de Reg. Ital. l. 4. ad Ann. 801.*) As no prince bore, at this time, the title of emperor of the west, that title might well be revived, but could not be transferred.

¹ *Annal. Anonym. ad Ann. 801.*

² *Anast. in Leon. III.*

³ *Annal. Frac. ad Ann. 801. Monach. Engolis. in vit. Carol. Aimo. l. 5. c. 6. Ado in Chron. etat. 6. Gofrid. Viterb. in Chron. Eginhard. in vit. Carol.*

⁴ *Eginhard. ad Ann. 801.*

Charlemagne's promotion, no argument of the temporal supremacy of the pope. The pope only gave him the bare title of emperor, and not even that by his own authority alone. In what sense Charlemagne may be said to have been made emperor by the pope.

The translation, as it is called, of the empire from the Greeks to the French is alledged by the two great champions of the papacy Baronius and Bellarmine as an indisputable instance of the temporal supremacy of the pope, or of the supreme and unlimited power they vest in the pope over all princes and kingdoms; and in that instance both authors triumph, as if Leo had really exercised such a power, and exercised it with the approbation of all Christian princes, since Charles was acknowledged by all for true and lawful emperor upon his being raised to that dignity by the pope.¹ But to make it undeniably appear that no such power was, on the present occasion, exercised by Leo, I need only observe, that in promoting Charlemagne to the imperial dignity he took nothing from Irene, who then governed the empire, gave nothing to the new emperor but the bare name or title of emperor. Had he deposed Irene, had he divested her of her dominions, and given them to Charles, and he had thereupon been acknowledged by all the Christian princes for lawful emperor both of the east and the west, he would indeed, in that case, have exercised the pretended supremacy; and such a translation of the empire might well be alledged as an instance of the power they vest in him of disposing at his pleasure of kingdoms and empires. But as he neither deposed Irene, nor took any dominions from her, or gave any to Charles, but only revived in him, and not even that by his own authority alone, the extinct title of emperor of the west, to pretend that by thus translating the empire, he exercised the power of disposing of kingdoms and empires, is pretending that he exercised such a power, when he did not dispose of a single foot of ground. Charles possessed more extensive dominions before he was raised to the empire, than had been possessed by any emperor of the west ever since the division of the empire. He held, by right of succession or by conquest, all Gaul, part of Spain, all Italy, from the Alps to Calabria, Istria, Dalmatia, Pannonia now Hungary, all Dacia, comprising Valachia, Moldavia, Transilvania, and, what no emperor had ever held before him, that vast tract of country laying between the Rhine and the Vistula, between the northern ocean and the Danube. These extensive dominions he possessed when he was yet only styled king; and it is not even pretended, that he acquired a single foot of ground more, or right to a single foot of ground more, by being styled emperor. Had Leo therefore given him that title by his own authority alone, it would not follow from thence that he had, or that he exercised

any kind of power over the temporal dominions of princes.

But that not even the bare title of emperor was conferred on him by the authority of the pope alone, but by the authority of the Roman people as well as by that of the pope, is manifest from the account all the contemporary historians give us of that transaction. The pope, says the anonymous annalist, quoted above, the other bishops, that is the French and Italian bishops then in Rome, and the whole Roman people thought it proper and just, that Charles should be distinguished with the title of emperor; and he being, at their request and desire, consecrated by Leo, took upon him the title of emperor. Anastasius writes, that the pope having placed a crown on his head, the whole people of Rome cried out three times to Charles Augustus, life and victory, and that he was thereby appointed emperor of the Romans; so that it was not by the pope alone, according to Anastasius, that the title of emperor was given him, or that he was appointed emperor of the Romans, but by the pope and the people: nay, twenty writers, and more, quoted by the learned Du Pin,¹ ascribe the raising of Charlemagne to the imperial dignity, or the conferring on him the title of emperor, to the senate and the people of Rome, without so much as ever once mentioning the pope.

Some Greek writers indeed, quoted by Bellarmine,² tell us, that Charles was made emperor by Leo; but from the context it is plain they meant no more than that he was by Leo crowned, and anointed emperor; which are but mere ceremonies, that may well suppose, but never can give any kind of title or right without the previous consent of the people. Besides, Leo may be properly said to have preferred Charlemagne to the empire, though he did not prefer him by his own authority, but by that of the people, acting in their name, and as their representative. He may likewise be said to have made him emperor as they, who formerly first proposed the emperors, and made interest in their behalf, were said to have made them, though properly speaking they were made or chosen by the people, or soldiery. What Bellarmine adds, namely, that Charlemagne did not acquire the empire, is true, if by the empire he means the bare title of emperor; but false, if he means such dominions or territories as gave him a claim to that title. These he acquired; but though possessed of dominions far more extensive than those, that composed the western empire even in its most flourishing state, he did not take upon him the title of emperor till it was

¹ Bar. ad Ann. 800. Bellar. de Translat. Rom. Imper. l. i. c. 4.

¹ Du Pin. de Antiq. Eccles. Discip. dissert. 7. p. 521.

² Bellar. ubi supra.

Charlemagne disposed of the empire or imperial dignity without the consent of the pope. He returns to France; [Year of Christ, 801.] Constantine resolves to divest his mother of her usurped power. His design discovered and all concerned in it severely punished.

given him by the people of Rome, and the pope executing their will, or acting, in their name, as the first, and chief man of the city.

But Charlemagne, says Bellarmine, having, by his last will, divided the empire amongst his children, would have Leo to confirm it, lest he should seem to deliver, without his consent, that empire to others, for which he was indebted to him. On the other hand Baronius pretends, that he did not dispose of the empire at all, thereby to show that the power of disposing of it was not vested in him, but in the pope. But that Charlemagne was not indebted to the pope alone for the empire, or rather for the title of emperor, has been shown already; and that he disposed of it some months before his death, taking his son Lewis, king of Aquitaine, for his partner in the empire, and causing him to be crowned emperor, is attested by Eginhard and Theganus, who lived both at that very time.¹ He consulted indeed, on that occasion, the barons of his kingdom, and required their approbation and consent, having assembled them for that purpose at Aix-la-Chapelle; but it does not appear, that he consulted the pope, or so much as acquainted him with his design. It is true, as Baronius observes, that Charlemagne did not dispose of the empire, or of the imperial dignity, in the will he made in 806. But it was not because he thought it belonged to the pope to dispose of it, since he afterwards disposed of it without the knowledge of the pope; but because he had not yet determined with himself, whether he should bequeath it to Pepin as king of Italy, or to Charles as the eldest of his children.²

Charlemagne, now emperor, passed the remaining part of the winter at Rome, regulating, says the Loiselian annalist,³ the affairs both of the state and the church; made many rich presents to most of the churches, especially to those of St. Peter and St. Paul, and taking leave of the pope on the 25th of April, repaired to Spoleti, from thence to Pavia, and from Pavia to France. At Pavia he added several laws to those of the Lombards, who had been hitherto governed by their own laws only, and, in imitation of the eastern emperors, began to mark in all his laws, diplomas and edicts, the years of his empire, and those of his consulate,

and likewise the indiction never before used by him, or by any of his ancestors.

While the empire was thus revived in the west, it was near utterly destroyed in the east by the unbounded ambition of the woman, who governed it. Irene, a most zealous advocate for the worship of images, but with all her zeal and devotion the most ambitious, nay, and the most wicked of women, had ruled, during the minority of her son Constantine, with an absolute sway; and with the same sway she continued to rule, when he was no longer a minor, taking the first place in all public ceremonies, signing all public acts before him, making war, concluding treaties of peace, disposing of all preferments both ecclesiastic and civil without so much as acquainting him therewith, as if he still were a minor or infant. The young emperor, finding himself thus excluded from all share in the government, and consequently left only with a small number of domestics, while the levée of Stauracius, the empress' prime minister, was daily crowded with persons of the highest distinction, he resolved to emancipate himself, and degrading both his unnatural mother and her favorite minister, take the reins of government into his own hands. This resolution he imparted to some of the officers of his court; and it was agreed among them, that the emperor should declare in full senate, that being of age, he was resolved thenceforth to govern of himself, and assume that power which others had engrossed, though he alone was entitled to it by his birth and the known laws of the empire, and that after this declaration Irene and Stauracius should both be arrested and confined for life to the island of Sicily.

But this resolution was no sooner taken than discovered, most of the emperor's domestics being retained by Stauracius, and ready to earn his favor at the expense of their master and sovereign. The plot, or conspiracy, as it was called, being thus discovered, all, who had been any ways concerned in it, or privy to it, were, by Irene's order, apprehended, most cruelly beaten, stript of all their effects, and banished to Sicily, whither they proposed banishing her and her minister. As for the young emperor, the enraged mother reprimanded him with the utmost severity, and not without blows, treating him as a child, and confining him, as wanting in the respect, that was due to her, to an apartment in the palace. While he was thus kept closely confined, she prevailed with her largesses on the venal soldiery, and their more venal officers to take an oath of allegiance to her, by which they bound themselves to maintain her in the full possession of the power she had enjoyed, during the minority of her son, to obey her in all things, and to acknowledge no other

¹ Eginhard. ad Ann. 813. Thegan. de Gest. Ludovic. Pii. c. 6.

² It is to be observed, that though the promotion of Charlemagne to the imperial dignity happened on the 25th of December of the year 800, it is generally placed by the French historians under the year 801, the 25th of December, or Christmas-day, being with them the first day of the year. For the same reason, pope Hadrian, who died on the 25th of December, 795, is said by Marianus Scotus to have died in 796, and on the first day of that year.

³ Annal. Lois. ad Ann. 801.

Irene deposed and Constantine placed on the throne. Treats his mother with kindness and respect. Recalls to court both her and her favorite minister. She procures the disgrace and the ruin of all his true friends. Advises him to divorce his lawful wife and marry one of her maids.

master or sovereign but her. That oath all took but the troops of Armenia, who rejected it, as the young empress, the wife of Constantine, was a native of that country, with the utmost indignation, declaring that the emperor was now of age, and he alone their lawful sovereign; that no other had a right to command them, and they would obey no other, much less a woman. Irene, apprehending their example might influence the rest of the army, dispatched, in great haste, an officer of her guards, named Alexis, with large sums to gain them. But Alexis was himself gained by them; nay, and putting himself at their head marched straight to Constantinople, entered the city without opposition, the troops quartered there being ashamed of the oath they had taken, set the emperor at liberty, and placed him on the throne amidst the loud acclamations both of the people and the soldiery.

Constantine, thus placed on the throne, began his government with banishing Stauracius, his mother's prime minister, into Armenia, and causing her favorite eunuchs to be publicly beaten with rods, and confined to the most inhospitable places of the empire. As for Irene, he led her himself, with great respect, out of the palace, and attended her in person to a house, which she had built, and in which was lodged the immense treasure she had amassed, during her long administration. He assured her that no injury should ever be offered her, but that she should, on the contrary, be always treated with the greatest respect, as empress, and the emperor's mother. In the mean time the Bulgarians breaking into the empire, the emperor marched against them in person, engaged them, but was entirely defeated. He was soon after defeated anew by the Saracens, with the loss of all his best officers, and the flower of his army. These misfortunes the friends of Irene took care to improve to her advantage, extolling her wisdom, her abilities, her experience in public affairs, and entreating the emperor, out of a pretended friendship for him, to advise with her at so critical a juncture, since none in the whole empire was capable of assisting him with better advice. Constantine fell into the snare. For he was not only reconciled to her, but recalled her to court, restored her to her former authority, caused her to be proclaimed empress anew, and even suffered himself to be persuaded by her to recall Stauracius, and admit him to his confidence. And now Irene, having one ready to second her in all her ambitious and wicked designs, made it her study to deprive him of all his true friends, and put him upon such measures as she well knew would render him odious both to the people and soldiery. Thus, by her advice, he not only caused the eyes of his uncle Nicephorus to

be put out upon his being told, that part of the army had formed a design of raising him to the throne, but commanded the tongues of his other four uncles, Christopher, Nicetas, Anthimus, and Euodimus, to be plucked out, though none of them was any way privy to, or concerned in the plot. He was indebted, as we have seen, to Alexis and the troops of Armenia for his liberty, and the power he enjoyed. They were entirely devoted to him, and had therefore opposed the restoration of Irene, and would not obey her when restored by him to her former authority. To be revenged therefore on them, and at the same time to remove out of the way the best, if not the only true friends the unhappy emperor had in the whole empire, the wicked mother found means to persuade him, that Alexis affected the crown, that he had already formed a considerable party, and only waited for a favorable opportunity to put in execution his wicked design. Hereupon Alexis was immediately seized, and his eyes were put out, neither he himself, nor any of his friends being allowed to speak a single word in defence of his innocence. Such barbarity, such crying injustice, provoked the troops of Armenia to such a degree, that openly revolting, not from Constantine, they said, but from Irene, they refused to obey the officer, whom the emperor had, at her instigation, appointed to command them. Irene, glad of so plausible a pretence to wreak her vengeance on that loyal corps, persuaded the emperor to treat them as rebels; and a strong detachment was sent against them. They defended themselves with great resolution and bravery, but being, in the end overpowered, the officers were all put to death, and the soldiers led in chains to Constantinople, and conveyed from thence into different islands.

In the mean time Irene, who watched every opportunity of exposing the emperor, observing that he betrayed a violent passion for one of her maids named Theodota, resolved to improve that passion to her advantage, and persuade the unwary prince to divorce his lawful wife, and take Theodota to his bed in her room. This she knew she could easily compass, as the emperor had no kind of affection for the present empress, whom she herself had forced him to marry against his inclination; and she was, on the other hand, well apprised that such a step would occasion no small scandal, would give no small offence to the clergy as well as the people, and be, in the end, probably attended with great disturbances, which she wanted neither skill nor address to improve. Having therefore one day, in a private conversation with the emperor, taken notice of the great regard he had for Theodota, she told him that his affections were not misplaced; that Theodota well deserved, not so much on

The patriarch so far gained as not to oppose that adulterous marriage of the emperor. Two famous monks separate themselves from the communion of the patriarch and the emperor, and are, at the instigation of Irene, severely punished by the emperor. Irene gains some of the chief officers of the army.

account of the charms of her person, as for her many other good qualities, all the regard and esteem he showed for her; that she heartily repented her having persuaded him to marry one, in every respect, so much inferior to her; one with whom she was now sensible he could never taste the happiness of a social life, the greatest happiness heaven could indulge in this world. She added, that the evil she had done was not, however, without a remedy; that he was vested with an absolute power; that none dared to control him, and he therefore might drive from, or take to his bed, whom he pleased. As this wicked suggestion was entirely agreeable to his inclination, he readily complied with it, resolving that moment, without reflecting on the consequences, to divorce his lawful wife, and marry his beloved Theodota in her room. However, to save appearances, he applied to the patriarch Tarasius, requiring him to declare his former marriage null, to perform the nuptial ceremony on occasion of his new marriage, and to give the veil to the empress Mary, who, to save her life, had consented to exchange the imperial crown for a veil, the emperor pretending, without the least foundation, that she had attempted to poison him, and threatening her with an ignominious death, if she did not retire to a monastery. The patriarch remonstrated, with great zeal, against the intended marriage, as forbidden, both by the laws of God and the empire, and alleging several passages of Scripture to prove the unlawfulness of it, boldly declared that he would be no ways accessory, nor suffer any of his clergy to be accessory to so wicked an action. To this resolution he kept firm and inflexible till the emperor, recollecting how zealous and active he had been in restoring the holy images, threatened to turn Iconoclast if he did not comply; to abrogate the acts of the council of Nice, and cause the images which he had taken so much pains to set up, to be all pulled down, to be cast out of the churches and broken. Here the firmness and constancy of the patriarch failed him, and he was some time at a loss what party to take. But concluding in the end, that of two evils he might choose, with a safe conscience, the least, he resolved no longer to oppose the adulterous marriage, since he could by no other means rescue the holy images, and with them the Christian religion, from the danger that threatened them. Forbearing, therefore, all further remonstrances, he allowed the abbot of a monastery in Constantinople to perform the marriage ceremony, and his own catechist to give the veil to the empress Mary; nay, and admitted the emperor to the eucharist, and to his communion, though living, even according to him, in the state of adultery.

The conduct of Tarasius gave great offence to many, who, though no less desirous than he of preserving the holy images, thought nevertheless that so open a breach of the divine law should not have been even connived at to preserve them; that it was quite as criminal in the patriarch to have allowed any of his clergy to marry the emperor, and veil the degraded empress, as if he had performed both ceremonies himself; that to admit one to the eucharist, to communicate with one, who lived in the state of adultery, was not barely conniving at his crime, but approving it. At the head of those, who thus complained of the conduct of the patriarch, were the two famous monks, Plato and Theodore, both reputed great saints, and highly revered by the people. They not satisfied with loudly condemning the unlawful, the adulterous, the wicked and scandalous marriage of the emperor, openly separated themselves from his communion, as no longer a member of the church, and from the communion of the patriarch too, as no less guilty than he. This occasioned great disturbances in the church of Constantinople, Irene stirring up the emperor secretly against the monks, and at the same time the monks against the emperor. At her instigation Constantine ordered the two monks to be seized, caused Theodore to be most cruelly beaten, and sent both into exile with all the monks, who, adhering to them did not approve of his marriage. Irene, though the chief author of all this severity, was the first to complain of it, taxing the emperor with cruelty, and extolling the virtue of the holy men, whom he persecuted with so much barbarity merely on account of their virtue. As the two monks were revered by all as great saints, Irene, by pretending to espouse their cause, gained the affections of the people, and at the same time estranged them, what she had chiefly in her view, from the emperor.

Her next care was to gain the soldiery; and in order to that she laid hold of the following opportunity. The new empress being delivered of a son, while the emperor was using, with his mother, the baths of Prusia in Bithynia, he repassed the straits, as soon as he received the joyful tidings, with a small retinue, leaving his mother with the rest of the court in Bithynia. In his absence, Irene privately applied to such of the officers of the army as seemed to her the most dissatisfied with the conduct of the emperor, and having with large sums and great promises gained them, and by their means most of the rest, she engaged them to bind themselves by an oath to depose Constantine, and place her on the imperial throne in his room. In the mean time news being brought that the Saracens had broken into the empire, Constantine marched against them in person

The emperor robbed by the chief officers of a victory over the Saracens. They conspire with Irene to seize him, but are disappointed in the attempt. His guards bribed by Irene and he seized by them and brought to Constantinople. His eyes put out by his mother's order, and he dies soon after.

at the head of twenty thousand chosen troops. Under him commanded Stauracius, who, concluding from the ardor he observed in the soldiery, that should they engage the enemy, nothing could prevent their gaining a complete victory, resolved to deprive the emperor, by some means or other, of that glory. Having therefore assembled with that view, some of the chief officers of his party, and represented to them, that should they engage the enemy, a complete victory would undoubtedly be the issue of the engagement; that such a victory would recommend the emperor to the love and esteem of the people as well as the soldiery, and consequently defeat their design, it was resolved, that an engagement should by all means be prevented. Pursuant to that resolution, Stauracius pretending to send out scouts to reconnoitre the situation and strength of the enemy, commanded them to report, on their return, that the Saracens, struck with a panic, at the approach of the emperor, had all retired in confusion, and that not one of them was any where to be seen in the field. This proved a great disappointment to the emperor; and he returned under the greatest concern to Constantinople, which he had flattered himself he should have entered in triumph.

On his return he met with a very cold reception from the people. To amuse them, therefore, and in some degree reconcile them to him, he resolved to entertain them with public shows, and the day being appointed, on which they were to be exhibited, the 17th of June, 797, Irene and the conspirators chose that very day for the execution of their design; and it was agreed, that they should seize the emperor as he returned from the circus. But he, having either received private intelligence of their design, or suspecting it from their attempting to surround him on all sides, snatched himself from them, riding full speed, as he was on horse-back, to the port, where he threw himself into a boat, and passing the straits that moment, arrived safe at Pylæ in Bithynia, where some of the eastern legions were quartered, on whose fidelity he knew he might safely rely. The news of his escape threw Irene, and the rest of the conspirators into the utmost confusion. They all concluded the conspiracy was discovered; and Irene, looking upon herself as lost, began to think of applying to the bishops, who all adored her on account of her zeal for images, and trying to obtain, by their means, leave to retire from the world, and pass undisturbed the rest of her life in a monastery. But in the mean time another expedient, more agreeable to her inclination, occurring to her, she thought it advisable to delay applying to the bishops till she found what success might attend it. This was to persuade, if by any

means she could, such of the conspirators as had attended the emperor in his flight, and of whom he entertained not the least distrust, to attempt the execution of their design. With that view she wrote to them by one, in whom she could confide, threatening to discover the whole plot, and all who were concerned in it, if they did not, as she was very confident they might, if their courage did not fail them, seize on the emperor, and bring him prisoner to Constantinople. As for herself, she said she wanted not friends to intercede for her, to whose intercession the emperor, however provoked, could not but pay great regard, especially when backed with filial duty, which they would take care to revive. But as for them, death must be their lot, and a most cruel and ignominious death; and she therefore conjured them, as they were reduced to the alternative of destroying the emperor, or being destroyed by him, to summon all their courage, and put him out of a condition of hurting them, promising to reward them, if they succeeded, as she did not doubt they would, with the first employments and dignities of the empire. This letter made a deep impression on their minds; and the danger they were in inspiring them with courage, they resolved, at a private meeting to bribe the guards at any rate, and entering the emperor's bed-chamber in the night, to seize him, to carry him on board a vessel, and conveying him to Constantinople, deliver him up, unhurt by them, into the hands of Irene. Every thing succeeded to their wish: the guards were easily gained, and the conspirators, entering the room, seized on the emperor, whom they found on his knees at his prayers, and carried him on board a vessel prepared for that purpose, to Constantinople. They arrived early in the morning, and having immediately acquainted Irene with their arrival, they received an order from her to shut up their prisoner in the apartment of the imperial palace called porphyra, that being the most remote from the street. He had been there but a few hours when the barbarous mother, having first advised with Stauracius and the rest of the conspirators, ordered his eyes to be put out; and they were accordingly put out in so cruel a manner, that he died soon after in the utmost agony. Upon his death Irene was proclaimed empress: and thus, what had never before happened, did the empire fall to the distaff.

This is the account the contemporary historians all give us of the usurpation of Irene,¹ a woman, if such an apostate from nature deserves the name of a woman, famous in history for aspiring, by an ambition unpre-

¹ Theoph. in Chron. Theod. Studit. in vit. Taras. Mich. in vit. Theod. Studit. Cedren, &c.

Irene is commended as a saint by the holy men of those days. Her unnatural cruelty not only excused, but justified by Baronius.

cedented in her sex, to the empire, but far more infamous for the methods she pursued to attain it. And yet this monster of wickedness, as she was a zealous promoter of the worship of images, wanted not her panegyrist amongst the holy men of those days; nor does she want her advocates amongst the writers of later times. Theodorus Studita,¹ the greatest saint of that age, styles her an excellent princess, a woman beloved of God, and extols her as the most religious, as the most virtuous of women.² The monk Michael in his life of that saint gives us, in the following words, an account of the present revolution. Constantine, says he, being deprived first of his eye-sight, which he had misused, and afterwards of the empire, his pious mother Irene resumed the government;³ and Theophanes, speaking of the revolution, that happened soon after, when Irene was deposed, and Nicephorus raised to the empire in her room, ascribes the deposing of the most pious Irene to the sins of the people;⁴ nay she has even a place, in the menology of the Greeks, amongst the saints; and the 13th of August is with them the anniversary of St. Irene. To worship images, to promote that worship was with the writers of those days, the height of all perfection, atoned for the blackest crimes, and turned the greatest monsters of wickedness into saints. On the contrary, not to worship images, to oppose that worship, was with them sacrilege, heresy, the height of all wickedness, and turned men, in all other respects of unblemished characters, into monsters of iniquity.

Amongst the modern writers Baronius undertakes not only to excuse, but to justify the cruelty of that inhuman monster to her son. What he says on that head I shall deliver in his own words. "Snares," says he under the year 796, "were laid this year for the emperor Constantine by his mother Irene, which he fell into the year following, and was deprived at the same time of his eyes and his life. An execrable crime indeed, had she not been prompted to it by her zeal for justice. On that consideration she even deserved to be commended for what she did. But it was not by her command he suffered: she only ordered him to be restrained and deprived of his power, which was snatching a sword out of the hand of a madman. Christ has taught us that it is great piety to be, on such an occasion, cruel to a son, saying, 'he that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me,'⁵ and, think not that I came to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a

sword.¹ In more ancient times the hands of parents were armed, by God's command, against their children worshipping strange gods, and they, who killed them, were commended by Moses, saying, 'you have consecrated to day your hands to the Lord, even every man upon his son and his father, (whom they killed) that he may bestow upon you a blessing.'² It matters much with what intention a person acts. Had Irene, out of ambition or a desire of reigning, plotted against her son, she had thereby rendered herself more detestable even than Agrippina, the mother of Nero, who chose her son should reign even at the expense of her own life. For, being foretold by a soothsayer, that if he ever reigned, he would kill his mother, she is said to have answered, let him kill her on condition he reigns, 'occidat modo imperet.'³ But as Irene was supposed to have done what she did, (that is, to have deposed her son, who alone had a right to reign, and murdered him) for the sake of religion, and love of justice, she was still thought by the eastern writers, who were eye-witnesses of the fact, and men of great sanctity, worthy of praise and commendation.⁴ Thus does the annalist strive to clear that monster of cruelty and wickedness, nay and blasphemously to justify from the Old and New Testament, and the doctrine of our Savior, one of the most horrid murders we read of in history. But that Constantine was not only seized and confined, as the annalist pretends, but deprived of his eyes by the command of his mother, is attested by Theophanes, one of the holy men, whom Baronius supposes to have been eye-witnesses of the fact, "They put out his eyes," says that writer, "by the advice of his mother and her counsellors, with so much cruelty, that he immediately expired."⁵ He adds, that the sun was darkened for seventeen days, heaven punishing with so long a darkness those, who had for ever deprived their sovereign of the comfort of light. To suppose with the holy men of those days, that the unnatural mother was prompted by her love of justice, and zeal for religion, to conspire against her son and her sovereign, to depose and to murder him, is supposing she was prompted by her love of justice to commit the most crying injustice, and by her zeal for religion the blackest of crimes. Her love of justice, her zeal for religion would have prompted her, had she had any, to divert her son with her good advice from abusing his power, whereas from history it appears, that he never abused it, that in no instance whatever he acted contrary to religion or to justice but by her advice and at her instigation. Had she plotted against her son out of a desire of reigning

¹ He was afterwards appointed abbot of the famous monastery founded by the consul Studius in the suburbs of Constantinople; and from thence he took the name of Studita.

² Theod. apud Bar. ad Ann. 801.

³ Mich. in vit. Theod. Studit.

⁴ Theoph. ad Ann. 593. ⁵ Mat. 10: v. 37.

¹ Mat. 10: v. 34.

² Exod. 32: v. 27, 29.

³ Bar. ad Ann. 796. p. 482.

⁴ Theoph. ad Ann. Iren. Iterum Imper. 1.

Upon the death of Constantine several aspire to the empire. Irene recurs to Charlemagne. Causes a marriage to be proposed between him and her.

in his room, she had been, even according to Baronius, more detestable than Agrippina: but that she did plot against him, that she deposed and murdered him out of a desire of reigning in his room, is as certain, if in history there is any certainty, as it is certain that she reigned; and consequently that she was more detestable than Agrippina. Indeed I see not why the annalist should have thought of comparing at all Irene to Agrippina, or Agrippina to Irene, since the one sacrificed her own life to the desire she had that her son should reign; which might have been owing to an unparalleled fondness, as well as to ambition; whereas the other sacrificed the life of her son to the desire she had of reigning herself, which can only be ascribed to the most criminal ambition, and the most unnatural cruelty. As to the passages alledged by Baronius out of the Scriptures, to pretend by them to excuse, or to justify a mother murdering her son is wantonly abusing the Scriptures, and next to blasphemy. The meaning of our Savior's words is obvious, namely, that we are not to suffer ourselves to be diverted from his service, or from following him, by our attachment to our parents or nearest relations. It was by the express command of God, delivered by Moses, that the parents put their children to death worshiping strange gods, and the children their parents; and the annalist, I suppose, does not pretend that the like command was given to Irene. But there is no wickedness, no crime however enormous, that he had not rather excuse and even sanctify, than allow one, who deserved so well of images, and the worshipers of images, to be guilty of any.

Irene, having seized on the empire in the manner we have seen, made it her study to gain the affections of the soldiery and the people; of the soldiery by largesses, of the people by remitting or lessening the taxes, and pretending great zeal for the worship of images. But as the royal family was extinct, Constantine having, at the instigation of his mother, put all to death, who had, from their birth, any claim to the crown, the nobility were all underhand busy in forming parties, and contriving the means of raising themselves to the empire, for which each of them thought himself better qualified than a woman. Stauracius, Irene's favorite minister, had gained great part of the army, with a design of deposing her, and placing himself on the throne in her room. But he dying before his design was quite ripe for execution, an eunuch, named Aetius, in whom Irene placed an entire confidence, and whom she had raised to the rank of patrician, undertook to get his brother Leo preferred to the imperial dignity, being excluded from it himself as an eunuch. He had procured, with that view, the government of Thrace and Macedon for his brother, as well

as the command of the troops quartered in those two provinces, and engaged, by his generosity, the rest of the army to second, when an opportunity offered, his ambitious designs. Depending upon them he began to act more like a sovereign than a subject, disposing of all the employments, both civil and military, to his friends, without consulting Irene, or so much as acquainting her with it. His conduct gave her great umbrage; but suspecting all about her alike, she resolved to recur to Charlemagne, who, she was informed, had been lately proclaimed by the Romans emperor of the west; to conclude upon the best terms she could, a treaty of alliance and friendship with that warlike prince, and engage him by that means to maintain her on the throne. This resolution she took the more readily, as Charlemagne was then making great military preparations, with a design, as was believed, to invade the island of Sicily, and it was publicly said at Constantinople that so important a war required an emperor. The person she chose to employ on that occasion, and send into France was Leo, captain of her guards; and as in him she placed an entire confidence, she privately charged him to propose a marriage between her and Charlemagne, not that she intended such a marriage should ever take place, but hoping she should thus not only divert him from making war on the empire, which she was sensible would end in her ruin, but engage him to espouse her cause, and undertake, with great zeal, her protection against all her enemies, both domestic and foreign. The proposal was quite unexpected, but received, as we may well imagine, by Charlemagne, with the greatest satisfaction. To marry Irene was uniting at once both empires in his person, and acquiring more extensive dominions, without striking a blow, than he could promise himself from a long war, however successful. He therefore not only consented to so advantageous a proposal, but impatient to see himself vested with so extensive a power, he sent back with the ambassador, whom he had entertained for some time with the greatest magnificence, Jesse, bishop of Amiens, and a count named Helingaude, to remove the difficulties that might be started at the court of Constantinople to obstruct the match, and put the last hand, in his name, to the treaty. His ambassadors were accompanied by a nuncio from the pope, who, being acquainted by him with the proposal of Irene, was no less impatient than he to see it brought to a happy issue, sensible that were Charlemagne master of the eastern empire, he should, under him, hold undisturbed his temporal dominions in Italy, which the Greeks still claimed, and at the same time see his authority, which was but very little regarded in the east, as much respected there, even by his haughty rival the patriarch of

The great lords of the empire, alarmed at the proposal, resolves to depose her;—[Year of Christ, 802.] Nicephorus raised to the throne and solemnly crowned. The behavior of Irene on this occasion.

the imperial city, as it was respected by all in the west.

The ambassadors were, in appearance, received by Irene with uncommon marks of joy; and without loss of time they entered, in conjunction with the pope's nuncio, upon the subject of their embassy. They proposed a marriage between the empress of the east, and the emperor of the west, and an union of the two empires as highly advantageous to both. The proposal alarmed Aetius, and all the great lords of the court, well apprised that such a marriage, should it ever take place, as they apprehended it might, not being privy to the true design of Irene, would defeat all their measures at once, and leave them no hopes of raising themselves, even upon her demise, to the throne. They therefore left nothing unattempted they could think of to divert her from hearkening to a proposal, which they said she could not agree to without exposing herself to the danger of forfeiting the power she at present enjoyed, and with it the crown; since the king of the Franks, accustomed to govern alone, would engross the whole power himself, and the Greeks, however pleased with her administration, would choose rather to drive her from the throne, than suffer themselves to be thus excluded from the imperial dignity, and governed by a stranger, nay, by an open and avowed enemy both to them and the empire. But Irene still pretending, chiefly with a design to awe the eunuch Aetius, who ruled with an absolute sway, to be rather inclined than averse to the proposed marriage, several of the nobility, thinking they could by no other means, but by deposing her, prevent their being governed either by a stranger, or an eunuch, resolved to depose her accordingly, and to raise one of their own body to the empire in her room.

The person they chose was the patrician Nicephorus; and having appointed the 30th of October for the execution of their design, they repaired, in the evening of that day, to the great palace, pretending, as Irene did not reside there, that they came from her; that she, no longer able to bear with the insolent and haughty behavior of the eunuch Aetius, had resolved, in the end, to take a partner in the empire capable of curbing his insolence; that she had chosen for that purpose the patrician Nicephorus, and charged them to place him on the throne. As they were all persons of the greatest distinction, the soldiery, who guarded the palace, suspecting no deceit, not only admitted but joined them, proclaiming, without further inquiry, Nicephorus emperor. Hereupon proper persons were immediately dispatched by the conspirators into the different quarters of the city with the news of the election of Nicephorus; and they gave every where out that Irene herself had chosen him for her partner

in the empire. Thus was Nicephorus, before midnight, acknowledged emperor by the whole city, and without the least opposition, the conspirators having taken care to place guards in all the avenues to the palace of Eleutherius, where the empress resided, to prevent her from receiving any intelligence of what passed, or contradicting what they gave out. Early next morning the new emperor was solemnly crowned in the church of St. Sophia, a strong body of troops being first sent to surround on all sides the palace of the empress, with a strict charge to suffer none to go out, or to enter it. Thus she was kept closely confined that whole day under the painful uncertainty of her lot, quite ignorant of what passed in the city, but suspecting the worst. The day following, the new emperor, having caused the empress to be conveyed, under a strong guard, to the great palace, repaired thither attended by almost all the nobility, and entering the apartment to which he had confined her, he addressed her with great outward respect, telling her, that the nobility and the people, thinking the empire should be governed by an emperor, had offered it to him, and forced him, as those who attended him could witness, to accept of the offer; that he appeared before her without any of the badges of his new dignity, and would not assume them without her consent, and therefore begged she would consent to his wearing them, and at the same time discover to him the treasures of the empire, that he might dispose of them according to the exigency of the state.

She answered without betraying the least concern or uneasiness, that she ascribed the present, as she had done all her other misfortunes, to her sins; that since God had been pleased, in his infinite justice and wisdom, to depose her, and raise him to the empire in her room, she adored his providence, and readily submitted to his will; that she begged one favor, which she flattered herself he would not refuse her, namely, that he would allow her to spend the rest of her days, as a private person, in the palace of Eleutherius, since she herself had built it, and that upon his promising to comply with that request, which she hoped he would not think unreasonable, she should discover and deliver up to him, without concealing or reserving for herself the smallest sum, the treasures of the empire. Nicephorus bound himself by a solemn oath to grant her, upon that condition, her request. But no sooner had she put him in possession of the treasures, than the emperor apprehending, as he was well acquainted with her unbounded ambition, her craft and her intriguing genius, that notwithstanding her pretended resignation to the will of God, she would be ever plotting to recover her former dignity, the rather, as the friends of images were all her friends, that is, the bulk of the people and

Irene is banished and dies:—[Year of Christ, 803.] A solemn embassy sent by the new emperor to Charlemagne, and peace concluded between the two empires. A miraculous sponge discovered at Mantua. Interview between the pope and Charlemagne. The king of Northumberland driven from his kingdom;—Year of Christ, 808.] He is restored by the pope.

the clergy, and the whole body of monks, to prevent the disturbances she might raise by their means, he banished her first to the Isle of Prince not far from Constantinople, and soon after to that of Lesbos, where she died of grief the following year, being strictly guarded day and night, and none allowed to approach her, or afford her the least comfort in her affliction.¹ Irene was, it must be owned, a woman of most extraordinary parts, scarce to be matched for her abilities and address by any of her own sex, and by very few of ours; but one, who stuck at nothing, committing, without remorse, the blackest crimes, to gratify her ambition. Had she with as much zeal opposed as she promoted the worship of images, the unparalleled wickedness of such a monster would have supplied the monkish writers with ample matter for invectives, and she would have met with no quarter at their hands. But as she promoted that superstition, they have not only spared her, but filled their writings with her praises, her zeal for the reigning superstition counterbalancing with them, and covering the multitude of her crimes.

This unexpected revolution happened while the ambassadors, sent by Charlemagne to conclude the marriage between him and Irene, were still in Constantinople; and it utterly defeated all their measures, and the ambitious views of their master. However the new emperor was no sooner settled on the throne than he sent for them, and receiving them in a most obliging manner, assured them, that he intended ever to maintain a sincere friendship with the king of the Franks; and not satisfied with charging them to acquaint their master with his pacific disposition, he sent with them on their return to France, a bishop and three abbots, with the character of his ambassadors, and full power to conclude a lasting peace between the two nations. The ambassadors were well received by Charlemagne, and a peace was concluded on the following terms: I. That the Greeks should acknowledge Charlemagne for emperor of the west, and allow him that title. II. That they should afford no kind of assistance to the dukes of Benevento, who depending upon their friendship and protection were ever raising new disturbances in Italy. III. That the western empire should not extend beyond the dukedom of Benevento, and consequently that the remaining part of Italy, lying between that dukedom and the straits of Messina, with the island of Sicily, should belong to the eastern empire, and be peaceably possessed by Nicephorus, and his successors in the imperial throne.²

Charlemagne received the ambassadors at Saltz in Alsace; and while he was yet there news was brought him, that a sponge was discovered at Mantua, steeped in the blood of our Savior, which was still fresh, and wrought great miracles. It was supposed, upon what foundation I know not, to have been left there by the Roman soldier, who pierced our Savior's side with a spear, and is now honored in the church of Rome as a saint under the name of Longinus. This important piece of intelligence Charlemagne immediately imparted to the pope, desiring him to repair to Mantua, to inquire there, into the truth of the matter, and acquaint him therewith. In compliance with his desire the pope set out without delay for Mantua, and being on his arrival there, fully satisfied as to the authenticity of the relic, (for he himself saw both the blood and the sponge, and the same sponge or another like it, is seen and worshiped there to this day) he gave notice thereof to Charlemagne, expressing at the same time a desire to celebrate with him, wherever he pleased, the festival of the nativity of our Savior. Charlemagne chose Quiercy, and sending his son Charles, king of Neustria, as far as St. Maurice in Valais, to meet his holiness, he went himself from Aix-la-Chapelle, where he then was, to Reims, received the pope there with extraordinary marks of friendship and esteem, and went from thence together with him to Quiercy. There they kept their Christmas, and both repairing from thence to Aix, Charlemagne, after spending eight days in that place with the pope, dismissed him loaded with rich presents, and accompanied by some of the chief nobility, who were ordered to attend him, as he proposed returning through Bavaria, as far as Ravenna.¹

From this time we find nothing in history of Leo, nothing at least worthy of notice, till the year 808, when he is said to have restored, jointly with the emperor Charlemagne, Eardulph, king of Northumberland, driven out by his subjects, to his kingdom. Of this event Eginhard gives us the following account: "In the mean time," says he, "the king of the Northumbrians, by name Eardulph, being driven from his kingdom and country, came from the island of Britain to the emperor, and having acquainted him with the affair he came upon, he goes to Rome, and returning from thence is restored to his kingdom by the legates of the pope and our lord the emperor."² Baronius adds: "the king was restored without opposition, all deeming it a crime not to obey the Roman pontiff, or to oppose so great an emperor. Here you have seen," continues the annalist, addressing his reader, "the authority of the Roman pontiff expressed in deeds.

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. Ir. iter. Iperatric. 5. & Niceph. 1.

² Eginhard. in vit. Carol. Mag. & Monach. Sangalens. de rebus bellicis Carol. Mag.

¹ Annal. Metens.

² Eginhard. in Annal.

The question concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost revived, and decided in a council at Aix-la-Chapelle; [Year of Christ, 809.]

For the emperor, sensible of his own want of authority to restore the deposed king, and knowing he might be restored by the authority of the pope, he sent him to Rome to the pope to be restored by his authority to his kingdom and dignity. Here you have likewise seen what great regard the English paid to the pope; for however enraged against their king, however inflamed with the desire of reigning, they did not refuse to receive the very king, whom they had driven out, but immediately obeyed.¹ Thus Baronius. But not the least notice is taken by any of our historians of the restoration of Eardulph; nay, they rather seem to suppose, that he never was restored; for they tell us, that the kingdom of Northumberland continued involved in the utmost confusion, and in a state of anarchy, from the death of Ethelred, murdered in 794, to the year 827, when Egbert, king of the West Saxons, got possession of that kingdom.² In the chronicle of Mailros, notice is taken of the expulsion of Eardulph, and it is said there, that upon his expulsion the kingdom of Northumberland continued many years without a king;³ and M. Westminster tells us, that Alwold, who drove Eardulph from the throne, dying after a reign of two years only was succeeded by Eandred, who reigned thirty-two years.⁴ Our historians therefore knew nothing of the restoration of Eardulph, but suppose, on the contrary, that he never was restored. Some foreign writers indeed tell us that he was restored; but they either ascribe his restoration equally to the pope and the emperor, or to the emperor alone. "He was restored," says Eginhard, "by the legates of the pope and our lord the emperor."⁵ "The deposed and banished king," say Ado and Aventinus,⁶ "repaired to the court of Charlemagne, went from thence in pilgrimage to Rome, and on his return from that city was attended by the ambassadors of the pope and the emperor, into Britain." But Siegbert, taking no notice of the pope, only says, "that the king of the Northumbrians was restored by the emperor Charlemagne to his kingdom and his country."⁷ Upon the whole, therefore, either Eardulph never was restored, or if he was, his restoration was owing, not to the authority, but to the interposition and good offices of the pope and the emperor, or of the emperor alone; and Baronius might at least, as well have alledged his restoration as an instance of the sovereign power of the emperor over the kingdoms and princes of

England, as of the sovereign power of the pope.

About this time was moved, or rather was revived a question in France, that in the following centuries made a great noise in the church; namely, whether the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son, or only from the Father. I say revived, the same question having been proposed and discussed in the council held under Pepin at Gentilli in 767, as has been related above.¹ The acts of that council have been long since lost; but it is highly probable it was there declared, that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son; for such was, at this time, the doctrine of the Gallican church. The fathers of the first four centuries seem to have all held the same doctrine; but it had not yet been defined by any general council. The first council of Constantinople had indeed added to the symbol of Nice, that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father, but did not determine whether he proceeded, in like manner, from the Son. However in the fifth and sixth centuries the churches of Spain added to the symbol of Nice and Constantinople the words "and from the Son." Their example was followed by most of the Gallican churches, where the symbol was read and sung in their service with that addition. But a monk of Palestine, by name John, having, at this time, declared for the opposite opinion, and gained a great many followers, the question, "whether the Holy Ghost proceeded only from the Father?" was revived and anew debated in France. Whether the monk came himself into that kingdom, or only some of his disciples, we know not; but certain it is, that several there, hearing the arguments, that were alledged in favor of his opinion, began to waver and question the truth of the doctrine, which they had, till then, held and professed.² Charlemagne therefore to prevent the misunderstanding and division, that might be thereby occasioned amongst the bishops and clergy of his kingdom, thought it advisable to have the point in dispute timely decided by a council; and he assembled one accordingly at Aix-la-Chapelle in the month of November of the following year 809. As none assisted at this council from the pope, nor indeed was any notice given him of its meeting, the point in dispute was fairly debated, and the reasons for and against the two opposite opinions patiently heard, and impartially examined. The disturbances and disagreements we read of amongst the bishops, in most other councils, were owing to the intrigues of the legates of the popes, their holinesses having before-hand decided the point in controversy at Rome, and charged their legates to get their decision by all means ap-

¹ Bar. ad Ann. 808. p. 549. 950.

² Malmsh. de gest. Reg. Angl. l. 1. c. 3. Vide Harpsfield Hist. Eccl. secul. 8. c. 21.

³ *Reverend Anglican Script.* apud Gal. vol. 2. p. 141.

⁴ M. Westm. Flor. Hist. Ang. p. 152.

⁵ Eginhard. ubi supra.

⁶ Ado Vien. Chron. ad Ann. 809. Aventin. Annal. Boior. l. 4. p. 210.

⁷ Siegb. Chron. ad Ann. 808.

¹ See p. 111.

² Eginhard in Annal. Ado in Chron.

Conference between the pope and the envoys of Charlemagne. The pope will not allow the words "and from the Son" to be added to the symbol.

proved by the council, or at least to approve no other. For it was not only to the council of Trent, but to most other councils, that the pope's legates carried the Holy Ghost in their cloak-bags.

What was the decision of the present council, history does not inform us. But as Charlemagne wrote, on that occasion, a long letter to the pope, filled with an infinite number of passages from the Old and New Testaments, as well as from the Fathers, showing, or calculated to show, that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son, there is no room to doubt but that was the doctrine defined by the council. With that letter the emperor dispatched to Rome, Bernard or Bernair bishop of Worms, and Adelar abbot of Corbie, who had two long conferences with the pope; and both turned upon these two points; whether it was an article of faith, that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Son as well as from the Father? And whether the words "and from the Son, filioque," might be added to the symbol, and the symbol might be read in the public service, or sung, with that addition, as was practised, at this time, by the Gallican church? In answer to the first question the pope, having heard with great attention, "diligentissime auditis," the authorities the envoys produced to satisfy him that the doctrine of the Gallican church was entirely agreeable to the doctrine of the Scriptures and the fathers, allowed it to be an article of faith that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Son as well as from the Father, and at the same time declared that he would communicate with none, who held or professed the opposite opinion. Since you allow it to be an article of faith, replied the envoys, are we not bound publicly to teach it, that they, who are ignorant of it, may know it, and they be confirmed in it, who know it? You are bound to teach it, answered the pope. But can one be saved, said the envoys, who either does not know this doctrine, or does not believe it? Whoever has heard it, replied the pope, and has penetration enough to understand it, but yet will not believe it, cannot be saved. In our holy faith there are many profound mysteries, which some do, and some do not understand for want of age or capacity; and I therefore say, that whoever understands that doctrine, but will not believe it, cannot be saved. Leo was, as is manifest from this answer, of opinion that no man is bound to believe what he cannot understand. But by his successors men are daily damned for not believing mysteries, which they themselves own to be incomprehensible, that is, quite unintelligible. Since we are bound to teach the present doctrine, answered the envoys, have we, or have we not done amiss in adding it to the symbol, and causing it to be read and sung

there in our service? We know that the words "and from the Son" were not put into the symbol by the council, that composed it, and are not ignorant that the following councils forbid any new symbol to be made, or any thing to be added to, to be struck out of, or to be changed in the present symbol. But had they added the above mentioned words, we should, in that case, be allowed both to read and to sing them in our service. And are they not to blame for not adding them, since by the addition of four syllables only "filioque, and from the Son," they would have made known to all future ages so important a mystery? Had they added them, replied the pope, they might both be read and sung in the service: but as I dare not say they would have done amiss had they added them, neither dare I say they did amiss in omitting them, and forbidding them, or any other words whatever to be added to their symbol. They were guided and directed not by human wisdom, but by wisdom from above. But you seem to entertain a mighty opinion of yourselves. As for me, far from preferring myself to them, I should think it the height of presumption to put myself upon the level with them. Far be it from us, said the envoys here to think otherwise of ourselves: we mean no more than to be useful to our brethren; and as many have learnt that mystery by hearing it read and sung in the symbol, who otherwise never would have known it, we think it should rather be added to the symbol, than so many thousands be left in their ignorance. Here the pope asked them, whether they were for adding to the symbol all the articles of the catholic faith, that were not contained in it? And upon their answering that they were not all alike necessary to salvation, he maintained that some however were, but being pressed by the envoys to point them out, he desired time to recollect them, that nothing might be advanced rashly on so important a subject. And thus ended the first day's conference.

The next day the conference was resumed, when the pope, to prove by instances the truth of what he had advanced the day before, asked the envoys whether they thought it more necessary to believe, or more dangerous not to believe, that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Son as well as from the Father, than that the Son was the Wisdom begotten of the Wisdom, was the Truth begotten of the Truth, and yet that the Father and the Son were by nature but one Wisdom, one Truth. They could not, he said, think it more necessary to believe, or more dangerous to disbelieve the one article than the other; and yet they were not, as he supposed, for adding the one article to the symbol as well as the other, else they must add many others no less important, that would swell the

The emperor Nicephorus killed;—[Year of Christ, 811.] Michael Rhangabe raised to the throne. The patriarch Nicephorus writes to the pope;—[Year of Christ, 812.]

symbol to an immoderate length. The envoys pleaded the practice of their churches; adding, that were they now to strike it out of the symbol, the rule of their faith, the people would no longer deem it an article of faith, but rather conclude the opposite doctrine to be the belief and the doctrine of the church. To remedy that evil the pope proposed the following expedient, namely, not to strike out of the symbol the words "and from the Son" every where at once, which he said might give offence, and make a great noise; but only to forbear reading it with that addition in the king's chapel, since a practice, once established there, would soon become general, and be readily adopted by all other churches.¹ Whether the Gallican church continued to keep those words in, or struck them out of the symbol agreeably to the practice of the Roman church, and the advice of the pope, we know not. But as for the pope himself, to show that he did not approve of that addition, he caused two tables of silver to be set up at the tomb of St. Peter, and the symbol to be engraved in Greek on the one, and on the other in Latin, without the words "and from the Son,"² which, however, were by his successors afterwards added to the symbol, on what occasion we shall see in the sequel.

In the mean time in the east was killed in battle by the Bulgarians, the emperor Nicephorus; and with him was cut off almost the whole army, and the flower of the nobility of the empire. His body being found among the slain, the king of the Bulgarians, having caused his head to be cut off, and kept it some time exposed to the view and the insults of his soldiery, enclosed the skull in silver, and used it thus inclosed instead of a cup. Nicephorus is said to have befriended the Manichees and the Athingani,³ and to have exceeded all the princes who reigned before him, in lewdness, cruelty and avarice. But it is to be observed, that he favored the Iconoclasts; that he taxed the clergy as well as the laity; that he took the vessels of silver and gold from the churches to defray the expenses of the wars he waged with the enemies of the Christian religion and the empire; that pursuant to the decree of a council held at Constantinople he banished several monks, and among the rest

the two great saints Theodore Studita and Plato, for raising disturbances in the church, and lastly, that he drove from the throne the great patroness of images St. Irene, deprived her of the power she had acquired by the murder of her son, and sent her into exile. Nicephorus being dead, Michael, surnamed Rhangabe, (the name of his grandfather) who had married Procopia, the late emperor's daughter, was by the senate, and the few officers, who had escaped the general slaughter, proclaimed emperor in his room, and on the 5th of October of the present year solemnly crowned by the patriarch.¹ He enriched with magnificent presents the churches and monasteries; recalled from exile, and set at liberty the monks, whom his predecessor had banished or confined; issued an edict commanding the Manichees to be put to the sword throughout the empire, and moved with divine zeal, spared none, who opposed the worship of images, or refused to worship them; caused a hermit, who had impiously presumed to take down an image of the virgin Mary, to be apprehended, and his tongue to be plucked out, which was attended with the death both of his body and his soul; allowed no liberty of conscience, but obliged all to profess the same faith, shewing no mercy to those who dissented from the church, and was therefore a prince, or is represented by the writers of those times as a prince, in whom centered all virtues, without the alloy of one single vice.

He was no sooner raised to the throne than Nicephorus, who had succeeded Tarasius in the see of Constantinople ever since the year 806, but had not been allowed by the late emperor to keep any correspondence with Rome, wrote a long letter to the pope to acquaint him with his promotion, to give him an account of his faith, which he said was entirely agreeable to that of the Roman church, the mother of all churches, and to beg his communion. From his letter it appears, that he had succeeded Tarasius in the office of secretary to Constantine and Irene, and that tired of the world, he had resigned his employment and retired to the desert, but upon the death of Tarasius had been recalled by the emperor Nicephorus to Constantinople, and obliged, though yet a layman, to accept of the patriarchal dignity.² He pleaded for his not writing sooner, as he ought to have done, and would have done with great pleasure, the prohibition of the emperor jealous of any intercourse between the two sees; and with his letter he sent, as a present to his fellow bishop, a rich "encolpium," that is, a reliquary in the form of a cross containing a piece of the true cross, or the reliques of some saint.³ These "encol-

¹ Concil. t. 7. 1194. Bar. ad Ann. 609, p. 566.

² Anast. in Leon. 3.

³ The Athingani were a race of people who, wandering from their native country, Phrygia and Lycæna, first into Egypt, and from thence into most other countries, lived by soothsaying and telling of fortunes. From the word Athingani, Goarus derives the Italian word Zingari, in English *gypsies*, and pretends the pilfering stragglers, whom the Italians call Zingari, and we call gypsies, or Egyptians, to come originally from them.—(Goar. in not. ad hunc locum.) The Athingani were baptized, but conformed in every thing else to the law of Moses and the ceremonies of the Jews. The emperor Michael, surnamed Balbus, is said to have been of that sect.—(Constantin. Porphyrogen, l. 2. n. 3.)

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. Mich. 1.

² Ep. Niceph. apud Bar. ad Ann. 811. p. 582.

³ Vide Ducang. ad Alexiad. Annæ Comnenæ, p. 247. & seq.

Michael resigns the empire to Leo, the Armenian;—[Year of Christ, 813.] Charlemagne dies;—[Year of Christ, 814.]

piums" bishops used to wear in those days hanging from their necks. The patriarch takes care to declare, with great zeal, for the worship of images as a practice coeval with the Christian religion, and does not at all doubt but that he shall soon have the satisfaction of seeing it universally established by the vigilant care, and indefatigable zeal of the most religious emperor, who seems to have been sent down for that purpose from heaven.

But that satisfaction the good patriarch never enjoyed, the most religious emperor resigning the empire, when he had held it scarce two years, and another, as zealous an enemy to images as he was a friend, being raised to the throne in his room. For Michael being most shamefully defeated by the Bulgarians, with the loss of almost his whole army, he was affected with that misfortune to such a degree, that he resolved to quit the empire, and resign it to one more capable of defending it than himself. The person he chose was Leo, surnamed from his country the Armenian, who had distinguished himself on all occasions by his courage and conduct, and was deemed at that time the best commander in the whole empire. But Leo opposed his choice; and he was the only person in the empire who opposed it; nor could he be prevailed upon to yield to the earnest entreaties of the senate, the patriarch, and the soldiery, till news was brought him, that the king of the Bulgarians, elated with his late success, was advancing with long marches to the imperial city. He then accepted the empire to save it, and was solemnly crowned by the patriarch amidst the loud acclamations of the people; which Michael no sooner understood, than he retired with his wife and his children to the monastery of Pharus, and there they all took the monastic habit, lest living in the world they should give occasion of jealousy to the new emperor. In the mean time the king of the Bulgarians advancing to the very gates of the imperial city, Leo marched out against him with the few troops, that had escaped the late slaughter, and obliged him to retire. He withdrew to Adrianople, and having closely besieged that city, he reduced it at last.¹

¹ Theoph. ad Ann. Incar. secund. Alexandrin. 805. Thus Theophanes, who lived at this time in Constantinople, and was an eye-witness of what he wrote. But the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenetus, who reigned in the beginning of the following century, gives us a very different account of the promotion of Leo. For he tells us, that the emperor had the advantage in the engagement with the Bulgarians till Leo, who aspired to the empire, and was sensible he could never attain it, should Michael return victorious to Constantinople, drew off the forces under his command; which so disheartened the imperial troops, that they immediately betook themselves to a disorderly flight, and left the Bulgarians masters of the field. He adds, that the emperor from the field of battle fled to Constantinople, and that Leo, by inveighing against him, in his absence, as a weak, effeminate and cowardly prince, prevailed on the soldiery to offer the empire to him. Thus Porphyrogenetus, and

With these words Theophanes closes his chronography begun with the first year of the reign of Dioclesian.¹ Of the zeal of the new emperor for the purity of the Christian religion, and his indefatigable endeavors to banish from the church, and the empire, the worship of images, which he thought inconsistent with that purity, I shall have occasion to speak in the sequel. To return in the mean time to the west.

The following year, 814, died at Aix-la-Chapelle, the great friend of the popes, and the chief author of their temporal grandeur the emperor Charlemagne;² and no sooner was the news of his death brought to Rome, than the relations of the late pope Hadrian, and their partisans, who had used the present pope with so much barbarity in the be-

after him Cedrenus with the whole tribe of the more modern writers both Greek and Latin, all prejudiced to such a degree against Leo, on account of his aversion to images, as to prefer the authority of an historian, who lived an hundred years after those times, and was no less biassed than they, to that of one, who lived at that very time, who was an eye-witness of what he wrote, and whose testimony on all other occasions they quote as decisive. Porphyrogenetus himself owns that according to some writers, the emperor's guards and those about him, were the first, who fled; that Leo fought valiantly, and that the emperor, in retiring from the army, left Leo behind him as a bulwark to awe the barbarians, and restrain them from ravaging the country and destroying the inhabitants.—(Porphyr. ad Ann. I. Leon.)

¹ The chronography of Theophanes was continued by the following writers, namely, Leo, surnamed the Grammarian, was contemporary with those, whose actions he relates; an anonymous author, who wrote the most remarkable events of the reign of the present emperor Leo the Armenian, and is supposed to have flourished in his time; the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenetus, who was raised to the empire in the beginning of the tenth century; Simeon Metaphrastes, and a monk named George. But, with respect to these writers, it is to be observed, that they were all no less zealous advocates for the worship of images than Theophanes himself, and consequently no less biassed in favor of those, who promoted that worship, than prejudiced against all, who opposed it. Hence we shall frequently find the best of men, who were enemies to images, painted by them, without any regard to truth or to conscience, as the worst, and the worst, who were or pretended to be, friends to images, represented and extolled as the best.

² He died on the 28th of January, and was buried the same day. Indeed that custom obtained, generally speaking, during the eight first ages of the church; and hence the day, on which even those popes were buried, who were not buried, as it happened to some, till three or four days after their death, is marked in some pontificals as the day of their death. Over the tomb of the deceased emperor was raised a kind of triumphal arch with the following epitaph: "Sub hoc conditio situm est corpus Karoli, magni atque orthodoxi imperatoris, qui regnum Francorum nobiliter ampliavit, & per annos XLVII. feliciter tenuit. Decessit septuagenarius anno ab incarnatione Domini DCCCXIV. Indictione VII. V kalend. Februarias. It is to be observed that in his epitaph he is not surnamed the Great, but styled Charles, great emperor; and thus he styled himself, in imitation of the Greek emperors, in all his diplomas, that are known to be authentic. Those therefore, in which he is called Charlemagne or "Charles the Great," may be justly looked upon as supposititious. Charlemagne was, as we have seen, no less averse to the worship of images than the emperor Leo or his son Constantine; but yet as he was a friend to the popes, as he made it his study to aggrandize and enrich them, his heresy was by them overlooked, and he extolled as a most pious, a most religious, a most Christian prince at the same time that they inveighed against Leo and Constantine, though guilty of no other heresy, as the worst of heretics.

Conspiracy against the pope, who puts all to death concerned in it;—[Year of Christ, 815.] Leo dies;—[Year of Christ, 816.] In Leo's time, the right hand first deemed the most honorable. Stephen chosen. He obliges the Romans to take an oath of allegiance to Lewis.

ginning of his pontificate, conspired against him anew with a design, not only to depose but to murder him. But the plot being discovered before it was ripe for execution, the pope caused all who were concerned in it to be apprehended, and put to death without mercy. This severity was not at all pleasing to the new emperor Lewis, surnamed the Debonnaire, who had succeeded his father Charlemagne in the empire of the west; and he was no sooner informed of it, than he commanded his nephew Bernard, king of Italy, to repair forthwith to Rome, in order to take cognizance of the whole affair upon the spot. The king, having spent some time at Rome in examining the enemies, as well as the friends of the pope, and receiving the depositions of men of both parties, dispatched count Gerholt with an account of the whole into France. At the same time the pope sent John, bishop, Theodore, nomenclator, and duke Sergius, with the character of his legates, to justify his conduct to the emperor, and clear him from the crimes that were laid to his charge; which they are said to have done to the entire satisfaction of Lewis.¹ But the pope being, in the mean time, seized with a dangerous malady, the people rose in a tumultuous manner, burnt or pulled down all the farm houses he had built in the country, plundered the farms, to recover, they said, what had been unjustly taken from them, and would have committed great disorders in Rome itself, had they not been prevented by Winigisus, duke of Spoleti, sent by Bernard, king of Italy, with a body of troops to quell and disperse the riotous multitude.²

The pope was taken ill in the beginning of the year 816; and he died of that illness on the eleventh of June, having borne it the whole time with great resignation and exemplary patience. He had governed the Roman church twenty years, five months, and sixteen days; and being himself enriched by the unparalleled generosity of

Charlemagne, he more enriched the churches of Rome with costly and valuable ornaments than all his predecessors together. He was buried in the Vatican; and in process of time an altar was built over his tomb, and under the altar were deposited together with his, the bodies of Leo I. II. and IV. as appears from the stone that was placed over their bodies by pope Paschal II. in the close of the eleventh century, with the following epitaph: "Under this altar lie the bodies of the holy pontiffs and confessors, Leo I. II. III. and IV."³ In the year 1608, the bodies of these four popes were translated by Paul V. from the old to the new church of St. Peter; and there they are all four worshiped to this day,⁴ though Leo III. has not yet been honored with a place in the calendar. Of this pope we are told, that he used to say seven masses, and said sometimes nine on one day.⁵ Indeed it was no unusual thing for a priest to say what number of masses he pleased till the time of pope Alexander II., who about the year 1070, restrained all priests to two masses only, the one for the living, and the other for the dead. They were afterwards confined by Innocent III. and Honorius III., to one mass a day, the festival of our Savior's nativity excepted, when all are still allowed to say three.⁴

It is observable, that in the time of Leo III., the right hand began first to be deemed the most honorable, St. Paul being constantly placed on the right hand of St. Peter in all the mosaic pieces or pictures of those two apostles, that were done before his time, and as constantly on his left in all, that were done in his time. However, upon his death the ancient custom took place anew, and the two apostles were represented in the same manner after his time as before it, till the pontificate of Nicholas IV. raised to the see in 1288, when the right hand was deemed again the most honorable; and so it has continued to be deemed from that time to the present.⁵

STEPHEN IV., NINETY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO ARMENUS, *Emperor of the East.*—LEWIS THE DEBONNAIRE, *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 816.] In the room of Leo was chosen, after a vacancy of ten days, Stephen, the fourth of that name. He was a native of Rome, of an illustrious family, had been educated in the Lateran under pope Hadrian, and ordained first subdeacon, and afterwards deacon by Leo, who entertained, as well as the people, and the

rest of the clergy, a mighty opinion of his virtue and learning.

He was no sooner ordained than he required the whole people of Rome to take the same oath of allegiance to the emperor

¹ Vide Aleman. in Pariet. Lateran. c. 10.

² Henschen ad diem xi. April.

³ Walfrid. Strabo de reb Ecclesiast. c. 21.

⁴ Vide Card. Bona rer. Liturgic. l. 1. c. 18. & Marten de Antiquis Eccles. ritib. l. 1. c. 3.

⁵ Vide Paperbroc. in Conatu. Chron. Hist.

¹ Anast. in Leon. III. Eginhard. in Annal. ad Ann. 815.

² Astron. in vit. Ludovic. Pii.

Stephen goes into France. Crowns the emperor. Returns to Rome. Stephen dies;—[Year of Christ, 817.]
Paschal chosen. Sends legates to acquaint the emperor with his promotion.

Lewis, which they had taken, under his predecessors, to his father Charlemagne. At the same time he dispatched legates into France to acquaint the emperor with his promotion, and signify to him his earnest desire of conferring with him in person in what place soever he should think fit to appoint.¹ The emperor readily complied with his desire, ordered his nephew Bernard, king of Italy, to attend him on his journey, and having appointed the city of Reims for the place of their meeting, he repaired thither, in person, as soon as he heard of his arrival in France. When the pope was yet at some distance from the city, he sent out Hildebald, his first chaplain, Theodulph, bishop of Orleans, and John, archbishop of Arles, attended by a great number of other ecclesiastics, all in their sacerdotal attire, to meet him, and went in person, as he approached the city, with all the great lords of the court to receive him. He waited his arrival on horse-back at the monastery of St. Remigius, a little way out of the city, and dismounting as his holiness approached, he fell three times prostrate on the ground, welcoming him with the words of the Scripture, "blessed is he, who cometh in the name of the Lord." The pope dismounted at the same time, and raising the emperor from the ground returned thanks to the Almighty for granting him the wished for satisfaction of seeing a second king David. They then embraced each other with great affection and tenderness, and walking together, with all their attendants, to the church, assisted at the Te Deum, which was sung with the utmost solemnity. After the Te Deum they prayed in silence till the pope rising up sung a hymn with his clergy in praise of the emperor, which ended with a prayer for his health and his welfare. From the church the pope withdrew with the emperor into the monastery, and there acquainted him with the motives of his journey, laying before him the state of the church and the city of Rome. As the pope was not a little fatigued with his journey, the

emperor leaving him after a very short conference, returned to the city.¹

The next day the emperor made a grand entertainment for the pope; and the day following the pope made the like entertainment for the emperor. One of the chief motives of the popes journey into France was, it seems, to have the satisfaction of consecrating and crowning the emperor; and that ceremony he performed, with great solemnity the first Sunday after his arrival at Reims. He crowned both the emperor, and his wife Hermenegard, whom he styled empress, with crowns of gold, enriched with a great number of precious stones, which he had brought with him for that purpose from Rome. He is said to have made many other valuable presents to the emperor, and to have received presents from him in return three times their value.² Anastasius tells us that the emperor even gave a village to St. Peter, on the borders of France, to be forever possessed by him and his successors.³ The pope having spent two months in France, frequently conferring with the emperor about the state of the church and the government of Rome, set out from Reims in the beginning of October on his return to Italy, accompanied by some of the great lords of the Court, whom the emperor had appointed to attend him to Rome. Before he left France he gave the pall to Theodulph, bishop of Orleans; and thenceforth we find that prelate constantly distinguished with the title of archbishop; though instances are not wanting of bishops, after, as well as before the time of Theodulph, who, though distinguished with the pall, were not distinguished with that title.

Of this pope we hear no more till the time of his death, which happened on the 24th of January, 817, about three months after his return to Rome, and seven after his promotion. He died, it seems, suddenly, a rescript being still to be seen, that was signed by him the day preceding his death.⁴ He is said in the copies of Anastasius by a gross mistake, no doubt of the transcribers, to have held the see seven years and as many months.

PASCHAL, NINETY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO ARMENUS, MICHAEL BALEUS, *Emperors of the East*.—LEWIS THE DEBONNAIRE, AND
LOTHARIUS, *Emperors of the West*.]

[Year of Christ 817.] Stephen was buried on the 25th of January, the next day after his death, and on the same day the senate, the clergy and the people chose with one voice Paschal in his room. He was by birth a Roman, the son of Bonosus, and

at the time of his election abbot of the monastery of the protomartyr St. Stephen.⁵

The first care of the new pope was to acquaint the emperor Lewis with his promo-

¹ Eginhard. in *Annal*. Thegan. *Auctor. vit. Ludovic. Pii.*

² Thegan.

³ Anast. in *Steph. IV.*

⁴ Apud Duchesn. i. 3. p. 655. ⁵ Anast. in *Pasch.*

The emperor confirms the donations of his father and grandfather, but adds nothing to them. Theodore Studita implores the protection of the pope against the Iconoclasts;—[Year of Christ, 818.]

tion, and he dispatched accordingly, as soon as he was ordained, his nomenclator Theodore for that purpose into France. He was, it seems, charged by some with having raised himself, by unlawful means, to the chair; in the letter he wrote, after his ordination, to the emperor, he takes great pains to satisfy him, that far from aspiring to the pontifical dignity, he had declined it till the people forced him, and much against his will, to acquiesce in the choice they had unanimously made. As that letter is by a contemporary historian styled an apology,¹ Platina and after him Ciaconius suppose it to have been written by the pope to apologize for his having suffered himself to be ordained before his election was approved by the emperor. But there was no decree at this time either of the pope or the emperor of the west forbidding the pope to be ordained till his election was notified to and approved by the emperor. I say of the emperor of the west; for that custom had indeed obtained while the emperors of the east were masters of Italy; and they took care, as we have seen, to have it strictly complied with till the popes, shaking off all dependence upon them, became their own masters. From that time, that is, from the time of pope Zachary raised to the see in 741, they continued to be ordained, without the approbation of the emperor either of the east or the west, till the year 825, the second of pope Eugene II., who revived the ancient custom in favor of the emperor Lotharius and his successors in the empire, as I shall relate in the sequel.

The emperor received Theodore with extraordinary marks of respect and esteem, honoring in him the vicar of St. Peter, whom he represented, and in the vicar of St. Peter the apostle himself; assured him of his inviolable attachment to the apostolic see, and declared himself unalterably determined to maintain, if necessary, with the whole strength of his kingdoms, the prince of the apostles and his successors, in the quiet possession of all his father and grandfather had by their religion and piety been prompted to give them.² Lewis is said to have not only confirmed on this occasion but enlarged their donations, adding by the famous decree *Ego Ludovicus* the islands of Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily to the domains given to St. Peter by Pepin and Charlemagne.³ But that the donation of Lewis yielding those islands to St. Peter is quite of a piece with the donation of Constantine the Great yielding all Italy to St. Peter may be easily demonstrated. I. For the donations of Pepin and Charlemagne are frequently mentioned by the popes, but by none of them ever is made the least mention of the pretended donation of

Lewis; and he is only commended by them for generously confirming the donations of his father and grandfather. II. The emperors Otho I., and Henry I., enumerate all the countries and places in particular, that were given by Pepin and Charlemagne to St. Peter and his church, and confirm their donations; but knew of none, at least take notice of none, that were given to St. Peter or his church by the emperor Lewis.¹ III. Lewis is supposed by his donation to have yielded to the apostolic see the islands of Corsica, Sardinia and Sicily. But he never was master of Sicily, nor indeed was any of that race, the island of Sicily having been possessed by the emperors of the east till the year 827, when it was betrayed to the Saracens. IV. Lewis in the instrument of his supposed donation is made to decree, that the pope lawfully chosen shall thenceforth be ordained without delay, and that after his ordination he shall send legates to acquaint therewith the emperor and his successors in the empire. But it is very certain, that by pope Eugene II., the immediate successor of the present pope, a decree was issued at the request, not to say the command, of Lotharius, the son and colleague of Lewis in the empire, forbidding the new pope, how lawfully soever chosen, to be ordained till his election was approved by the emperor, or the deputies he should appoint to assist at his ordination. Had Lewis, out of his great regard for the apostolic see, enacted the above-mentioned decree, he would not have suffered it to be thus in a few years reversed and annulled. The decree of pope Eugene was observed with the greatest strictness, during the whole ninth century; and I do not find, that the Roman clergy, though they frequently and loudly complained of it, ever pleaded the decree of the emperor Lewis to exempt themselves from complying with it, which they certainly would have done, had they known of any such decree. Upon the whole, the donation of Lewis was as evidently forged as that of Constantine, and probably forged in the latter end of the eleventh century, Leo Ostensis, who died in the beginning of the twelfth, being the first who mentions it, telling us, that it was made to St. Peter and his vicar pope Paschal, in the palace of Aix-la-Chapelle, in the year 817.²

The election of Paschal was no sooner known in the east than the famous monk Theodore Studita, abbot of the monastery of Studius in the suburbs of Constantinople, wrote to him in his own name, and in the name of four other abbots, to acquaint him with the cruel persecution the orthodox, that is, the worshipers of images, suffered under the Iconoclast emperor Leo, and im-

¹ Auct. vit. Ludovic. Pii.

² Eginhard. in Annal. Auct. vit. Ludovic. Pii. Anast. in Eugen.

³ Apud Gratian. Dist. 63.

¹ Vide Baron. ad Annos 62. & 1014.

² Leo Ostiens. Chron. Cassin. l. I. c. 18.

The emperor's opinion of image worship.

plore his protection.¹ In his letter he exhorts the pope to exert all his zeal on so

¹ Of this persecution, as they call it, the writers of those days give us the following account. Leo, having by a remarkable victory over the Bulgarians, whose numerous army he entirely cut off, established himself firmly on the throne, undertook to reform the abuses, that prevailed in the church, and what to him seemed most of all to stand in need of a reformation, the worship of images. For whether he had been always in his heart an enemy to images, as some write, or was but lately seduced, as others will have it, by a monk named Sabbatius, and persuaded that God alone was to be worshipped, certain it is, that in the year 814, the second of his reign, he first showed himself offended at the worship, that was given to images, and strongly inclined to banish it, as repugnant, in his opinion, to the law of God, from the church and the empire. However, not to trust to his own judgment alone, though he had, it seems, perused, and with great attention, the acts of the two preceding councils, of the council of Constantinople under Copronymus against images, and of Nice under Irene in their favor, he would take no step in a matter of such importance till he had consulted the patriarch, as well as the bishops and all the men of character at that time in the imperial city, and heard the point fairly debated, in his presence, by the learned of both parties. Having therefore assembled, in the imperial palace, a great number of bishops with the patriarch, the senate, the chief of the clergy, and the abbots of all the monasteries in Constantinople, and its neighborhood, he is said, but very improbably, to have taken an image of our Savior out of his bosom, and kissing it, to have addressed them thus: "I agree, as you see, in opinion with you. But some there are, who maintain the contrary opinion, and condemn ours: and I have called together both you and them to hear what you have to offer in support of your opinion, and what they have to offer in support of theirs. If you show that they teach a new doctrine, your opinion shall henceforth prevail; and theirs, if they show that you teach a new doctrine. Had an affair of ever so little moment been referred to me, I ought not to have left it undetermined; much less am I to leave undetermined an affair of infinite moment.—(Michael in vit. Theodor. Studit. & Theosterict. in vit. Nicet.)"

Thus the emperor: but by no means could he prevail on the advocates for images to enter the lists with their adversaries. Some excused themselves on account of the place, saying that matters of religion, that points of faith were to be canvassed and determined in the church, and not in the imperial palace. By others was alleged the obstinacy of heretics, whom they said it was lost labor to attempt to convince; their obstinacy being proof against demonstration itself. Some taxing the emperor to his face with insincerity, hypocrisy, partiality, had the assurance to tell him, that he was too much prepossessed and prejudiced in favor of error to be capable of distinguishing truth from falsehood, or falsehood from truth; and they therefore could not, nor would they stand to his judgment in proving the one, or confuting the other. All this the emperor bore with great temper and patience, only reminding them of the respect, that was due to the imperial dignity, and telling them that every Christian, much more a bishop and teacher of the Christian religion, ought to be ready, whenever he is called upon, to give an account of his religion, and that from their backwardness, their antagonists would conclude, that they distrusted their cause, or wanted arguments to support it. "We have abundance of arguments," replied Theophylactus, bishop of Nicomedia; "but our antagonists have ears and hear not, and it would therefore be to no purpose to produce them." "Our adversaries," added Peter, bishop of Nice, "are patronized and protected by you; and even a Manichee would prove, under your protection, too powerful for us. Here Euthynius, bishop of Sardis, addressing the emperor, "Christ," said he, "from the time he first appeared upon the earth to the present, that is for the space of eight hundred years and upwards, has been painted in all the churches throughout the world, and adored in his pictures. And who dares impugn, alter or condemn a practice handed down to us and approved by the apostles, the martyrs and all the holy fathers? The apostle Paul exhorts us to stand fast, and hold the traditions, which we have been taught, whether by word, or his epistle, and will have us to anathematize and curse even an angel from heaven, should he preach any other Gos-

pel, or doctrine, than what we have received. The holy synod, assembled at Nice by the pious emperors Constantine and Irene, condemned those, who first taught that images were not to be worshipped; and that synod the Son of God signed with his own hand. If any man therefore shall presume to contradict or to alter it, let him be accursed. That the practice of setting up images in churches, or places of worship, was not introduced till the latter end of the fourth century, nor the practice of worshipping them till the latter end of the seventh, or the beginning of the eighth has been shown in the present volume; (See p. 40. 43.) and consequently that neither was a practice derived from the apostles, or the primitive martyrs and fathers. Theodore Studita, the famous champion of images, pretended, that the emperor was not at all to concern himself with the church, or the affairs of the church, "God," said he with the words of the apostle, "having set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers," made no mention of kings, who were therefore to govern the state, but leave the church to be governed by its pastors and doctors. Theodore added, that if the emperor was nevertheless determined, right or wrong, to meddle with ecclesiastical matters, he must let him know, that he would not even hearken to an angel from heaven, should he preach any other doctrine than that he had received, much less would he hearken to him.—(Michael & Theosterict. ubi supra.)

But by God himself, replied the emperor, we are expressly forbidden to make any graven images, to bow down to them, or to worship them. The Jews were forbidden, answered Theodore: but the law, given to them, is not binding with respect to us Christians; else why should not we be circumcised as well as the Jews? Where he ignorantly confounds the ceremonial law with the decalogue. But he had, it seems, perused the acts of the second council of Nice, and read there of a learned bishop wondering at the ignorance of the Iconoclast heretics in alleging against the Christians, words spoken so long ago to the Jews.—(See p. 155.) The emperor maintained that the law given to Moses was binding with respect to the Christians as well as the Jews, our Savior having declared, that he came not to destroy, but to fulfil the law; and consequently if it was idolatry in a Jew to bow down to images and worship them, it was likewise idolatry in a Christian. In answer to that was urged by Theodore the example of our Savior himself, who had sent his picture to Abgarus king of Edessa; (See p. 29.) the example of St. Luke, (See p. 30.) and many others, who had painted him in the earliest times, and whose pictures were still to be seen, and still were worshipped by the faithful; the many advantages attending the use as well as the worship of images, and the uninterrupted practice of the church from the times of Christ and his apostles to the present. The emperor answered, that the use, as well as the worship of images, was of a much later date than he pretended, as some, who were present, would convince him, if he and his brethren would agree to hear them. For to this conference the emperor had invited some of the most zealous and learned Iconoclasts, and among them Anthony, metropolitan of Syleum in Pamphylia, a prelate, perhaps, better acquainted than any of his time with the Scriptures, the writings of the fathers, and the history of the church. But Theodore declaring, in the name of the rest, that far from hearing condemned and accursed heretics, they would not so much as see them, nor meet them, could they avoid it, in the public streets, and at the same time inveighing, without any regard to the imperial dignity, against the emperor himself as a heretic, as an abettor of heretics, as one, who had impiously undertaken, as was apparent from his conduct, to disturb the peace of the church, and banish the true religion from the empire, Leo thought it advisable to dismiss the assembly: and he dismissed it accordingly, having first reprimanded the insolent monk for treating him, he said, not as an emperor, but as the meanest of the populace. The monk Michael, who lived at this time, tells us, that the emperor, transported with rage, drove the holy man with dreadful menaces and opprobrious language from his presence.—(Michael. in vit. Theodor. Studit.) But Theosterictus, who likewise lived at this time, writes that Leo patiently heard him without ever betraying the least resentment or anger: (Theosterict. in vit. Nicet.) and Theosterictus was as much prejudiced against Leo as Michael.

Image worship condemned by the council of Constantinople.

bishops in the west, the wicked heresy that prevailed in the east, and all who professed

The next day the patriarch, by the advice of Theodore, assembled in the great church the bishops and abbots, who the day before had been present at the conference, in order to deliberate, together with them, about the means of maintaining the catholic faith, that is, the worship of images, in opposition to the emperor, should he attempt to banish it, and introduce the so often condemned and anathematized heresy in its room. But the emperor no sooner heard of their thus caballing than he sent them an order by the governor of the city, commanding them to retire forthwith to their respective habitations, and forbear assembling again without his permission or knowledge. Hereupon the monks spreading themselves, at the instigation of Theodore, all over the city, began to exhort the populace to continue steadfast in the religion of their ancestors, to avoid all communication with heretics, especially with the accursed Iconoclasts, and to defend, even at the expence of their lives, the holy images of our Savior and his saints, should any presume to remove or insult them, as they would defend our Savior himself or his saints, since the insults offered to their images, were offered to them. The seditious conduct of the monks obliged the emperor, apprehensive of the consequences that might attend it, to confine them all to their monasteries. At the same time he let the patriarch know, as well as the bishops of his party, that though he would not concern himself with their private opinion, yet he could not allow them to preach a doctrine to the ignorant and undistinguishing multitude, which the most learned amongst them had not been able, or at least had declined to maintain against those, who held and were ready to maintain the opposite doctrine. And he therefore ordered them to observe thenceforth a strict silence concerning images and the worship of images. This order he sent, by the governor of the city, to the patriarch, to the bishops, to the abbots; and all, except Theodore, promised in compliance with it, and promised in writing, as was required by the emperor, thenceforth to forbear all mention, in public, of images or the worship of images. But Theodore, addressing the governor with the words of the two apostles, "whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye," (Acts 4: 19.) told him, that he would rather suffer his tongue to be cut out than observe the enjoined silence only one hour: nay, no sooner did he hear that the patriarch had promised to observe it, than quitting his monastery, though confined to it by an express order from the emperor, and flying to the episcopal palace, he prevailed on the weak prelate not only to recall his promise, but to assemble, in defiance of the emperor's late prohibition, all the bishops, abbots and leading men of the clergy, and extort from them a promise in writing, which they all signed with a cross, binding themselves to defend, if necessary, the holy and venerable images at the expence of their lives. The assembly was scarce dismissed when the emperor, informed of all that had passed, sent one of the chief lords of his court to reproach the patriarch, in his name, with the breach of his promise, and at the same time to let him know, that to prevent the disturbances factionous men might raise in the city, when encouraged by him, he must either comply with the will of his sovereign, or resign his dignity. The patriarch answered, with great resolution and firmness, that the promise he made had given great offence to all good Christians, that he therefore repented his ever having made it, and was determined rather to die a thousand times than betray, by observing it, so good a cause. This answer determined the emperor to remove him; and he sent accordingly an officer to acquaint him with this his determination, and convey him to a monastery on the other side the Bosphorus, which he himself had built. In his room was raised to the patriarchal dignity, Theodotus of Melissa, whom even his avowed enemies allow to have been a person of a noble extraction, of a mild temper, of an engaging behavior, nay, and to have been universally reputed a man of great probity, though his probity, say they, was only affected, being himself an irreconcilable enemy to Christ and his saints in their images, and sparing no pains to gain over others to his detestable heresy.—(Continuat. Anonym. Theoph. Ignat. in vit. Niceph.)

The new patriarch was no sooner consecrated than he appointed, in the emperor's name, all the bishops, abbots, and other ecclesiastics in the city and neighborhood of Constantinople, to meet in the church of

St. Sophia, and there to examine anew, since the controversy about images was revived, and many were offended at the worship, that was given them, whether that worship was agreeable or repugnant to the doctrine of the apostles and the fathers. The patriarch ingeniously owned in the letter he wrote on this occasion, that as for himself, he was of opinion, that such a worship could not be excused from idolatry, since in the Old Testament it was expressly forbidden as idolatrous, and was no-where recommended or allowed in the New. However he was willing, he said, and so was the emperor, to hear what they, who were of a different opinion, had to offer in support of it, and both were ready to receive the doctrine, that should appear to them the best grounded. He added, that the question had indeed been already examined, nay, and had been decided by two different councils, namely, those of Constantinople and Nice, but as their decisions were diametrically opposite to each other, it might still be looked upon as quite undecided; and he therefore flattered himself that none would object to its being examined anew. In compliance with the desire of the emperor and the patriarch the bishops assembled at the time appointed, and with them a great number of other ecclesiastics, and some abbots and monks. But the greater part of the abbots were diverted by Theodore from attending the council, on pretence that it was not lawful to re-examine a doctrine, that had been already examined and defined by a general council; the insolent monk had even the assurance to write to the council in the name of all the abbots, styling them heretics, and declaring, that if Peter and Paul were to come down from heaven, and preach another gospel (besides that, which teaches the worship of images) they would not receive them into their communion.—(Michael. in vit. Theodor.)

As the acts of this council have not been suffered to reach our times, nor indeed any writings whatever against images, all we know of it is, that the council of Constantinople, forbidding the worship of images, was approved and confirmed, and the council of Nice commanding that worship, anathematized and condemned; that many bishops as well as other ecclesiastics, and even some monks, solemnly renounced the worship of images (not convinced, say Michael and Theosterictus, by reasons or arguments, but gained by rich presents or promises of greater preferments.) and that those, who on this occasion changed their opinion, showed themselves ever after the most of all averse to images, and the worship of images.—(Mich. & Theosterict. ibid.) Theosterictus tell us, that such of the bishops as dissented from the rest, and would not together with them, condemn the ancient doctrine of the church, were by them cruelly beaten, and trod under foot in the council. But of that unwarrantable conduct no mention is made by any other contemporary writer; and it is quite inconsistent with the mild temper of the patriarch, and the character of the emperor, who bore so long, and with an unparalleled patience, the opposition and insults he met with from the enthusiastic monks, especially from the author of all the disturbances, Theodore Studita.

"The council was no sooner dismissed than an edict was issued by the emperor, wonderfully calculated," says Theosterictus, "to extirpate the catholic faith, and establish the worst of heresies in its room: for by that edict he ordered all the holy images, even the images of our Savior himself, to be pulled down, to be cast out of the churches and broken, calling them idols, and blasphemously ascribing all the calamities, that had befallen the empire ever since they were restored by the most religious empress Irene, to the vengeance of heaven justly provoked at the idolatrous worship, that was given them. The populace were not, it seems, at this time, so zealously attached to their images, as they were in the time of Leo the Isaurian, the first emperor, who undertook to control that superstition; for I do not find that the imperial officers, who were charged with the execution of the present edict, met with any opposition from them, though they spared no images, but pulled down, effaced, or broke them all in the sight of the people, even those, that were most revered and resorted to for the miracles they were said to work. They questioned perhaps the truth of the miracles, that were said to have been wrought by them to save others, since they could work none to save themselves. However that be, images were once more destroyed throughout the empire, or at least removed, and re-

Theodore Studia writes to the other three patriarchs.

prince of bishops, and his apostolic lord." At the same time he wrote to the other three

moved without the least disturbance, out of the churches and all other public places, and the Christian worship once more restored to its primitive purity. This Theodore could not bear; and he undertook to maintain, in spite of the emperor and in defiance of his edict, the condemned superstition. With that view he ordered his monks to take each of them an image, and walking round the monastery, in procession, with their images in their hands, to sing aloud a hymn, that began with these words, 'we adore thy immaculate image.' The seditious monk flattered himself, that he should thus raise the multitude, and, being backed by them, oblige the emperor to repeal his edict, or at least to connive at a practice, which he could not abolish without exposing himself to the danger of losing his crown, and perhaps his life. But, to his great mortification, not one person joined in the procession, or betrayed the least inclination of rising for the sake of images, against a prince, who had but very lately, by a most glorious victory over the barbarians, delivered the empire, and the imperial city, from impending ruin and destruction. Some, however, apprehending the disturbances the monk might raise in the end, were he suffered thus to insult both the emperor and the council, and stir up the populace, with impunity, to sedition and rebellion, loudly complained of him to Leo, advising him, as he tendered the peace and tranquillity of the church and the empire, to remove out of the way, by some means or other, the only man, who was capable of disturbing them, and made it his study to disturb them. But the tyrant, as he is here styled by the monk Michael, instead of hearkening to them, and causing the refractory and rebellious abbot to be immediately apprehended, confined and even put to death, as they advised him, and he might have done without the least imputation of injustice or of cruelty, contented himself, by an instance of clemency and good-nature scarce to be matched in history, with putting him in mind of his duty, with exhorting him to forbear such treasonable practices, and threatening, if he did not, to let justice thenceforth take place of mercy."—(Mich. in vit. Theodor.) "But the holy man," says the historian, "despising alike the crosses and the menaces of the tyrant, continued, in spite of both, the same practices with more zeal than ever, preaching the catholic faith, and exhorting all to defend, if necessary, at the expense of their lives, the religion they had received from their ancestors, and their ancestors from the apostles, and Christ himself, who had sent his image to the king of Edessa to be worshipped by him and his people. Hereupon the tyrant," continues the historian, "quite at a loss what measures to take, and no longer able to bear the liberty and firmness of the holy abbot, ordered him first to depart the city, and soon after sent him, (no doubt upon some new provocation) into exile, and confined him to a castle." And who but a prince of Leo's good nature and clemency would have bore so long his unparalleled presumption, and, when it was past all bearing, contented himself with inflicting so slight a punishment on such an incendiary? We need no other proof of this excellent prince's humane disposition and merciful temper, than the very facts, that gave occasion to the writers of those times, all bigoted monks, to style him a tyrant. With Theodore were banished several bishops, and most of the abbots of the monasteries in Constantinople, who, encouraged by that turbulent monk, not only refused to comply with the imperial edict, but publicly inveighed against the emperor as a heretic for issuing it. Among the abbots was the famous chronologer Theophanes, and Nicetas, whose life written by the monk Theosterictus, and filled with invectives against Leo, has reached our times, Nicetas was nearly related to the empress Irene, had been governor of Sicily, and honored with some of the first employments of the empire, but having afterwards embraced a monastic life under Theodore, he rivalled even Theodore himself in his zeal for images and the worship of images, publicly opposing, and stirring up the people to oppose the execution of the imperial edict.—(Theosterict. in vit. Nicet.) He was therefore banished with the rest, after the emperor, mindful of his former services, had done all that lay in his power to divert him from opposing his edict, if he could not comply with it.

The banished monks were confined to different islands; but scarce had they begun to feel the hard-

patriarchs, bestowing on them as pompous and high sounding titles as he bestowed on

ships of their exile, when the good-natured emperor, pitying their condition, recalled them all but Theodore, the chief author of all the disturbances, and restored them to their monasteries. Upon their return to Constantinople the emperor sent for them to the imperial palace, and thereafter reproaching them, in a friendly manner, with striving to maintain, by seditious practices, a superstition, which they had declined to maintain with reasons and with arguments, he told them, that he would not thenceforth concern himself with their private opinions, nor even prevent them from worshipping their images, provided they contented themselves to worship them within the walls of their monasteries, and, to avoid divisions and a schism in the church, communicated but once with the patriarch. To these terms all readily agreed, and were thereupon allowed quietly to live and to worship undisturbed what images they pleased in their monasteries. At the same time were recalled most of the banished bishops, and such of them restored to their sees as agreed to communicate with the patriarch, and not to oppose, nor stir up the people to oppose the execution of the imperial edict. Of this agreement Theodore was soon informed; and fired with zeal he undertook to divert his brethren from standing to it, or suffering themselves to be restrained, by any agreement whatever, from opposing the wicked laws of the tyrant and his antichristian edicts. Of the letters he wrote from his prison on this occasion to the monks, to the nuns, to the bishops, and to all true Christians in general, near two hundred have reached our times, all calculated to stir them up to sedition and rebellion, and encourage them to maintain, and publicly to profess, in defiance of the tyrant, the faith and religion, which our Savior himself had taught, that is the worship of images, and all true Christians had held and professed, ever since his time to the present. The emperor however, sparing his life, by an excess of good nature, contented himself with ordering him to be whipped, to be removed farther from Constantinople, and to be more closely confined. But as he still found means to write and convey letters to his brethren in Constantinople, most of them filled with bitter invectives against the emperor, calling him a tyrant, an apostate, a heretic, an "Amorrhite, the great dragon, the crooked serpent, a vessel of wrath," an avowed enemy to Christ and his saints, &c., and comparing him to Og, king of Basan, to Ahab, to Julian, Leo resolved at last to let justice take place of mercy, and order him, since he could by no other means overcome his obstinacy, to be publicly executed. But his good nature still prevailing over his resentment, he soon changed his mind, and ordered him only to be conveyed to Smyrna, and delivered up to the bishop of that place, a prelate of great learning, and no less remarkable for his zeal in promoting the worship of God alone than Theodore was in promoting the worship of images. By him the monk was kept closely confined, and used, if the author of his life is to be credited, with the utmost barbarity till the death of the emperor, that is for the space of two years.—(Mich. in vit. Theodor.) As for the other monks, many of them, standing to the agreement they had made, contented themselves, without hearkening to the suggestions of Theodore, with the liberty the emperor allowed them of worshipping their images within the walls of their monasteries; and to them no kind of violence was offered. But those, who still continued, in defiance of the emperor and the imperial edict, publicly to preach and recommend to the populace the forbidden superstition, were all either closely confined, or sent into exile. And it is observable, that in this cruel and bloody persecution, as it is styled and described by the later Greek writers, and after them by Baronius and Maimbourg, one person only suffered death, a monk named Thadaeus, whom Bardas, one of the emperor's officers, provoked at his obstinacy, caused to be whipped with so much severity, that he expired on the spot. Indeed whipping, confinement, and exile were the only punishments the emperor allowed to be inflicted even on those, who, not satisfied with transgressing his edict, had the assurance publicly to revile and insult him as an apostate from the faith, as a heretic, as an enemy to God and his saints. And yet the reader will find this excellent and most humane prince painted by Maimbourg as a blood-thirsty tyrant, as one, who delighted in nothing so much as in acts of the most barbarous cruelty, as a Nero or a Dioclesian. But whether Leo

The pope's answer to Theodore's letter. He repairs, rebuilds, and enriches many churches. Crowns Lotharius emperor and king of Italy;—[Year of Christ, 823.] The emperors not made sovereigns of Rome by the pope.

the pope. The patriarch of Alexandria he styles, "the most holy father of fathers, the light of lights, and the most blessed pope." The very same letter he sent with the very same titles, to the patriarch of Alexandria; and as to the patriarch of Jerusalem, he calls him "the first of all the patriarchs, though only reckoned the fifth." He addresses them all with the greatest submission, prostrates himself at their feet, and declares himself unworthy of their notice, but hopes that as our Savior condescended to receive a letter from Abgarus, nay, and to answer it, they will condescend to receive one from him. From these letters it appears, that images were every where cast out of the churches, and either broken in pieces, or publicly burnt; that none were suffered even on the sacred utensils; that all, who had any images, pictures, or books recommending either the use or the worship of them, were ordered to deliver them up to the patriarch or the imperial officers; that those, in whose custody such books, images, or pictures were found, were whipped, imprisoned, or sent into exile; that a great many monks, and all the bishops but those of Thessalonica, Ephesus, Nice, and Nicomedia, readily complied with the decree of the emperor, and that thus was the worship, as well as the use of images, which had given occasion to that worship, a second time utterly suppressed throughout the empire. The pope was greatly affected with the sufferings of the monks, and the other worshippers of images, as described, and indeed exaggerated beyond all measure by Theodore: but unable to afford them the least relief, he contented himself with comforting them by letters, assuring them, that to suffer for images was to suffer for Christ; that the martyrs of images were martyrs of Christ, and that the same reward was reserved in heaven for those, who suffered under the Iconoclast emperors for the sake of images, that was given to those, who suffered under the pagan emperors for the sake of Christ.

The four following years were spent by Paschal in rebuilding, repairing, or embellishing with many costly ornaments several churches and monasteries in Rome, as is related at length by Anastasius¹, and out of him by Baronius. As Rome swarmed at this time with Greek monks, who had fled from Constantinople, and the other cities in the east the pope built, amongst his other public works, a spacious monastery for their reception, and richly endowed it, that those, who had chosen to quit their country rather

or his grand monarch best deserved the name of tyrant, I shall leave every man to judge, who compares the treatment, that the worshippers of images met with from the former, after they had provoked him in the manner we have seen, with the treatment those, who refused to worship images, met with from the latter, whom they had noways provoked.

¹ Anast. in Paschal.

than renounce the faith, that is the use and the worship of images, might there, as in a safe port, be comfortably maintained till it pleased God to lay the storm.

In the year 823 Paschal had the satisfaction of receiving at Rome Lotharius, the eldest son of the emperor Louis, and crowning him emperor and king of Italy. Lotharius had been taken by his father in 817 for his partner in the empire; had been appointed King of Italy in 822, and was sent in 823 to take upon him the government of his new kingdom. Paschal no sooner heard of his arrival than he invited him by his legates to Rome, received him there with all possible marks of respect and distinction, and on easter-day crowned him, with the greatest solemnity, at the tomb of St. Peter, giving him at the same time the title of Augustus.¹ In many of this prince's diplomas the years of his empire are reckoned from the time of his coronation, that is, from the 5th of April, for in 823 Easter fell on that day. In the supplement to the history of Paulus Diaconus it is said, that on this occasion the apostolic pope Paschal vested the emperor Lotharius with the same power over the Romans and the city of Rome, that had been vested in the ancient emperors, that is, he yielded to him the sovereignty of Rome: and thus were the emperors of the west, says F. Pagi, made by the pope sovereigns of Rome, they being better able than he to curb the insolence of the unruly and mutinous Romans.² But what acts of sovereignty or sovereign power were exercised by the emperors in Rome after the pontificate of Paschal, that were not exercised before it by Charlemagne? He coined money in Rome, and sent thither commissioners from time to time to administer justice, to judge causes, to try criminals, and absolve or condemn them, nay and to try the pope himself.³ It was not therefore from the pope Lotharius received the sovereignty of Rome, but from his father Charlemagne, who yielded indeed to the pope the dominium utile, or the revenues of the city and dukedom of Rome, but kept the sovereignty to himself. The popes, it is true, coined money in Rome in Charlemagne's time; but their coining money is no proof of their sovereign power, since they coined money after Paschal's time, that is when the sovereign power was, according to all, lodged in the emperors, and not in them.⁴ That pri-

¹ Eginhard. in Annal. ad Ann. 823.

² Pagi in Annal. Bar. ad Ann. 823.

³ See p. 177.

⁴ No papal money is to be met with, that was coined before Charlemagne's time, and very few, that were coined after it till the pontificate of Leo IX., raised to the see in 1049. On some of their coins are only the names of the popes, in whose time they were coined, and on others the names both of the popes and the emperors. Thus on some silver coins of Leo IX., that have reached our times, is his name only. But on one of Benedict III. chosen in 855, is the figure of St. Peter in his pontifical attire with the letters S. P. over it,

Two persons of rank murdered in the pope's palace. The pope sends legates on that occasion into France, and clears himself by an oath. Paschal dies;—[Year of Christ, 824.] Ebo of Reims preaches the Gospel to the Danes.

vilege was granted by the emperors, and by the emperors the same privilege was granted to the dukes of Benevento, who acknowledged the emperors for their liege lords and sovereigns¹.

From Rome Lotharius returned to his father then in France. But scarce was he arrived there when word was brought him by a messenger sent from Rome, that two of the chief officers of the Roman church, Theodore, primicerius, and Leo the nomenclator, had been apprehended after his departure, had been carried to the Lateran palace, and had there had their eyes first cruelly put out, and their heads afterwards struck off. The messenger charged the pope with that barbarous execution, pretending those unhappy men had been by him so cruelly used merely on account of their inviolable attachment to the emperors, and their known zeal for the interests of France. The emperor Lewis, shocked at such barbarity, dispatched immediately to Rome Adalunge, abbot of St. Vast, and Hunfrid, count or governor of Coire, to inquire into the fact upon the spot. But they were not yet gone, when John, bishop of the White Forest, a bishopric united since to that of Porto, and Benedict, archdeacon of the Roman church, arrived with the character of the pope's legates, being sent by him to assure the emperors, that he was no ways concerned in, or accessory to the death of Theodore and Leo, and beg they would not suffer themselves to be prepossessed against him by the malicious and false reports of his enemies. The commissioners, however, were ordered to repair to Rome: and thither they repaired accordingly, but found the depositions of the many witnesses they examined so different, and so contradictory, that after all the pains they had taken, they could not in the end, with any certainty, declare the pope innocent of the murder, nor guilty. They were therefore obliged, upon his offering to clear himself by an oath, as his predecessor pope Leo had done,² to acquiesce in the offer; and he solemnly declared upon oath, in their presence, and in the presence of thirty-four bishops, that he was no ways accessory, or privy to the murder, which his enemies had maliciously laid to his charge. He could not, however, be prevailed upon to deliver up the persons by whom the murder was committed, alledging that they were of the family of St. Peter, that is, his own servants, and guilty of no crime or injustice, since those whom they put to death, had

and the name of the pope round it, namely, Benedict P. On the reverse is a hand between the two letters RO., that is Roma, and the emperor's name Lodovicus Imp. round it, Louis, the third Son of Louis the Debonnaire, being then emperor.

¹ On one of their coins is to be seen the figure of duke Grimoldi with his name round it, and on the reverse Dons Carolus R., that is Dominus Carolus Rex, for he was contemporary with Charlemagne.

² See p. 178.

long deserved, by their treasonable practices, the doom, that in the end overtook them. Here Baronius, to prevent his injudicious and undistinguishing readers from concluding, biassed by these circumstances, that his holiness was privy to the murder, and consequently guilty of perjury, tells us of his miraculously stopping soon after, with his presence alone, a dreadful conflagration, that threatened the Vatican itself with destruction. And by him heaven would never have wrought such a miracle, as the annalist well observes, had he been guilty of murder and perjury.¹ But the judicious and distinguishing reader will perhaps be rather inclined to question the miracle, than allow two persons of the first rank in Rome to have been put to death in the pope's own palace, and by his own servants, without his consent or privy; and the rather as he approved of the murder, not only refusing to deliver up the assassins, but pretending they were guilty, in what they had done, of no crime or injustice. The imperial commissioners were accompanied, on their return from Rome, by the bishop of the White Forest, and three other legates sent by the pope to satisfy the emperor of his innocence. The emperor heard them all with great attention and patience, but being, after he had heard them, quite at a loss what judgment to give, he thought it advisable to forbear all further inquiries, and acquiesce, as his father had done on the like occasion, in the oath of the pope. He did not, however, declare him innocent, but only dismissed his legates, as Eginhard informs us, with a proper answer, "dato convenienti responso."²

The legates, on their return to Rome, found the pope dangerously ill; and he died a few days after their arrival, that is, on the 10th of February, 824, having held the see seven years and seventeen days.³ The Romans, believing him guilty, notwithstanding the oath he had taken, of the murder of Leo and Theodore, would not allow him to be buried in the Vatican; and he remained unburied till his successor, chosen after a vacancy of four days, caused his remains to be deposited in the church of St. Praxedes, which the deceased pope had entirely rebuilt.⁴ The Romans knew nothing, it seems, of his miraculously saving the Vatican, else they had thought him as worthy of a place there after his death as any of his predecessors.

In Paschal's time, and with his approbation, Ebo, archbishop of Reims, was sent by the emperor Lewis to preach the Gospel to the Danes. The emperor named him for that mission; and the pope, upon his coming

¹ Bar. ad Ann. 823. p. 727.

² Eginhard. ad Ann. 823. Thegan. de gest. Ludovic. c. 30. Astronom. ad Ann. 823.

³ Martin. Polon. & Honor. Augusto donens.

⁴ Theganus, p. 30.

The emperor Leo barbarously murdered. His character.

to Rome, granted him full power to preach to the northern nations, especially to the Nordalbingi, or the Danes; appointed Halidgarius, afterwards bishop of Cambrai, to assist him as a companion in that undertaking; and furnished him with letters of recommendation addressed to the bishops, presbyters, princes, dukes, counts, and all Christians in those parts.¹ The conversion of the Danes was first attempted by Willibrardus, as has been related above, and afterwards by the presbyter Heridagus, sent for that purpose by Charlemagne into Nordalbingia, or Denmark;² but both were attended with little success. Ebbo is said to have converted great numbers;³ but the glory of completing the conversion both of the Danes and the Swedes, was reserved for Ansharius, who employed thirty-eight years in that great work.

In the fourth year of Paschal's pontificate, the emperor Leo was barbarously murdered; and Michael, surnamed Balbus, or the Stammerer, was raised to the imperial throne in his room. Of this revolution historians give us the following account: Michael had served from his youth in the army, had distinguished himself, on all occasions, by the prudence of his conduct, as well as his courage, and had been therefore preferred by the emperor to the chief command of all the forces of the empire; but, not satisfied with that station, he began to think of raising himself, as he was greatly beloved by the soldiery, to the imperial dignity. He was therein encouraged by his friends; but the plot being discovered before it was ripe for execution, he was seized, tried, and sentenced by his judges to die in the flames. The sentence was to have been executed on Christmas eve; but the empress Theodosia having prevailed on her husband to put off the execution till after that festival, the criminal found means, during that interval, to write to his accomplices, threatening to discover them to the emperor, if they did not attempt, without loss of time, his release. His letter was conveyed to them by some religious persons, who had been admitted to him with the permission of the emperor; and they no sooner received it, than alarmed at the danger that threatened them, they resolved to deliver themselves from it by the death of the emperor. As Leo was therefore to assist very early the next day, the festival of our Savior's nativity, at divine service in the chapel of the imperial palace, the conspirators chose that time as the most proper for the execution of their design; and being accordingly admitted by the papias, or the door-keeper of the palace, whom they had gained, amongst the ecclesiastics who were to officiate, they lay concealed till the empe-

ror, who took particular delight in singing psalms and hymns, began the first, according to custom, to sing aloud a hymn commencing thus, "All things have they despised for the love of the Lord." As that was the signal agreed on, they started up that moment, and making altogether, with their drawn swords, towards the emperor, they first fell, in that hurry and confusion, as it was not yet daylight, on one of the ecclesiastics, who greatly resembled him in size and in stature, and dangerously wounded him. In the mean time the emperor, apprised of their design, flew to the altar, as to a safe and inviolable asylum; but the conspirators, pursuing him as soon as they were aware of their mistake, furiously attacked him on all sides, striving, without any regard to the sacredness of the place, who should have the glory and the merit of putting an end to his life. However, the brave prince, as he was quite unarmed, laying hold of the chain of the incensory with the one hand, and snatching with the other the cross from the altar, defended himself with great resolution and courage, warding off the blows with the cross, and returning them with the incensory, till one of the conspirators, who in strength surpassed all the rest, cut off, at one blow, his hand, and with it the cross in two pieces. He then fell to the ground, pierced with numberless wounds, and covered with his blood; and one of the assassins cut off his head, while the rest continued barbarously mangling his body even after his death.¹

Such was the unhappy and undeserved end of the emperor Leo, surnamed the Armenian, after he had reigned seven years, five months, and fifteen days. In him nothing was wanting, if his avowed enemies are to be credited, but zeal for the true faith, that is, for the worship of images, to complete the character of a great and excellent prince; for he was, even according to them, the best general, and ablest statesman, of his time; brave, vigilant, industrious, an enemy to pleasure, and a friend to virtue. He despised wealth, had nothing so much at heart, and ever in the first place, consulted the welfare of the state, and the safety of the subject, sparing no pains, declining no danger, to procure the one and the other. He undertook nothing rashly, pursued steadily, but with discretion and prudence, and happily accomplished whatever he undertook. He utterly abhorred all sort of corruption, had regard, in bestowing his favors, to merit alone; and never was known to have preferred any but the most deserving and worthy in the state or the army. Not satisfied with appointing men of the greatest integrity to administer justice to his subjects, he administered it himself, hearing causes two days in the week in one of the great halls of

¹ Annal. Fuld. Flodoart. l. ii. c. 12. Bolland. ad diem 3 Februarii.

² Rembart. in vit. Ansharii, c. 5.

³ Flodoart. ubi supra.

¹ Ignat. in Taras. Theodor. Studit. ep. 61. Leo Grammat. in Lon. Cedren. in Michael.

Remarkable instance of Leo's love of justice. His death lamented by all but the monks. Michael proclaimed and crowned.

the palace, and deciding them with the greatest exactness and equity. He was at all times ready to hear the complaints and redress the grievances of the meanest of his subjects; and of this Cedrenus gives us the following instance: As he was one day coming out of the palace, a person of a mean condition accosting him, begged he would stop for a moment and hear him. The emperor stopped and heard him with patience: He complained of a senator, who, he said, had by force taken his wife from him, and detained her: adding, that he had applied to the prefect or governor of the city, but applied to no purpose for justice. Hereupon the emperor, returning to his apartment, sent immediately both for the senator and the prefect, and finding the one and the other guilty of the charge, he dismissed the prefect that moment from his employment, and ordered the senator to be punished, as convicted of adultery, according to the rigor of the law. Such is the character Theophanes, the author of the *Miscella*, Anastasius, and the patriarch Nicephorus, gives us of Leo the Armenian, though all his avowed enemies, on account of his enmity to images; nay, the patriarch Nicephorus, though driven by him from his see, and sent into exile, did him the justice to own that they had indeed lost a great, though not a good prince, (a good prince would never have opposed the worship of images!) who had truly at heart the welfare of the state and his subjects.¹ His death was lamented by all but the monks, and such of the monks only, as, not satisfied with the liberty the good-natured emperor had granted them of worshipping what images they pleased within the walls of their monasteries, obstinately continued, in open defiance of his edicts, to recommend that worship to the ignorant multitude. Amongst these, the mad enthusiast Theodore, far from showing any kind of concern or compassion at the melancholy account of the emperor's death, transmitted to him by one of his monks named Naveratius, could not forbear expressing his joy, nay, and blasphemously inviting heaven and earth, men and angels, to rejoice with him at so barbarous a murder and parricide. To the many good qualities which even the enemies of this excellent prince have allowed him, we may add his zeal for the purity of

the Christian worship,¹ the extraordinary regard he paid to religion, and to men truly religious, his great moderation in the use of the power with which he was trusted, and his unparalleled good nature in bearing so long, and punishing in the end with so much lenity, the unparalleled insolence of the monks, and reckon him not only amongst the greatest, but amongst the most religious, the most humane, and best natured princes we read of in history. As for the many absurd, ridiculous, and improbable stories invented by the later Greek writers to blacken his character, and from them copied by Maimbourg in no fewer than ninety-eight pages,² they are only worthy of a place in the lying legends of the monks who invented them, or in such fabulous pieces as Maimbourg's *History of the Iconoclasts*.

The conspirators, not satisfied with murdering the emperor in the barbarous manner we have seen, dragged his body through the public streets to the hippodrome, and leaving it there exposed to public view, that all might know he was dead, they carried Michael in triumph from his prison to the great hall of the imperial palace, and there placed him, loaded as he still was with his irons, the keys of them being no where found, with loud acclamations on the throne. The same day he repaired, as soon as his irons could be got off, to the church of St. Sophia, attended and guarded by all the conspirators, and was there solemnly crowned by the patriarch. The new emperor issued an edict the third day after his promotion, to set at liberty, and recal from exile, all who had been confined or banished by Leo for the worship of images; which gave occasion to the monk Theodore, who was released with the rest, to style him, in the famous letter he wrote to him, a new David, a new Josiah, a true follower of Christ.³ But he soon changed his style, and had good reason to change it, as will appear in the sequel.

¹ Cedrenus, and after him Baronius and Maimbourg, tell us, that it was not out of any zeal for religion that he undertook the destruction of images, but because he was foretold by an Iconoclast hermit and impostor, that, unless he destroyed all idols, and banished idolatry, he would soon lose his life and the empire. But Leo was a man of too much penetration and sense to give any credit to such a prediction. He thought the worship of images inconsistent with the worship of God as commanded in Scripture; found the advocates for that worship declined maintaining it against their antagonists, and therefore proscribed it.

² *Hist. de l' Heres. des Iconoclast. part. ii. a p. 131. ad p. 229.*

³ *Apud Bar. ad Ann. 821. p. 712, 713.*

¹ Cedren. in Leon. p. 490. Continuât. Constantin. Porphyrogen

Eugene chosen, and at the same time another. Lotharius sent by his father into Italy. Reforms the government of Rome. Revives the ancient custom, that the pope should not be ordained, till his election was approved by the emperor.

EUGENE II., NINETY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MICHAEL BALBUS, AND HIS SON THEOPHILUS, *Emperors of the East*.—LEWIS THE DEBONAIRE, AND HIS SON LOTHARIUS, *Emperors of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 824.] In the room of Paschal was chosen and ordained, after a vacancy of four days, and consequently on the 14th of February, which, in 824, fell on a Sunday, Eugene, the second of that name, a native of Rome, the son of one Boemund, and, at the time of his election, archpriest of St. Sabina.¹ He was not chosen without opposition; but at the same time was chosen another, whom Onuphris, and after him Ciaconius, call Zinzinus,² though named by no author I know of who wrote before them. This double election occasioned such disturbances in Rome, Eugene being supported by the nobility, and his competitor by the people, that the emperor Lewis, being informed of it by the subdeacon, Quirinus, whom Eugene had sent to acquaint him with his promotion, and implore his protection, thought it necessary to send his son Lotharius into Italy to restore peace to the city. Lotharius set out for Rome after the middle of August; and finding, on his arrival there, that the party of Eugene had prevailed in the end, he undertook to reform the government of the city, and correct the many abuses that had crept into it. He loudly complained to the new pope of the disorders that had happened under his predecessors in Rome; of the little regard that was shown by the Romans to the French, and the emperor himself; of their having put to death, without consulting him, persons entirely devoted to his service; of their deriding, insulting, and abusing such as were known to be his friends; and for no other reason, but because they were his friends; of the many crying acts of injustice and violence, that had been committed with impunity, through the ignorance and indolence of the popes, and the insatiable avarice of the judges. These evils, he told the pope, he was determined to redress; and he redressed them accordingly, revising several causes, and ordering the estates that had been unjustly seized and confiscated, to be restored to the lawful owners. At the same time he issued a constitution, calculated to prevent such disorders for the future, and caused it, that none might plead ignorance, to be published in the Vatican. Of the ten articles or heads it contained, the four following are the most worthy of notice: I. That none but Romans should have a vote in the election of the pope. II. That proper persons should be

appointed, both by the pope and the emperor, to inform them yearly how justice was administered; and that all complaints should be first brought to the pope, who might either redress the grievances complained of himself, or, acquainting the emperor with them, leave the care of redressing them to him. III. That the Romans, and the people as well as the Senate, should be asked according to what law they chose to live (the Roman, the Lombard, or the French) that they may be judged, and condemned or absolved, by the law, according to which they have chosen to live. IV. That all dukes, judges, and other persons in authority, should attend the emperor, when he is in Rome, that he may know both their number and their names, and put them in mind of their duty. By the other articles, the emperor inculcates due submission and obedience to the pope and his officers; forbids, and on pain of death, any violence to be offered to such as are under his immediate protection, or the immediate protection of the pope; commands the goods of the church, that some had seized and retained, pretending they had been granted to them by the pope, to be forthwith restored. Lastly, he forbids all plunder and rapine at the death of the pope, or in his life time.¹ The Romans, especially the Roman nobility, paid, it seems, very little regard to the authority of the pope; which obliged the emperors frequently to exert the supreme power with which they were vested both over them and the popes. They were awed by the emperors alone, and kept in subjection; and thence arose that aversion in them to the French, which Lotharius complained of to the pope. The author of the life of the emperor Lewis, who wrote at this time, tells us, that Lotharius, reviving while he was at Rome an ancient custom, decreed, that commissioners should, from time to time, be sent by the emperor to Rome, to hear the complaints of the people, to see that justice was duly administered, and to administer it, in cases of greater importance, themselves.²

Lotharius revived, before he left Rome, another ancient custom; namely, that the new pope should not be ordained till his election was approved by the emperor himself, or by the deputies he should appoint to assist at his ordination. This custom was first introduced in 483, by Odoacer, then

¹ Anast. in Eugen. II.

² Onuph. & Ciacon. in Eugen. II.

¹ Sigon. de regno Ital. l. iv. & Hilsten. Collect. Rom. Part. ii. p. 242.

² Auct. vit. Luodvi. Pii.

A solemn embassy sent by the emperors of the East to the emperor Lewis. The patrons of images refuse to assist at a council. The emperor enjoins silence with respect to the worship of images, and punishes such as do not comply with that injunction.

master of Italy,¹ was adopted by the Gothic kings his successors in the kingdom of Italy, and likewise by the emperors, upon their recovering that country from the Goths, and re-uniting it to the empire; and it was punctually complied with by the popes till the year 741, when the power of the emperors being at a very low ebb in the west, pope Zachary caused himself to be ordained without waiting for the approbation of the emperor, or asking it.² This usurped independence the popes enjoyed from the time of Zachary to the present year 824, when Lotharius, claiming all the rights the emperors of the east had enjoyed while lords of Rome, revived the ancient custom. I do not find that the pope offered to dispute his right, or any ways to oppose such a regulation; nay, as parties and factions ran at this time very high in Rome, the great families all striving, upon the decease of the pope, to raise one of their friends, relations, or dependents to the chair, which, at every vacancy, gave rise to endless disturbances, Eugene is said to have, on this occasion, readily concurred with the emperor, and to have himself drawn up an oath, calculated to re-establish the ancient custom, and obliged all his clergy to take it. The form of the oath was; I I L L (these letters stood formerly for the name of the person, as the letter N does now) "promise by the Omnipotent God, by the four holy Gospels, by this cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the body of the blessed St. Peter, prince of the apostles, that, from this time forward, I shall be unfeignedly faithful to our lords the emperors Lewis and Lotharius, saving the faith I have promised to the apostolic lord; that I shall consent to no election of a pontiff for this see that is not canonical; and that he, who shall be chosen, shall not be consecrated, with my consent, till he has taken, in the presence of the emperor's deputy, and the people, such an oath as pope Eugene prescribed, of his own accord, for the safety and welfare of all."³

Lotharius had not yet left Rome, when ambassadors from the emperors Michael, and his son Theophilus, whom Michael had taken for his colleague in the empire arrived in France, having been sent by those princes to confirm the treaties of friendship and peace concluded between Charlemagne and their predecessors in the empire, and at the same time to engage the most powerful king of the Franks, and, by his interposition, the most holy patriarch of Rome, to concur with

them in healing the divisions, that the dispute about images had occasioned, and still kept alive in the church. Michael was himself quite averse to the worship of images; but, having nothing so much at heart as to see peace restored in his days to the church, he had left nothing unattempted he could think of to reconcile the two parties, and thus put an end to the unhappy dispute. With that view he had issued an edict, when he was yet scarce warm on his throne, to release and recal all the bishops and monks, whom his predecessor had confined, or sent into exile, for obstinately maintaining, in defiance of his edicts, and recommending to the populace, the worship of images. He had flattered himself that he should thus have engaged them to hearken at least to an accommodation; and he appointed accordingly a synod to meet soon after their return, inviting to it the leading men of both parties, not to dispute, but to consult, in an amicable manner, about the means of bringing to a happy issue the intended reconciliation. But at that synod the patrons of images, to the great disappointment of the emperor, obstinately refused to assist or appear, alledging that it was not lawful for them to form one council with heretics; nay, on this occasion they wrote, at the instigation of the monk Theodore, a letter to the emperor, supposed to be penned by that incendiary, to tell him, that he was not to concern himself with religious affairs; that points of faith and religion were only to be discussed and determined by the successors of the apostles, the five patriarchs; and, if they could not be conveniently assembled, recourse was to be had to the first patriarch, the successor of St. Peter, and all were to stand to his judgment and decision. This insolent conduct the emperor bore with incredible patience; nay, instead of resenting it, and sending them that instant all back to the places of their confinement and exile, he granted them an audience, upon their desiring to be heard by themselves, as they could have no communication with heretics, received them in a most obliging manner, and having heard all they could offer in defence of themselves and their images, told them, that he never had worshiped images himself, and was not yet convinced that they were to be worshiped; but nevertheless, as he was not for offering violence to any man's conscience, he granted them full liberty to set up and to worship what images they pleased; but upon the following conditions: I. That as he worshiped none, none should be set up in the imperial city. II. That, to prevent the superstitious practices of the ignorant multitude, they should be placed in all churches and oratories out of their reach. III. That, to put an end to so long and so fatal a dispute, an entire silence should be observed by men of both parties concerning the lawfulness or unlawfulness of set-

¹ See vol. I. p. 272.

² See p. 76.

³ Supplement. Longbartic. & in Libel. de Episcop. Meters.

⁴ Of this oath no notice is taken by Baronius, by Natalis Alexander, or by Papebrake, in speaking of pope Eugene, probably because they looked upon it as supposititious. But it is to be found, and almost verbatim, in the diplomas of the emperors Otho I., and Henry I., lodged in the castle St. Angelo at Rome.

Michael and Theophilus write to the emperor Lewis. Abuses introduced by the worshipers of images.

ting up images, or worshipping them, as if no such controversy had ever been heard of in the church. That silence he strictly enjoined by an edict, declaring, that he did not take upon him to determine so important a question; but thought it his duty, as he was trusted with the care of the church as well as the state, to procure the peace and tranquillity of the one as well as the other, and had, with that view alone, imposed silence on both parties indifferently, since neither would yield to the other, and disputes rather served to divide them still more than to unite them in one mind. With that edict, how just soever and reasonable, the patrons of images refused to comply, claiming, with the turbulent monk Theodore, and at his instigation, an unrestrained liberty not only of professing themselves, but of preaching to others, the true catholic faith, and reclaiming such as had been seduced by the heretics to their impious sect. That liberty they assumed, without any regard to the express prohibition of the emperor, stirring up the populace to maintain what they called the apostolic and ancient practice of the church, and damning all who opposed it, as enemies to Christ and his saints. Their conduct obliged the emperor to change his; and he now resolved to proceed against them, as they were not to be gained by gentle methods, with the same severity that his predecessor had used. The prefect of the imperial city was accordingly ordered, and so were the governors of the provinces, to cause the imperial edict, enjoining silence, to be strictly complied with in their respective jurisdictions, and to spare none, whether ecclesiastics or laymen, who should presume to transgress it. Pursuant to that order, the monk Theodore, and with him most of the monks whom the emperor had lately recalled, were sent back into exile; others were publicly whipped, and, to prevent the disturbances they might raise, shut up in dungeons, or confined to the most distant and inhospitable places of the empire.¹

This wholesome severity had the wished for effect; the zeal of the monks was damped in the end; the imperial edict was strictly complied with, and peace by that means, for the present, restored throughout the empire to the church. And it was to justify his conduct to the emperor of the west, as well as to the pope, and at the same time to engage them to concur with him in preventing all further disputes, and uniting the east and the west in one faith, that Michael sent the solemn embassy, mentioned above, into France. The ambassadors, who were all persons of rank and distinction, brought a letter from the two emperors, Michael and his son Theophilus, to the emperor Lewis, with the following direction; "in the name

of the Father, of the Son, and the Holy Ghost, one God, Michael and Theophilus, emperors of the Romans, to their beloved and honored brother Lewis, the renowned king of the Franks and the Lombards, who styles himself their emperor." By the words "who styles himself their emperor," they declared, and very unseasonably, that they did not acknowledge the king of the Franks for lawful emperor, though he had an unquestionable right to that title, in virtue of several treaties between Charlemagne and the preceding emperors, and by one concluded a few years before between Lewis himself and the emperor Leo, the immediate predecessor of Michael in the empire. In the letter, the two emperors notify, in the first place, to their beloved brother the king of the Franks, their accession to the imperial throne, and at the same time excuse their having so long delayed to acquaint him therewith, and to sue for his alliance and friendship. That delay they ascribe to a war kindled in the bowels of the empire by an usurper and impostor named Thomas, who, pretending to be Constantine, the son of Irene, had thereby seduced such numbers, both of the people and the soldiery, as had enabled him to defeat the imperial army, to overrun all Syria and Asia, to reduce many important strong holds, and at last to lay siege to the city of Constantinople itself, and keep it besieged a whole year. They add, that, by the particular assistance of the Almighty, they had prevailed in the end, had defeated the usurper, had obliged him to fly for refuge to the city of Adrianople, which city they had reduced after a five months siege, and put to death both him and his son, having first caused their hands and their feet to be cut off. The emperors take no notice of the assistance they received from the king of the Bulgarians, who, marching unasked to the relief of Constantinople, gained the first victory over the usurper; and to the first the other victories were all, in a great measure, owing.

In the next place, the emperors, to justify their conduct with respect to the worshipers of images, give an account of the many superstitious abuses that had begun to prevail in that worship, and of the methods they had employed to reform them; adding a confession of their faith, to confute the calumnies of the monks, who, flying from Constantinople, and the other cities of the empire, to Rome, had represented them there, not only as heretics, but as persecutors of the catholic church, and enemies to Christ and his saints. Of the many abuses that had crept into the worship of images, and were patronized by those who worshipped them, they take notice of the following, namely, that they had banished the cross from the churches, and set up images in its room, giving the same honor to them they gave to

¹ Georg. Monach. in Michael. p. 510. Theodor. Studit. in epist. apud Bar. ad Ann. 821. Cedren. ibid.

Michael's confession of faith. Presents brought by his ambassadors for the emperor Lewis and the pope. The ambassadors propose the assembling a council in France, to examine the doctrine of the Greeks in relation to images. The emperor Lewis agrees to the proposal.

the cross; that they burnt lights and incense before them, sung hymns in their honor, implored their assistance, and carrying them to the sacred font, made them godfathers and godmothers to their children; that some priests, scraping off the colors from their pictures, mixed them with the wine of the eucharist, and gave the wine thus mixed, to the people; that others, putting the body of our Lord into the hands of images, obliged those who received it, to receive it from them; that the sacred mysteries were by many celebrated not in churches, or upon altars, but in private houses, and upon pictures. These, and many like superstitious practices, the orthodox emperors, say they, whose example they thought themselves bound to follow, had undertaken to suppress, and with that view ordered, after advising with the most learned of the clergy, assembled in council, such images to be removed out of the churches as were within the reach of the people, but allowed those to remain that were not, to the end they, who beheld them, might be put in mind of the objects they represented, without being tempted to kiss them, to burn lights or incense before them or give them any kind of worship whatever.

In the third place, the emperors give an account of their faith; declaring, that they receive the six general councils; that they profess the doctrine defined by those councils, and hold all the traditions that are truly apostolical, or have been acknowledged as such by the fathers. By declaring they received the six general councils, they tacitly rejected the council of Constantinople under Copronymus, commanding images to be cast out of the churches and broken, as well as the council of Nice under Irene, ordering them to be worshiped; the one being acknowledged by the Iconoclasts, and the other by the patrons of images, for the seventh. They close their letter with the warmest protestations of friendship and esteem for their brother the king of the Franks, earnestly entreating him, as they had charged their ambassadors to return by Rome, and there to negotiate a union between the east and the west, to second him in so pious an undertaking, and to interpose his authority in driving from Rome the wicked incendiaries, who, flying from the east, had taken refuge in that city; and, misrepresenting to the pope and his clergy the doctrine of the Greeks, strove by that means to obstruct the union, and widen the breach between the two churches.¹

The ambassadors brought with them some valuable presents for the emperor Lewis, among which were the works, as was then supposed, of Dionysius the areopagite, never before seen nor heard of in France;²

and some for the pope; namely, the book of the Gospels, covered with gold, a chalice and a patten, or its cover, likewise of gold; and all three enriched with precious stones.¹ These they were, on their arrival at Rome, to offer at the tomb of St. Peter, in the name of the two emperors. As the emperor Lewis was employed in reducing the rebels of Normandy when the ambassadors arrived in France, they waited his return at Rouen; and there he received them with all possible marks of honor and esteem, accepted their presents, renewed the alliance between the two empires, and, commending the zeal of their masters in striving to suppress the superstitious worship of images, and reunite the east and the west in one and the same faith, he promised to assist them to the utmost of his power in so meritorious an undertaking. The ambassadors, encouraged with the reception they met with, suggested to the emperor, pursuant to their private instructions, the assembling of a council in France, to examine the doctrine and the practice of the Greeks, with respect to the use and the worship of images. Michael well knew, that the emperor Lewis, and the French nation in general, agreed in both with him and the Greeks; that they allowed, agreeably to the doctrine of the council of Frankfort, and the Caroline books, the use, but condemned the worship of images, and consequently rejected, with him, both the council of Copronymus, and the council of Irene. He therefore flattered himself, that the Gallican clergy, finding the doctrine of the Greeks entirely agreeable to their own, would look upon their cause as their own, would espouse it as their own, and prevail upon the pope to hearken to an accommodation, or at least restrain him from anathematizing the Greeks as heretics, for holding a doctrine that was common to them and the French.

The emperor Lewis readily agreed to the assembling of a council, as was suggested by the ambassadors, in order to examine the doctrine of the Greeks with respect to the use and the worship of images; but apprehending that the pope might resent the assembling of a council, without his knowledge or consent, to examine a doctrine that his predecessors had already examined and condemned, and be thereupon tempted to reject all proposals of an accommodation between the east and the west, he resolved first of all to acquaint his holiness with the request of the ambassadors, and obtain his

Genadius, or by any other writer, till after the fifth century, of any books written by Dionysius the areopagite, and, in some of those that are ascribed to him, notice is taken of several practices that were not introduced before the time of Constantine the Great, the books, that go under his name, are now universally supposed to have been written by another Dionysius, who flourished long after the areopagite.

¹ Epist. Imp. ad Ludovic. apud Bar. ad Ann. 824.

² As no mention is made by Eusebius, by Jerom, by

¹ Epist. Imp. ad Ludovic. apud Bar. ad Ann. 824.

The council meets at Paris;—[Year of Christ, 825.] They declare it lawful to set up images, but unlawful to worship them. Pope Hadrian severely censured by the council. Decree of the council. Their letter to the emperor Lewis.

concent to comply with it. For that purpose Freculphus, bishop of Lisieux, and Adegarius, were sent to Rome; and the pope, highly pleased with so remarkable an instance of filial submission in his son the emperor, consented at once to his gratifying the ambassadors, and assembling, with that view, the clergy of his kingdom. The emperor therefore, upon the return of the deputies, appointed, without loss of time, the bishops, and most learned ecclesiastics of his kingdom, to meet, and examine the doctrine of images, as taught by the churches of Constantinople and Rome; to inquire into the subject of disagreement and dispute between the two churches with respect to that article, and suggest to him the means, that, upon mature deliberation, should appear to them the best calculated to reconcile and unite them in one faith. The council met in the royal palace at Paris, on the 1st of November, in the present year, 825. Of what number of bishops and other ecclesiastics it consisted, history does not inform us; but it is certain that most of the bishops of France and Germany were present, and among the rest Agobard, the famous bishop of Lyons, Jeremiah, bishop of Sens, Jonas, bishop of Orleans, Haligarius, bishop of Cambray, Amalaris, bishop of Treves, Freculphus and Adegarius, mentioned above, Theodomir, abbot of a monastery in France of one hundred and forty monks, Dungalus, monk of the monastery of St. Dinis; all persons of unexceptionable characters, and deservedly reckoned, as appears from their writings, amongst the most learned men of the age.

The council being met, the letter of pope Hadrian to the emperors Constantine and Irene, in favor of images,¹ was read in the first place, and received as recommending the use, but rejected as commanding the worship of images; it being lawful, said they, to set up images, but unlawful to worship them, “*cum eas erigere licitum, adorare vero nefas sit.*” They observe, that, in the same letter, the passages, alledged by the pope out of the fathers to support his opinion, were all misapplied, and quite foreign to his purpose; “*valde absona, et ad rem, de qua agebatur, minime pertinentia.*” Indeed no man can peruse that letter, and not acquiesce in their censure. The same censure they passed on the second council of Nice, expressing great surprise at the presumption and ignorance of the fathers of that assembly in commanding images to be worshiped, in calling them holy, and thinking that holiness might be acquired by them. At the same time, they found great fault with the council of Constantinople under Copronymus, ordering images, that put us in mind

of the objects they represented, and enlivened by that means our devotion, to be cast out of the churches and broken.

In the next place, the council caused the confutation of the council of Nice by Charlemagne, known by the name of the Caroline books,¹ to be read, and pope Hadrian's answer to that confutation. The Caroline books they entirely approved, as plainly containing the doctrine of the primitive church and the fathers. But of Hadrian's answer they deliver their opinion in the following terms: “The pope,” say they, “sull approving the acts of that council (the council of Nice) in spite of all the arguments urged by Charlemagne against it, obstinately continued to support those who had argued so absurdly, alledging what occurred to him, but not what became him, to excuse them. For in his answer are many things alike repugnant to truth and authority. However, in the end of his apology, he declares, that as to the subject in dispute, he agrees in opinion with the holy pope Gregory, (Gregory the Great, teaching that we are neither to break images, nor to worship them) showing thereby, that it was not designedly, but ignorantly, he went astray from the right path; and that he would have fallen into the abyss of superstition, had he not been withheld from it by the doctrine of that holy pope.”

Lastly, the fathers of the council ordered the above-mentioned letter of the emperor Michael to the emperor Lewis, to be read; and, upon the whole, concluded, “that images are not to be broken, are not to be cast out of the churches, nor even removed in the places of worship out of the reach of the people; but though they are to be preserved for the sake of those whom they represent, we are by no means to serve, worship, nor adore them, agreeably to the doctrine of the blessed pope Gregory.”²

The council being ended, the bishops wrote a letter in common, to the emperor Lewis, to acquaint him with their proceedings, and the judgment they had given of the point in dispute between the churches of Constantinople and Rome; namely, that both churches were highly to blame, the one for worshipping images, the other for breaking them; but that it was a far greater crime to worship than to break them. In the same letter they tell the emperor, that the superstitious worship of images had taken deep root at Rome, as they were informed by Freculphus and Adegarius, lately returned from that city; that it was countenanced there, and promoted by those, whose duty it was to oppose it, meaning the popes, and was therefore incumbent on so Christian a prince to remove the scandal it gave to all

¹ See p. 163.

² Goldast. Constit. Imper. tom. i. p. 154, 155.

¹ See p. 144, 145.

The emperor Lewis sends two bishops to acquaint the pope with the result of the council. Instructions given them. Lewis's letter to the pope. The doctrine of the Gallican church at this time concerning images.

good men, and abolish a practice that ignorance had introduced, and custom established. They added, that, in so nice and important an affair, he must proceed with the utmost caution and prudence, not openly disapproving what the apostolic see had approved; but only expressing an earnest desire of seeing peace restored to the church, and begging his holiness to interpose the authority with which he is vested, and cause the doctrine to be universally received, that should be found, upon searching the Scriptures, and the writings of the fathers, the most agreeable to both. With that letter the Gallican bishops sent to the emperor a large collection of passages out of the fathers, all calculated to prove, that images, according to them, were neither to be worshiped, nor cast out of the churches, and broken. But against destroying, and banishing them out of the churches, not one father is quoted of the first three centuries; and the testimonies alledged out of those of the following ages, only prove, that some advantages attend them, and that they might be consequently set up in places of worship, provided care were taken that no kind of worship was given them. As the emperor was, on this occasion, to write to the pope, the bishops of the council drew up, and sent him, before they parted, a sketch of the letter, they thought, he should write, and likewise of the letter they wished the pope could be persuaded to write to the two emperors Michael and Theophilus. Both letters turned upon this, that, as the use of images is neither commanded nor forbidden in Scripture, they, who choose to have any, be allowed to have them, but not to worship them; and they, who choose to have none, be not obliged to have any; and that neither presume to find fault with the other, since neither can be charged with practising what is forbidden, or not practising what is commanded by lawful authority.

The proceedings of the council, and the means they suggested of putting an end to so long a dispute, were highly approved by the emperor; and he immediately despatched Jeremiah of Sens, and Jonas of Orleans, to acquaint his holiness with them, and try to divert him, if by any means they could, from countenancing a worship that gave so great offence both to the Greeks and the Gallican bishops. Their private instructions were, to use, in treating with the pope, the utmost circumspection, advancing nothing rashly, or that he could take amiss; to read over together, with the greatest care and attention, the passages the council had collected from the Scriptures and the fathers against the worshiping of images, and choose out of them those that were most to the purpose, and such as neither the pope nor his council could reasonably object to; to affect,

above all things, great moderation in their conferences with his holiness, not openly contradicting him, but striving to bring him, by their complaisance and condescension, to hearken to reason; but if he obstinately withstood all their endeavors, and still continued deaf both to reason and authority, yet to take care not to be wanting in the respect that is due to his dignity, but modestly representing to him the many evils that attend the present disagreement between the east and the west, leave his holiness to find out, and employ the means that should appear to him, in his great prudence and discretion, the best calculated to redress them.

By the same bishops the emperor wrote a most obliging letter to the pope, in his own name, and in the name of Lotharius, his son and colleague in the empire, recommending to him the Greek ambassadors, sent by the emperors Michael and Thophilus, to negotiate an union between the east and the west, and earnestly entreating him to hearken to their proposals, to pity the distracted state of the church, and concur with him in composing the differences that had so long subsisted between the churches of Constantinople and Rome.¹ What reception the two bishops met with from the pope no writer has informed us, nor what was transacted at Rome by the Greek ambassadors, or at Constantinople by Haliugarius bishop of Cambria, and Hufridus, abbot of Nonantula, whom Lewis sent on this occasion with the character of his ambassadors into the east. All we know for certain, is, that the pope still continued to defend and promote the worship of images, though condemned in the strongest terms by the Gallican bishops; that he would hearken to no terms of agreement excluding that worship, and that thereupon some of the most eminent men for piety and learning in the Gallican church, siding with the Greeks, undertook to impugn it. Amongst these, Claudius, bishop of Turin, perhaps the most learned man of that age, declared, in a treatise he wrote on this occasion, not only against the worship, but against the use of images as well as the worship, and caused them all, nay, and with them the cross, to be cast out of the churches throughout his diocese, and consigned to the flames. That treatise was answered by Jonas, of Orleans, who, though no less averse to the worship of images than Claudius himself, was yet for retaining them as books for the ignorant, and helps to devotion. But, on the other hand, Agobard was of opinion, and that opinion he maintained with great erudition and learning, that images rather hinder than help true devotion, and ought therefore to be excluded, as they were by the primitive

¹ Goldast. p. 160—180.

The Gallican bishops did not believe the pope incapable of erring. The pope assembles a council in Rome. Eugene dies;—[Year of Christ, 827.] Valentine chosen. His inthronation. His death.

fathers, from all places of worship and devotion.¹ However, that they were neither to be broken, nor to be worshiped, was, it must be owned, the received doctrine of the Gallican church at this time, and that doctrine they continued to profess, as will appear in the sequel, long after the ninth century, retaining images as ornaments, as books for the ignorant, as helps to memory, but giving them no kind of worship, and charging those with idolatry who gave them any.

To conclude: From what has been said, it is manifest beyond all dispute, I. That the authority of the pope was not yet, that is, so late as the ninth century, thought decisive by the Gallican bishops, nor he thought infallible, or incapable of erring, since they condemned, and condemned with one voice, a doctrine as erroneous and heretical, which so many popes had taught ex cathedra, and defined. II. That those bishops did not believe themselves bound to receive a council as œcumenical, though received as such by the pope; nor bound to submit to its decisions, though approved and confirmed by the pope, but thought themselves at full liberty to re-

ceive or reject them. III. That to reject a council, and the definitions of a council, received by the pope as œcumenical, was not at this time deemed heresy, since the pope did not, as appears from history, declare the Gallican bishops heretics on that account, or exclude them from the communion of the apostolic see.

Of pope Eugene we hear no more till the years 826, when he assembled a council in Rome, consisting of sixty-three bishops, seventeen presbyters, and some deacons; all from the Italian provinces subject to the emperor Lewis, or the pope. By that council were issued thirty-eight canons; all calculated to restore the ecclesiastical discipline, and encourage learning both sacred and profane.¹

The following year the pope died; but, as to the time of his death, we only know, that it happened in the month of August, 827, the contemporary historians all telling us he died in that month, but not one of them mentioning the precise day on which he died. As he was ordained on the 14th of February, 824, and died in August, 827, he must have held the see at least three years and five months.

VALENTINE, NINETY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MICHAEL AND THEOPHILUS, *Emperors of the East*.—LEWIS THE DEBONNAIRE, AND LOTHARIUS, *Emperors of the West*.]

[Year of Christ 827.] Eugene was succeeded by Valentine, chosen, as is commonly supposed, after a few days vacancy. He was a native of Rome, the son of one Peter, and, at the time of his election, archdeacon of the Roman church. He was greatly esteemed and beloved by the two preceding popes Paschal and Eugene, especially by the latter, who is said to have cherished him as his son, and to have kept him constantly with him in the palace.²

From the account Anastasius gives of the ordination and instalment, or, as it is called, inthronation, of this pope, we learn the particulars of both these ceremonies. The new pope was, according to that account, attended by the Roman clergy, the people, and the senate, to the Vatican, was there first ordained, then placed in the supposed chair of St. Peter, and from thence conducted in great pomp, after he had performed divine service, to the Lateran palace, where he was enthroned, or set upon the pontifical throne, and acknowledged by the nobility and the senate prostrating themselves before him, and kissing his foot amidst the acclamations of the people. When the cere-

mony was ended, the pope gave a great entertainment to the chief of the clergy, and the officers of state, and enriched, to use the word of Anastasius, with many gifts, the clergy, the people, and the senate.²

Valentine enjoyed his new dignity but a very short time, according to some, scarce one month;³ according to others, forty days.⁴ He must therefore have died on the latter end of September, or the beginning of October, of the same year in which he was chosen. Indeed, from this time to the middle of the eleventh century, no writer I know of, besides Anastasius, has been so accurate and exact as to mention the months or the days that each pope sat above the whole years; and in Anastasius the numbers have been so altered, through the inaccuracy or the ignorance of the transcribers, that, with respect to them, no two copies agree. We must therefore, henceforth, be satisfied with ascertaining the number of the years, and guessing, where we can, at that of the months and the days.

¹ Eginhard. in *Annal. Lab. Concil. c. 8. Natal. Alex. sect. 9. part. i. art. 4.*

² Anast. in *Valent. & Mabill. in comment. ad Ord. Roman. n. 18.*

³ Eginhard. in *Annal.*

⁴ *Liber Pont. Luitprand. Martin. Pelon. &c.*

¹ Agobard. p. 142, 143. 254—266.

² Anast. in *Valentine.*

Gregory elected. Quarrel between Lewis the Debonnaire and his three sons;—[Year of Christ, 833.] Charge brought against the empress Judith, who is shut up in a monastery.

GREGORY IV., THE HUNDREDTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[THEOPHILUS, *Emperor of the East.*—LEWIS THE DEBONNAIRE, AND LOTHARIUS, *Emperors of the West.*]

[Year of Christ 827.] Valentine being dead, Gregory, the fourth of that name, by birth a Roman, the son of one John, and presbyter of the Roman church, was either immediately, or after a very short vacancy, for we read of no opposition, raised to the see in his room. However, as his ordination was delayed till the emperor, then in France, was acquainted with his election, and it was examined and confirmed by deputies from thence sent to Rome,¹ we cannot well suppose him to have been ordained till the latter end of the present year.

Of this pope nothing occurs in history, worthy of notice, till the year 833, when he interposed in the quarrel between the emperor Lewis and his three sons, Lotharius, Pepin, and Lewis. Of that quarrel, of the disturbances attending it, of the part the pope acted in it, the contemporary historians give us the following account: the emperor had, ever since the year 817, divided his dominions, after the example of his father Charlemagne, amongst his children. Lotharius, his eldest son, he had chosen for his successor in the empire, and taken him for his colleague; to Pepin, his second son, he had given the kingdom of Aquitaine; and to Lewis, the youngest of the three, the kingdom of Bavaria. This division was approved by the general assembly of the states at Aix-la-Chapelle; the three princes were crowned there with great solemnity; the act of settlement was sent to the pope; and the two kings, repairing, as soon as they were crowned, to their respective kingdoms, were everywhere received with loud acclamations, and by all acknowledged for their lawful sovereigns. But the empress Hermengard, their mother, dying the following year, 818, the emperor was prevailed upon by his nobles, apprehending him inclined to resign the crown, and lead a retired life, to marry again; and he married Judith, daughter to Duke Welfo, descended from a very ancient family, and at that time one of the most powerful and illustrious in Bavaria. In 823, the empress was delivered of a son, who was called Charles, and is known in history by the name of Charles the Bald. His birth obliged the emperor to make a new division of his dominions in favor of the young prince, born after the former division, and consequently left entirely to the mercy of his brothers. He published accordingly

an edict at Worms, in 829, settling on prince Charles the country of the Alemans, or the country lying between the Mein, the Rhine, the Neckar, and the Danube, all Rhetia, now the country of the Grisons, and that part of the kingdom of Burgundy, that extends beyond mount Jura; that is, the country of the Swiss, and Geneva.

As the share given to Charles was taken out of the largest of the three, or out of that which Lotharius was to succeed to as emperor, he loudly complained of the injustice, as he called it, done him, and resolved to leave nothing unattempted, that, he thought, could prevent the new division from taking place. With that view he gave out, and so did all his friends and adherents, who were very numerous, that the empress Judith, a true step-mother, was determined to raise her son to the imperial throne, and pave the way for him to it by the destruction of the whole imperial family; that, to the great disgrace of the crown, she entertained a criminal commerce with count Bernard, her principal minister; that she had, in conjunction with him, banished all men of conscience and honor from the court, and was concerting such measures as must end, if not timely defeated, in the ruin of the emperor, and all his true friends. These reports, though probably destitute of all foundation, alarmed not only the kings of Aquitaine and Bavaria, and some of the great lords of the empire, but several of the most eminent men in the church for probity, wisdom, and learning; among the rest Bernard, bishop of Vienne, Agobard, bishop of Lions, Jesse, bishop of Amiens, Hilduin, abbot of St. Denys, and Wala, abbot of Corbie, reckoned the greatest saint of the age. These holy men, giving entire credit to the reports they heard, and thereupon declaring all enemies to God and his church, who did not concur with them in reforming the court, and effectually providing for the safety of the imperial family against the wicked attempts of the empress and her favorite minister, easily prevailed, first on the king of Aquitaine, and afterwards on Lotharius, and the king of Bavaria, to join them. The king of Aquitaine, drawing together his troops in great haste, surprised the cities of Orleans and Laon; and finding the empress in the latter, the emperor being then waging war with the rebels in Britany, after reproaching her with her scandalous conduct, and the evil designs she had formed against him and his

¹ Eginhard. in *Annal. Auctori vit. Lud. Pii Annalist. Bertin.*

The emperor delivers himself up to his son Lotharius. He and his three sons reconciled. His son Lotharius rebels anew and persuades the pope to attend him into France. The emperor forbids the bishops to wait on the pope. Conduct of Agobard, bishop of Lyons, on this occasion.

brothers, he obliged her to take the religious veil in the monastery of St. Radegonde of Poitiers.

The emperor received, at the same time, the news of this revolt and the captivity of the empress; and struck with astonishment at so bold an attempt, he left Britany, and marched without delay, but under the greatest concern, against his son. But the king of Aquitaine being, in the mean time, joined by his brother Lotharius, at the head of a very numerous army, and the emperor's troops, officers as well as soldiers, deserting to them daily in whole bodies, the unhappy prince, thus left, in a short time almost alone, was obliged to deliver himself up, with his son Charles, to the rebels. Lotharius treated him, in appearance, with great respect; but left him no kind of power or authority, nothing but the bare title of emperor; and of that title too he flattered himself he should prevail on the states, that were soon to meet, to divest him, and oblige him to resign the crown, and retire to a monastery. But, in the mean time, the kings of Aquitaine and Bavaria, jealous of the power, and offended at the arbitrary and despotic conduct of their brother, began to think of abandoning him, and being reconciled with their father. They were encouraged in that thought by a monk, named Gombaud, in whom they placed great confidence; and by his means, as he was a man of great address, the reconciliation was soon brought about. Lotharius, finding himself thus abandoned by his brothers, and his party thereby weakened, in proportion as his father's was strengthened, thought it advisable to follow their example, lest, by his obstinacy, he should forfeit, in the end, all share in his father's dominions, and with it his life, or his liberty. As he was the first and chief author of all the disturbances, and his submission was forced, and not voluntary, the emperor, at the same time that he added some cities and territories to the share of his brothers, divested him of the imperial dignity, declared the subjects of the empire absolved from the oath of allegiance they had taken to him as emperor, and leaving him only the title of king of Italy, strictly enjoined him to undertake, even there, nothing of moment without his consent.¹

Thus was peace restored to the empire; but it was short lived: the three brothers revolted soon after anew, and were, by an excess of goodness, forgiven anew by the emperor. His matchless indulgence and good nature encouraged the king of Aquitaine to revolt the third time; which so provoked the emperor, that he was easily prevailed upon by the empress (who was returned to court, her profession, as it was forced, having been

declared null by the pope and the bishops) to disinherit Pepin, and give the kingdom of Aquitaine to her son, prince Charles. Lotharius wanted no better pretence to fly to arms, and try to recover his forfeited dignity. He was then in Italy; and being sensible that he could by no other means more effectually strengthen his party, and disguise the injustice of his cause, than by engaging the pope to espouse it, he applied to Gregory; and pretending he had nothing in view but to defeat the wicked designs of the empress, at whose instigation the emperor, divesting himself of his natural tenderness, had degraded him, though solemnly crowned by the holy pope Paschal; had disinherited his brother Pepin, to make room for her son; and was pursuing such measures as must inevitably kindle a civil war in the bowels of the kingdom; he begged his holiness to second him in an undertaking, that would recommend him to the love and esteem of all good men, of all the true friends of the emperor, of the imperial family, and the empire.

The pope, believing all he said to be true, readily agreed not only to interpose his good offices in his behalf, but to attend him in person into France, and there mediate a reconciliation between him and his father. Lotharius was then upon the point of setting out for France, at the head of a considerable army he had raised in Italy, not with a design, as he pretended to the pope, of defeating the ambitious and wicked designs of the empress, but to drive his father from the throne, and seize on the empire. Having thus gained, or rather deceived, the pope, he began his march, attended by him, and some of the chief men of his clergy, giving everywhere out, as he entered France, that his holiness, fully satisfied of the justice of his cause, had zealously espoused it, and was come from Italy on purpose to excommunicate the emperor, and the bishops of his party, if an end was not put to the unjust persecution of his innocent children. These reports, industriously spread abroad by Lotharius and his friends, had the wished for effect; and men flocked to him from all parts, persuaded he had justice on his side, since the pope had declared in his favor.

In the mean time the emperor, hearing, to his inexpressible surprise, that the pope was come into France with Lotharius, and taking it for granted that he had gained him over to his cause, wrote a circulatory letter to the bishops, to put them in mind of their allegiance, and forbid their waiting on the pope, or entertaining any kind of commerce with him so long as he continued with the rebels; nay, he charged Agobard, bishop of Lyons, to write against the pope, and expose his conduct, at the present juncture, in siding with a son, who had set up the standard of rebellion against his father. Agobard,

¹ Thegan. c. 35—40. Vit. Lud. Pii, ad Ann. 829—832. Nithard. vit. Wal. Albat. Eginhard. &c.

Letter from the bishops of the emperor's party to the pope. The pope's answer to their letter.

though a prelate of most unexceptionable character, and one of the most learned in France, was most unaccountably prejudiced against the empress and the ministers; and therefore, instead of writing against the pope, or blaming his conduct, he wrote a letter to the emperor, entreating him not to quarrel with his holiness, but to treat him with all the respect that was due to his character. "Were the pope come," said he, "to raise disturbances in the kingdom, or to foment those that have already been raised, you might, and ought, in that case, to drive him out with shame and disgrace; but, as he has undertaken this journey with no other view but to re-establish peace and tranquillity, by removing the cause of all the disturbances, you ought not only to receive, but obey him." Agobard pretended, that the disturbances were all owing to the intrigues of bad counsellors, and the wicked measures suggested by them; that the emperor could not in conscience annul the act of settlement, after it had been confirmed in a general assembly of all the states of the empire, and approved by the pope; that as the empire was, by that act, settled on Lotharius, and the kingdoms of Aquitaine and Bavaria on Pepin and Lewis, he could not, without the greatest injustice, take from them what he himself, and with him the whole nation, had given them. He added, "that the pope, sensible of the injury that was done them, and well apprised of the malice and craft of designing and evil-minded men, was come into France to interpose his good offices; nay, and to exert, if his good offices proved unsuccessful, all his authority in behalf of their oppressed innocence." He closed his letter with telling the emperor, that having taken an oath of allegiance to Lotharius as emperor, he thought himself bound by that oath to join and support him.¹

On the other hand, the bishops of the emperor's party hearing that the pope had attended Lotharius into France, with a design, as was given out, to excommunicate the emperor and his friends, agreed, at a meeting they had on that occasion, to write a letter to him in common, and try to divert him from so rash and unprecedented an attempt. In the letter they tell him that the news of his arrival in France had given them great joy, as they flattered themselves he was come with no other view or design but to interpose his good offices and mediate a reconciliation between the contending and opposite parties, and they would therefore have gone out to meet him had they not been restrained from showing him that mark of regard by an express command from the emperor; that if what they all heard was true, namely, that his holiness was come to excommunicate the emperor and his friends,

it could not be expected they should show him any kind of regard, and the emperor had done well in forbidding all intercourse between his loyal subjects and him; that an excommunication so unjust, so contrary to the practice and canons of the church, would reflect no less disgrace on the pontifical authority, that would thereby be brought into contempt, than on the imperial dignity; that if he came to excommunicate he might return excommunicated, "si excommunicatus veniret, excommunicatus abiret;" that in so presumptuous an attempt, he would meet with a more vigorous resistance from the German and Gallican bishops than perhaps he expected; that if he did not change his mind they would not allow his authority to be acknowledged in France or in Germany. In the close of their letter, they put him in mind of the oath of allegiance he took to the emperor upon his promotion, and even threaten to depose him for presuming to come into France with the emperor's enemies and without his permission. They likewise threaten with degradation the bishops, who, unmindful of their allegiance, had joined the rebels, adding, that should their obstinacy oblige the emperor to proceed to extremities the sentence pronounced against them would be irreversible.¹

This letter alarmed the pope, but being encouraged by Wala, abbot of Corbie, and his companion Pascasius, pretending that the vicar of St. Peter was empowered by God to determine all differences whatever, and that all men were to be judged by him, and he by none, he answered the bishops in a style that gave great offence both to them and the emperor, and left no room to doubt but he had been gained over to the party of rebels. He begins his answer with upbraiding them for styling him at the same time pope, that is, father and brother, titles that he thinks incompatible, and tells them, that they should only have given him the title of father, as the most respectful of the two, as if it were presumption in the Gallican bishops to call him their brother, though no title was more frequently given by the other bishops to the pope, nor by the pope to other bishops, as might be shown by innumerable instances. They styled him father and brother in the Lord; and in that sense the two titles are not incompatible. In the second place the pope finds fault with the bishops for not coming out to meet him, but suffering themselves to be diverted, by the command of the prince, from showing him that mark of respect that was due to his character, and wonders they did not know that the spiritual government of souls ought to take place of the temporal government of princes and kings; that is, in other words, they ought to obey him rather than the em-

¹ Agobard. de comparat utriusque regimin.

¹ Epist. Greg. IV. ad Episcopos Francorum, & Vita Wale.

The pope sent by the rebels to the emperor. How received. The emperor delivers himself up to the rebels.

peror, and, to wait on him, should have disobeyed an express command of their liege lord and their sovereign. He advises them to imitate the freedom of the holy pope Gregory, who was not afraid to tell the emperor that he too was one of his flock; that he ought to hearken to him, and to act agreeably to his directions. But the freedom taken by pope Gregory was only with respect to matters of faith and religion, as is plain from his words, and not to civil matters, as in the present case, and merely political, that have no kind of connexion with faith or religion. The bishops had put the pope in mind of his oath of allegiance, and, in answer to that, he tells them, that by his oath he is bound to give the emperor good advice; to acquaint him with his own faults and those of his ministers; to rebuke him if he does not correct them, and suggest to him such measures as seem the best calculated to re-establish peace and tranquillity both in the state and the church; that for these purposes alone he is come into France, whereas, they, betraying their trust, and prostituting their honor as well as their consciences, to the will of their prince, have, by a breach of their oath, encouraged him in all his bad measures, and ought therefore to be charged with the evils attending them. By bad measures the pope means the emperor's divesting Lotharius of the imperial dignity, and Pepin of his kingdom, though they had forfeited both by their rebellion. As for their threatening to excommunicate him or have him deposed, he bids them defiance, as they can lay no heinous crime to his charge, no theft, no murder, or sacrilege, which was tacitly owning that he might be excommunicated and deposed were he guilty of any such crimes. In the end of his letter he delivers it as his opinion, gained over, no doubt, by Agobard and the other bishops and monks of that party, that the emperor ought to stand to the division he had formerly made of his dominions, and could not, in justice, deprive any of his children of the share allotted them, condemning thereby the conduct of the father, and justifying that of the children in rebelling against him. And could not the emperor, who made the division, for just reasons alter it? Did not the birth of a son after that division, fully justify the alteration he made? Was that son to be left to the mercy of his brothers, that is, quite destitute? What the pope observes in his letter is true, namely, that they had all taken an oath of allegiance to Lotharius as emperor, but that dignity he had forfeited by his rebellion, and, under a less merciful parent, would have forfeited his life or his liberty as well as his dignity. The oath, therefore, they had taken to him was no longer binding; but as that was still binding they had taken to the emperor, it was a breach of his oath in the pope, to join the

rebels, and no breach of their oath in the bishops, but duty and loyalty, to stand by the emperor.

The pope's letter was immediately communicated to the emperor; who no longer doubting but the rebels had gained him to their party, and at the same time sensible that his presence, as it authorized, in a manner, their rebellion, would daily draw great numbers of ecclesiastics, and, by their means, men of all ranks, to their party, thought it advisable to put the whole, without further delay, to the issue of a battle. The kings of Aquitaine and Bavaria had joined Lotharius when he first entered France; and they were all three encamped between Bale and Strasbourg. Against them the emperor marched at the head of his army; but they, well apprised that the longer they delayed giving battle, the more sure they would be of the victory, as many, abandoning the emperor, came daily over to them, bethought themselves of sending the pope to negotiate, as they pretended, a reconciliation between them and their father, but, in truth, with no other design but to gain time, and acquire new strength, as they daily did. The pope, whom they used on this, and had used on all other occasions, as a mere tool, proud of his commission, immediately repaired to the emperor's camp, that was but a small distance from that of the rebels. The emperor received him at the head of his army, with great coldness, treated him as his vassal, and severely rebuked him for abusing the authority his character gave him, to encourage children in an unnatural rebellion against their own father; for presuming to come into France without his leave, which none of his predecessors had had the assurance to do; and for striving to seduce, by his letters, the bishops, who, in compliance with their oaths and their duty, had sided with him. The pope strove to appease him; assuring him, that he was come into France with no other design but to re-establish concord and peace in the imperial family. Hereupon the emperor, willing to hearken to any reasonable terms of an accommodation, ordered him to be conveyed to his quarters, and at the same time dispatched Bernard, archbishop of Vienne, to treat, in his name, with the three princes, and try to bring them to a sense of their duty. The pope continued some days in the camp; and having had, during that time, several conferences with the emperor, he was sent back, upon his promising to employ his good offices with the princes, and to return in a short time to acquaint him with the success that might attend them. But the night after he left the emperor's camp, and he left it on St. Peter's day, he was followed by almost the whole army; insomuch that the unhappy prince, finding himself abandoned by all, and at the same time so closely besieged by the rebels,

The pope, how far to blame in this affair. The emperor restored. The pope fortifies Ostia ;—[Year of Christ, 834, 835.] The abbot Adrebal sent by the emperor to Rome ;—[Year of Christ, 836.]

that it was in vain for him to attempt an escape, was obliged to deliver himself up, with the empress, and his son Charles, into the hands of his rebellious children. By them he was deposed; and Lotharius being proclaimed emperor in his room, he was confined to a monastery, obliged to own crimes he had never committed, and thereupon to exchange, as really guilty of those crimes, the imperial robes for the habit of a penitent.¹

Baronius, undertaking the defence of the pope, pretends, that his holiness never declared for, or took part with, the rebels.² But the letter he wrote to the Gallican bishops, quoted above, is a full answer to all that the annalist has alledged, or that can be alledged, to clear him from countenancing so unnatural and so wicked a rebellion. However, he seems to have borne no ill-will to the emperor, but to have been imposed upon by those of the opposite party, and to have gained entire credit to the many false reports that were by them industriously spread abroad to color their wicked designs; namely, that the empress had gained an absolute ascendancy over the emperor; that he was wholly governed by her councils; that all the disorders in the state and the church, which they exaggerated beyond all measure, were owing to her; that she aimed at nothing less than the destruction of the whole imperial family to make room for her son; and that it was not against the emperor, but against her, and in their own defence, that the three princes had taken up arms. These reports the pope too rashly believed; and he is therein greatly to blame. But he was, it seems, undeceived by the emperor, in the interview he had with him: for we are told by a contemporary writer, that, being sent back after that interview to treat with the rebels, he was for returning to the emperor's camp; but they did not think it advisable to let him return.³ Theganus bishop of Treves, who was probably at this very time in the field with the emperor, writes, that Lewis, after having conferred with the pope, sent him many valuable presents; which it is not at all likely he would have done, had the pope still maintained the cause of the rebels, and justified their rebellion. Some writers, as ready to charge the popes with crimes, of which they were innocent, as Baronius is ready to clear them from the crimes of which they are guilty, ascribe to the intrigues of Gregory the general desertion that ensued in the imperial camp the night after he left it, as if he had laid hold of the opportunity he had, while in the camp, to debauch and gain them over to the rebels. But of this his pretended treachery not the least hint is given by the writers of those times; and his

proposing to return to the emperor, clears him sufficiently from that imputation.

The emperor did not long continue in the deplorable condition, to which the treachery of his subjects, and the perfidy of his children, had reduced him. The barbarous usage he met with from Lotharius, softened the other two princes; and compassion prevailing over all other regards, they rescued him the very next year out of his hands, and replaced him, to the great satisfaction of all ranks of men, on the throne. But as the pope was no ways concerned in his restoration, I shall refer the reader, for the particulars attending it, to the writers of those times.

The rebels, having no further occasion for the name or authority of the pope, when they had once got the emperor into their power, allowed him to return to Rome; and there he employed himself the two following years, 834, 835, in repairing and adorning the churches and monasteries of that city, and in rebuilding and fortifying the city of Ostia against the incursions of the Saracens, who began to infest the neighboring coast. That city he entirely rebuilt, surrounded it with a very high wall, and a deep ditch, fortified it with many strong towers, and placed a great number of warlike engines on the towers and the wall, to throw stones, and repulse the barbarians. The city, thus rebuilt and fortified, he called, from his own name, as Frodoard informs us, *Gregoriopolis*; but it soon resumed its ancient name, and by that name it is known to this day.

In the mean time, the emperor, having settled the affairs of the empire to his entire satisfaction, and apprehending no further disturbances from his subjects or his children, resolved to undertake a journey to Rome, to visit the holy places there, and confer with the pope; but being diverted from that journey by a sudden irruption of the Normans into Friesland, he sent the abbot Adrebal to Rome, to advise with the pope, in his name, concerning some particular affairs not mentioned by the historian. The pope received the abbot with extraordinary marks of respect and esteem, expressed great joy in hearing that all matters were settled to the satisfaction of the emperor, and, though greatly indisposed, and troubled with a bleeding at the nose, that had lasted some time, he had several conferences with the envoy, and upon his departure, appointed two bishops to attend him into France, with a letter, which they were to deliver into the emperor's own hands. They set out together from Rome; but, on their arrival at Bologna, the two bishops were stopped by an order from Lotharius, who was then at Pavia, and commanded to pro-

¹ Vit. Lud. Pil. Vit. Walæ. Thegan. &c.

² Bar. ad Ann. 833. p. 823.

³ Auct. vit. Lud. Pil.

¹ Frodoard. in frag. de Pont. Rom. apud Mabill. sect. 3. Benedict. part. 2.

Authority of the imperial judges in Rome. Death of Gregory;—[Year of Christ, 844.] His writings.

ceed no farther. They complied with the order; but privately delivered the letter they were charged with to Adrebald, who got it conveyed by one of his domestics, in the disguise of a beggar, into France; and there it was returned to him, and by him delivered to the emperor.¹ Lotharius had lately suffered his men to pillage some lands belonging to the church of St. Peter; and he probably apprehended, that the two bishops were sent by the pope to complain of that outrage to the emperor.

In the pontificate of pope Gregory, in what year we know not, occurs a remarkable instance of the authority exercised by the imperial judges in Rome. I have observed elsewhere, that the emperors, as supreme lords of Rome, used, from time to time, to send judges to administer justice there; to hear the complaints of the people; to redress their grievances; and finally to determine all causes both civil and criminal. To these judges Ingoald applied, then abbot of the monastery of Farfa in the dukedom of Spoleti, complaining, that the popes Hadrian and Leo had seized by force, per fortiam, on five possessions or farms belonging to the above-mentioned monastery; that the monastery had reclaimed those possessions of the three succeeding popes, Stephen, Paschal, and Eugene, but always in vain; that, instead of restoring them, they had even pretended, that they had always belonged to the apostolic see, and had never been possessed by the monastery. The judges hearkened to the complaints of the abbot, and the cause was tried in the Lateran palace, the pope himself being present, and with him several bishops, and other persons of rank and distinction. The abbot, to make good his claim, produced the original instrument of the donation of those lands made to the monastery, and likewise the charter of Desiderius, the last king of the Lombards, and of Charlemagne, who succeeded him in that kingdom. But Gregory, the pope's counsel, questioning the authenticity both of the instrument and the charters, which, if allowed to be authentic, would at once have put an end to the dispute; the judge, at a loss what to determine, declined coming to any determination that day, probably that the instrument and the charters might, in the mean time, be examined by persons skilled in such matters with more care and attention. But the next day, several

persons appearing, of unexceptionable characters, and deposing, upon oath, that, in their memory, the disputed lands had been possessed by the monastery, and quietly possessed, till pope Hadrian seized them, they knew not upon what pretence; they were adjudged to the monastery, and a decree was issued, ordering them to be forthwith restored. The pope, one should think, would have acquiesced in so just a sentence, and restored, without hesitation, to the lawful owners, what so plainly appeared to have been unjustly seized by his predecessors. But with those good bishops it was a maxim, so far as we can judge from their conduct, to part with nothing they had once acquired, by what means soever they had acquired it: Gregory therefore, instead of complying with the sentence, and the decree of the judges, however equitable, appealed from them to the emperor; but with what success we know not.¹

Of this pope I find nothing else recorded that is worthy of notice till the time of his death, which happened, according to the most probable opinion, on the 25th of January 844, after he had governed the Roman church sixteen years, and some months and days.² He is said by some to have died on the 25th of January 843; but with them Easter-day, or the 25th of March, was the first day of the new year.

Two letters, ascribed to Gregory, have reached our times; the one restoring Ebbo, archbishop of Reims, deposed in 835, as one of the chief authors of the late rebellion, to his former dignity and his see.³ But as from history it appears that Ebbo, after the death of Gregory, applied to his successor, begging to be restored, and was only admitted by him to lay communion, the letter of Gregory, to the bishops and orthodox Christians, commanding the bishop of Reims to be reinstated in his dignity, is now universally looked upon as supposititious.⁴ By the other letter, the pope appoints Anscharius, who had converted the Swedes and Danes to the Christian faith, legate of the apostolic see to all the northern nations of Germany, approves the erecting the city of Hamburg, where Anscharius was to reside, into an archiepiscopal see, and confirms all the privileges granted to that see by the emperor.

¹ Chronic. Farf. apud Mabill. in Museo Italic. t. i. part 2. p. 62.

² Sigibert. Marian. Sist. Herman. Contract. Annal. Bertin. Sigon. Onuph. &c.

³ Concil. t. viii. p. 1575.

⁴ Vide Sirmond. in Append. ad Concil. Gall. t. iii.

⁴ Auct. vit. Lud. Pii.

Sergius elected, and his competitor driven from the see. The emperor resents his being ordained before his election was confirmed by him. His son Lewis lays waste the Roman territories. He is crowned by the pope king of Italy. Complaints against the pope.

SERGIUS II., THE HUNDRED AND FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[MICHAEL, *Emperor of the East.*—LOTHARIUS, *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ 844.] In the room of Gregory, was chosen and ordained on the 10th of February, which, in 844 fell on a Sunday, Sergius, the second of that name, the son of one Sergius, a native of Rome, and archpriest of the Roman church.¹ He was not chosen without opposition; John, deacon of the Roman church, supported by the populace, took possession, by force, of the Lateran palace; and having driven Sergius from thence, was placed by the populace in the pontifical chair; but he was soon driven out, in his turn, by the Roman nobility, who would have put him to death, had not Sergius interposed in his favor.²

As the new pope was ordained as soon as elected, Lotharius, who had succeeded his father in the imperial dignity ever since the year 840, heard at the same time of his election and ordination; and highly provoked at his having been ordained before his election was examined and confirmed, according to custom, by him or his deputies, he despatched his eldest son Lewis, whom he had appointed king of the Lombards, with a powerful army into Italy, to take possession of his kingdom, and at the same time to examine the election of the pope, to chastise the Romans for their presumption, and order matters so as to prevent their encroaching for the future on the just rights of his crown. The young prince was attended by a great many bishops, and other persons of distinction, among whom was his uncle Drogo, Bishop of Metz; and, upon his entering the ecclesiastical state, he committed every where the most dreadful ravages, put great numbers of the inhabitants to the sword, burnt their habitations, and turned the whole country, through which he passed, into a desert. However, as he bent his march towards Rome, the pope sent out all the judges and magistrates to meet him, while yet at the distance of nine miles from the city. He was received, when one mile from the gate, by all the Roman militia, by the nobility, and part of the clergy, and attended by them singing his praises, and by the people welcoming him with repeated acclamations, to the Vatican. There the pope, with the rest of the clergy, waited his arrival on the top of the steps leading up to the church, which the king ascending, he embraced the pope, and taking hold of his right hand, they thus advanced together to the door of the church; but, when they were upon the point of entering the basilic, the pope, unexpectedly

stopping, ordered all the doors to be shut; and then turning to the king, "If you come," said he, "as a friend, and for the good of the state, and this church, I shall order the doors to be opened; if not, they shall not be opened by me, nor by my command." The king, not a little surprised at the resolution of the pope, assured him that he was come with no evil intention, which he had no sooner done, than the doors were opened, and the king, entering the church with the pope, was conducted by him to the tomb of St. Peter, the clergy singing in the meantime, "Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord." There thanks were returned, with great solemnity, to God, and his apostle, for the safe arrival of the king, who taking leave of the pope when prayers were ended, returned, attended by all the Roman nobility, to his camp. He had signified to the pope his desire of being crowned and anointed by him king of the Lombards, and that ceremony Sergius performed the following Sunday, the 15th of June, with the greatest pomp and magnificence.¹

Lewis, though well pleased with the reception he met with at Rome, and the uncommon regard the Roman nobility paid him; yet, to punish them for suffering the new pope to be ordained before his election was approved by the emperor, he allowed his army to pillage their farms, to lay waste their lands, and to live as in an enemy's country. The city would in all likelihood have fared no better than the neighboring country, had not the pope, apprehending the danger, ordered all the gates to be shut, and the walls to be night and day guarded by the Roman militia. In the mean time the king's camp was filled with bishops from the different provinces of Italy, come, upon their hearing that the king and the pope were at variance, to complain of the daily usurpations of the popes, and the tyranny they exercised over them and their sees. Amongst these were the archbishops of Ravenna and Milan, and no fewer than thirteen bishops immediately subject to the apostolic see, and they all greedily laid hold of the present opportunity, encouraged, says Anastasius, by the archbishop of Metz, to redeem themselves from so galling a yoke. The king, glad of any pretence to humble the pope, not only hearkened to the complaints of the bishops, but ordered them to be examined by the bishops who were with him, and likewise by the counts, of whom Anastasius names seven,

¹ Anast. in Serg. II.

² Idem ibid.

¹ Anast. in Serg. II.

The pope and the Romans take an oath of allegiance to the emperor. Sergius appoints Drogo his vicar in France and Germany. Drogo's conduct on that occasion. Edict forbidding the pope to be ordained till his election was confirmed by the emperor. Sergius dies;—[Year of Christ, 847.]

assembled in council, and summoned the pope to appear before them and justify the conduct of his see. That council Anastasius styles a "cabal against the universal church, and head of all churches." The pope, however, obeyed the summons, and, if we may credit that writer, answered the complaints of his adversaries with such prudence and wisdom as confounded and silenced them all.¹ The king was probably satisfied with having thus humbled and mortified the pope for suffering himself to be ordained without the knowledge and consent of the emperor.

Before the council was dismissed, Drogo moved that an oath of allegiance might be taken to king Lewis by the pope and the Roman nobility and people. But this motion, though seconded by all the Gallican bishops, was vigorously opposed by the pope, declaring that they were all ready to swear allegiance to their great emperor Lotharius, but that he neither would take such an oath himself nor suffer the Romans to take it to the king of the Lombards. The motion was therefore dropped, and both Drogo and the king contented themselves with the pope's taking, in their presence, together with the Romans, the usual oath of allegiance to the emperor.² And hence it is manifest that the pope and the Romans acknowledged the emperor for their liege lord, and that the king of Italy could exercise no power or authority, but in the emperor's name, over them or the city.

As great confidence was reposed in Drogo by the emperor as well as the king, and he bore great sway in both courts, the pope, to gain so powerful a protector, appointed him before he left Rome, his vicar in France and in Germany, with a power over all those churches and bishops, to be controlled by none but the pope himself, as the immediate vicar of St. Peter. In the letter Sergius wrote on this occasion to the bishops of France and Germany, he bestows the highest encomiums upon Drogo, acquaints them with his having preferred him, in consideration of his high birth and his eminent virtues to the dignity of his vicar, and requires them to obey him in all things, as acting in his name, and by the authority of his see. But Drogo, finding upon his return to France, the Gallican bishops too jealous of their liberties, and too much upon their guard against all papal encroachments, to acknowledge his unbounded authority, he wisely forbore exercising or claiming any over

them or their churches; and he is on that account highly commended by Hincmar, as choosing rather to forego his power than to maintain it at the expense of the public peace and tranquillity.¹ Happy had it been for the church had all bishops, especially the bishops of Rome, been actuated by such Christian principles: But alas! what greater disturbances have been raised by the ambition of temporal princes in the state, than by the ambition of these spiritual princes in the church? And what else is the history of the church, to the great disgrace of the Christian religion, but the history of anti-Christian disputes and quarrels of churchmen about power and pre-eminence?

The king renewed, during his stay at Rome, the imperial edict, forbidding the pope, how canonically soever elected, to be ordained, till his election was approved and confirmed by the emperor; severely reprimanded the pope, as well as the people and clergy, for having presumed to transgress that edict, and recommended to all the strict observance of it, on pain of incurring the displeasure of the emperor, and his. He made several other regulations, in the emperor's name, with respect to the government of Rome, and the better administration of justice; and then quitting, to the great joy of the pope and the Romans, the neighborhood of the city, he repaired with his army to Pavia, the residence of the kings of Italy, or the kings of the Lombards.²

I find nothing else recorded of Sergius, besides his admitting Siconulph, duke of Benevento, to kiss his precious feet, as Anastasius expresses it, and his rebuilding, repairing, and embellishing with pictures and other ornaments, the churches of Rome, and robbing the cemeteries to enrich them with relics.³ Indeed this seems to have been the chief, if not the whole, employment of the popes at this time. Sergius died on the 27th of January, 847;⁴ and consequently, as he was ordained about the 10th of February, 844, he must have held the see three years, wanting some days. In the latter end of the pontificate of Sergius, the Saracens, entering with a numerous fleet of small vessels the Tiber, landed at Rome, burnt the suburbs, plundered the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul without the walls, and retired, unmolested, with an immense booty, and a great number of captives.

¹ Hincmar. ep. 44. & l. vii. Concil. p. 1799.

² Anast. in Serg. II.

³ Idem. ibid.

⁴ Annal. Bertin.

¹ Anast. in Serg. II.

² Idem ibid.

Leo chosen, and ordained, before his election was confirmed by the emperor. Enriches the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, and undertakes the building of the Leonine city. Fortifies Rome;—[Year of Christ, 849.] The fleet of the Saracens entirely destroyed.

LEO IV., THE HUNDRED AND SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[MICHAEL, *Emperor of the East.*—LOTHARIUS AND LEWIS, *Emperors of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 844.] Sergius was not yet buried, when Leo, the fourth of that name, a native of Rome, the son of Rodolph, and presbyter of the Roman church, was chosen with one voice in his room, was carried by force to the Lateran palace, and placed, with the usual ceremonies, and loud acclamations, on the pontifical throne. However, he was not ordained till the 11th of April, that is, till two months and fifteen days after his election; and the cause of so long a delay was, that the new pope, not daring to suffer himself to be ordained till his election was confirmed by the emperor, waited the arrival of his deputies to examine and confirm it. But as neither the deputies arrived, nor did the messengers return, whom the pope had sent to acquaint the emperor with his promotion, and at the same time the Saracens appeared anew on the neighboring coast, the Roman Senate were of opinion that the imperial edict might be dispensed with at so critical a juncture, and Leo was accordingly ordained, at their request and desire, on the 11th of April, which, in 847, fell on Easter Monday. On this occasion, however, they took care to protest and declare, that, in causing the pope to be thus ordained, they did not intend, by any means, to derogate from the just rights of the imperial crown, or to decline complying with the ordinance of "their liege lord, whom, next to God, they were bound to obey."¹

The first care of the new pope, was to restore to their former splendor the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul, which the Saracens had stripped of all their valuable ornaments; and the quantity of gold, of silver, of precious stones, he is said by Anastasius, to have employed for that purpose, almost exceeds all belief. A very small portion of the wealth he thus wantonly lavished away, would have afforded a comfortable maintenance to all the poor of the city.

Leo's next care was to secure so great a treasure against any new attempts of the Saracens; and with that view he resolved to execute the design which his predecessor Leo III. had formed, but was prevented by death from putting it in execution; namely, to build a new city on the Vatican, and inclose it, as well as the church of St. Peter, with a wall, lest so much wealth should be left exposed to the sacrilegious avarice of every corsair. That resolution he imparted to the emperor, who not only approved of it, but generously contributed, and prevailed

on his two brothers, Charles, king of Neustria, and Louis, king of Bavaria, to contribute no less generously than himself, towards carrying on so great and so necessary a work. The Roman nobility, too, applauding the design, assisted the pope with large sums to undertake the execution of it without delay. Leo, therefore, being thus encouraged to begin, and enabled to pursue the intended work, the materials were got ready, artificers and workmen, were, with the promise of extraordinary wages, enticed from the different provinces of Italy to Rome, and the foundations of the new city were laid in the month of September, of the present year, with the greatest solemnity. The pope took upon himself the office of overseer, spending all the time he could spare from his spiritual functions in reviewing the works, which he is said to have done every day, and in all kinds of weather, in encouraging the workmen, and examining what progress they made in their respective tasks or duties.¹

This great undertaking the pope, however, was obliged to interrupt for some time the following year, being certainly informed that the Saracens were equipping a powerful fleet in the ports of Africa, with a design to make a second attempt upon Rome. This intelligence occasioned a general consternation; and Leo, abandoning for the present the work he had begun, employed all his workmen in fortifying the city, and putting it in a condition to withstand any sudden attack or surprise. He repaired the walls in several places, gone quite to decay, rebuilt most of the towers, erected several new ones, two especially of great strength, on the opposite banks of the Tiber, with a chain drawn from the one to the other, to prevent any vessel from passing; and, to defend the city still more effectually, caused a great many bodies of saints, dug up in the cemeteries without the walls, to be brought into it with great pomp and solemnity.

In the meantime the Saracens, having assembled their fleet at Tozar in Sardinia, the place of their general rendezvous, set sail from thence for Porto, with a design to land part of their forces there, and convey the rest up the Tiber to the very gates of the city. But the inhabitants of Naples, of Amalfi, of Gaeta, and the other maritime places, no sooner heard of their design, than apprehending their own fate depended upon that of Rome, they assembled in great haste all

¹ Anast. in Leon. IV.

¹ Anast. in Leon. IV.

Lewis, king of Italy, crowned emperor at Rome;—[Year of Christ, 850.] The Leonine city consecrated;—
[Year of Christ, 852.] Council assembled at Rome, the following year.

their armed vessels, and putting to sea, sailed to Porto, resolved to guard the entrance into the river, and to engage the barbarians, should they offer to enter it, or to land any forces. Upon their arrival, they sent some of their chief officers to let the pope know that they were come as friends (for he distrusted the Greeks and the Beneventan Lombards, to whom those cities belonged) and that they were all to a man ready to venture their lives in his defence, and the defence of the city. Hereupon the pope, transported with joy, flew to Porto, received there both the soldiers and officers with extraordinary marks of esteem and affection, admitted them to kiss his foot; and, upon expressing a great desire to receive the sacrament at his hands, he went with them in procession to the church of St. Aurea, and having performed there divine service with great solemnity, and administered the sacrament to them all, he encouraged them to fight manfully, having St. Peter and St. Paul, whose sacred bodies they defended, to fight with them, gave them his blessing, and recommending them to the protection of the prince of the apostles, returned to Rome. The very next day, the fleet of the Saracens appeared off Ostia; and the Christian fleet putting thereupon immediately to sea, an engagement ensued; but the two fleets were soon parted by a violent wind that arose unexpectedly, and drove most of the enemy's ships on the shore, where they were dashed to pieces, and all on board miserably perished. The rest were dispersed, and either swallowed up by the sea, or shipwrecked against the rocks and the islands, and very few had the good luck to reach the African coast. The Saracens were almost all either drowned, starved with hunger on the abandoned islands where their vessels were shipwrecked, or taken prisoners, and carried in triumph to Rome. There, and all along the coast, great numbers of them were hanged, and left on the gibbets, to strike terror into their countrymen, and the rest were put in chains by the pope, and employed as drudges in the most laborious parts of his new works.¹ This victory or deliverance was, we may be sure, ascribed to the miraculous interposition of the saints, especially of the two princes of the apostles. By them the storm was raised; and by them alone the fleet of the Saracens was dispersed and destroyed.

While the Romans were at the height of their rejoicings for so remarkable a victory, Lewis, king of Italy, arrived at Rome, sent thither by his father, who had lately taken him for his colleague in the empire, to be crowned emperor by the pope. Leo received him with all the marks of distinction due to his character, and crowned him, with the usual ceremonies, on the 2d of December of

the present year. As Leo had been ordained before his election was confirmed by the emperor, the Romans were under no small apprehensions of the king's resenting it, as he had resented but a few years before their suffering Sergius to be thus ordained. But Lewis was entirely satisfied with the reasons they alledged, and their having protested on that occasion that they did, by no means, intend to withdraw themselves from the obedience they owed to their liege lord and sovereign.

Leo, in the mean time, pursued with incredible ardor the great work he had begun in the second year of his pontificate; and he had in the sixth the satisfaction of completing it, and seeing the basalic of the prince of the apostles, that had hitherto stood by itself, defended only by the reverence that was due to so sacred a place, standing now in the midst of a city, and defended, where that reverence should be wanting, by a strong wall. The new city was, from the name of its founder, called the Leonine city, and the pope consecrated it with great solemnity on the 27th of June. He walked on that occasion, in procession with several bishops, and all the Roman clergy, round the new wall bare-foot, sprinkled it with holy water, and stopping at the three gates, said at each of them a different prayer, begging the Almighty, by the merits of his holy apostles St. Peter and St. Paul (not of Christ) to pour down his blessings on the city which he had built, and, from his own name, called the Leonine city; to grant it new triumphs over those against whom it was built, and to preserve it from ever falling into the hands of its cruel and merciless enemies. When the procession was ended, the pope performed divine service in the church of St. Peter, at which assisted the whole Roman clergy in a body, the senate, all the nobility, and a great many strangers of distinction, come from all parts to see the new city and be present at the ceremony of its consecration. After divine service, the pope, whose treasure was not, it seems, to be exhausted, ordered considerable sums to be distributed among the people, and presents to be sent to all persons of distinction, both Roman and foreign then in Rome. Such is the account Anastasius gives us of the building and consecrating of the Leonine city, and he was an eye witness of what he relates.¹

Leo, being now at leisure to attend to ecclesiastical affairs, and discharge the duties of his episcopal office, undertook with great zeal, to reform the manners of the clergy, and redress the many abuses that prevailed among them as well as the monks. With that view he assembled, in the month of December, 853, a council at Rome, consisting of sixty-seven bishops. By them some new canons were issued, and the observance

¹ Anast. in Leon. IV.

¹ Anast. in Leon. IV.

Anastasius deposed by the pope and the council. Alfred sent by his father to be educated at Rome. Colony of Corsicans settled at Porto, and the city of Centumcellæ rebuilt;—[Year of Christ, 854.] The emperor comes to Rome.

of others, that had been formerly made, enforced, on pain of deposition, excommunication, &c., all calculated to restore the ecclesiastical discipline, and banish the many abuses that had insensibly crept into the church. The council took particular care, as most other councils had done, though to very little purpose, to prevent the bishops and clerks from frequenting the company of women, from admitting them into their houses, or conversing familiarly with them. By the same council divorces were forbidden in all cases, but in that of adultery; and married persons restrained from embracing a monastic life, without the consent of the bishop, who was charged to inquire, with great care, whether both truly agreed to it, and if they did not, to deny his consent.

The pope and the bishops of the assembly deposed, before they parted, and deposed with one consent, Anastasius, cardinal presbyter of the church of St. Marcellus, in Rome. He had been five years absent, and though commanded by the pope to return, and even excommunicated for paying no kind of regard to his repeated commands, he still continued to live, unconcerned, in the diocese of Aquilea, pretending that the pope had there no sort of power or authority over him. He was therefore solemnly deposed, and the sentence, declaring him divested of all sacerdotal and ecclesiastical dignity, was signed by the pope, and all the bishops, presbyters, and deacons who were present.¹ It is observable that this council is said to have been held "in the seventh year of the pontificate of the most holy and universal pope Leo IVth," and this is the first instance we meet with of any public deeds marked with the years of the popes or of their pontificate.

The same year came to Rome the famous Alfred, sent by his father Æthelwulf, king of the West Saxons, to be educated there, under the care and direction of the pope, being then scarce four years old, for he was born in 849. Asserius, who lived with him, and wrote his life, tells us, that Leo confirmed him; that he adopted him for his son, and anointed him king,² but of what kingdom, neither that writer nor any other, has informed us. As for the kingdom of the West Saxons, it was then held by his father, and he had three other sons, who were all older than Alfred, and came to the crown before him.

As the Saracens continued, notwithstanding their late disaster, to infest the coast, the pope fortified, at a great expense, the city of Porto, planted there a colony of Corsicans, and not only yielded to them for ever that city, and its territory, upon their swearing allegiance to him and his successors, but generously supplied them with horses, with oxen, with tools of agriculture, and

arms to repulse the Saracens, should they offer to attack them. He likewise rebuilt the walls of Hortana and Amerina, quite gone to ruin, and of many other cities on the coast, left altogether defenceless to the mercy of the enemy. The inhabitants of Centumcellæ had abandoned their city, chosing rather to wander like wild beasts in the woods, than to live in constant fear of being either massacred by the Saracens, or carried by them into captivity, with their wives and their children. The pope was affected with the miseries they suffered; and he determined, notwithstanding the immense sums he had already expended, to build them a new city. He went accordingly in person to look out for a convenient place to build it on; but, though he viewed, and narrowly examined, every spot in that part of the country, he could find none that he entirely approved of. But heaven interposed; and a most convenient situation for the intended city was pointed out to him in a dream, nay, and the plan shown him, which he was to conform to in building it. The plan he copied in his sleep, found it, when he awaked, in his hand, and had, in a very short time, the satisfaction of seeing a new city raised in the place, and in every part answering the plan that heaven had shown him.¹ Thus Anastasius; and he probably learnt the story he relates from the pope himself, who might not scruple to use that pious invention or fraud to get his design the more readily approved, and the more speedily executed: for who would not approve, who would not, with the greatest ardor and eagerness, concur in the execution of a plan or design sent down from heaven? The pope consecrated the new city with the very same ceremonies, pomp, and solemnity he had used in consecrating the Leonine city; and, from his own name, called it Leonopolis, the same name in Greek that he gave to the other in Latin. I leave Anastasius to reconcile his thus transmitting his name to posterity with the utter contempt he is said by that writer to have entertained of all human glory. In process of time, the inhabitants of the new city, disliking its situation, and either forgetting, or not believing it had been pointed out by heaven, abandoned it, and returned to Centumcellæ, which they called Civita Vecchia, that is, the ancient city; and so it is called to this day.²

Leo had scarce finished his new city, when news was brought him, to his great surprise, of the arrival of the emperor Lewis in the neighborhood of Rome. As he came quite unexpected, at the head of a numerous army, and no one knew with what design, his arrival threw the whole city into the utmost consternation. He was, however, met

¹ Anast. Vit. Alfred.

² Bruzen. Martin. Dict. Geograph. et Crit.

¹ Anast. in Leon. IV.

² Vit. Alfred.

Gratian, commander of the Roman militia, tried and acquitted. Leo dies, and is sainted;—[Year of Christ, 855.] Miracle wrought by him. The dispute about grace and free-will, first moved in Leo's time. His homily.

and attended, according to custom, by the Roman magistrates, the clergy and nobility, to the Vatican, and there received, with the usual marks of distinction, by the pope. It does not appear that he entered the church on this occasion, or visited the tomb of St. Peter. He only acquainted the pope with the motive of his journey, which, he said, was to punish the author of a plot, that was privately carried on against him and the French nation in general. The pope, not in the least daunted, as being conscious of his own innocence, begged he would name the person, and appoint a day for his trial, since no man could be lawfully punished till he was heard, and convicted of the crimes laid to his charge. The emperor named Gratian, commander of the Roman militia, one of the pope's counsellors, and a man of the first rank and distinction in Rome; and charged him with having, in a private conversation, solicited Daniel, another commander of the militia, to join him in driving out the French, and calling in their old friends the Greeks in their room. This charge Daniel, said the emperor, is ready to make good: a day was therefore appointed for the trial; and Gratian was accordingly tried in the presence of the pope, of the emperor, of the Roman senate, and all the French nobility who attended the emperor. Before that assembly Daniel renewed the accusation with great assurance; but Gratian, in the course of the trial, made his innocence so plainly appear, and convicted the informer of such palpable contradictions, that he was obliged in the end to own, that the whole was a calumny, entirely owing to malice and envy. Hereupon Gratian was cleared, and Daniel delivered up to him, agreeably to the Roman law, that still obtained in Rome, to be disposed of by him at his pleasure. The emperor, however, begged, that his life might be spared; and Gratian accordingly spared it.¹

The emperor left Rome as soon as the trial was over, entirely satisfied of the loyalty of Gratian, and the Romans in general; and the pope died soon after his departure, that is, according to the most correct copies of Anastasius, and the other chronologist, on the 17th of July, 855, having presided in the Roman church eight years, three months, and six days.² In this pope centered, if Anastasius is to be credited, all moral and Christian virtues, without the alloy of one single vice or defect; and it is not to be doubted but the place he now holds amongst saints in the calendar, was owing to the

high commendations that writer bestows on him, and the miracles he is by him said to have wrought. Amongst these, the following was alone sufficient to convince the world of his extraordinary sanctity: a basilisk of an immense size haunted a cave in the neighborhood of the church of St. Lucia in Orphea, and, with its venomous breath, killed all who approached the mouth of the cave. Thus was that part of the city soon turned into a desert, all flying from thence to avoid the contagion. But Leo, pitying their condition, undertook, as soon as he was ordained, to deliver them from so troublesome a neighbor. In order to that, he went in procession, after a general fast, with all his clergy, to the church of St. Mary ad Præsepe, and from thence to the cave, causing an image of the virgin Mary to be carried before him. As he approached the fatal place, he ordered the clergy and people to stop, and boldly advancing alone to the very mouth of the cavern, pronounced some prayers there, returned unhurt; and the basilisk was never more heard of.¹ Against this miracle might be objected the authority of Pliny, telling us, that the basilisk is no where to be met with, but in the province of Cyrenaica in Africa.² But that objection Baronius has answered, by letting us know, that when God wants to punish the sins of men, every country produces every noxious creature.³

In Leo's time was first moved by a monk named Gothescalque, the famous dispute about grace, predestination, and free will, that divided the whole Gallician church, into two opposite parties, and was long carried on, with great warmth, by the most eminent men of that church. But as the pope never interfered in the controversy, nor did any of either party ever think of appealing to him, or asking his opinion (an irrefragable proof that they did not look upon him as an unerring judge in religious disputes,) I shall refer the reader, for an account of that dispute, to the contemporary writers, especially to Rabanus of Mentz, to Hincmar of Reims, and Amolo of Lions, who were the chief actors in it, and distinguished themselves, above the rest, by their erudition and learning.

Leo wrote a homily, calculated to instruct the clergy in the duties of their office; and ordered it to be read by the bishops in the assemblies of the clergy of their respective dioceses. It has reached our times, and is to be found in the collection of the councils.⁴

¹ Anast. in Leo. IV.

² Anast. Herman. Contract. Orderii. Vital. Martin. Pelon &c.

¹ Anast. Herman. Contract. Orderii. Vital. Martin. Pelon. &c.

² Plin. Nat. Hist. l. 8. c. 21.

³ Bar. ad Ann. 847. p. 52. ⁴ Concil. i. viii. p. 33.

POPE JOAN.

[Year of Christ, 855.] After Leo IV. and before Benedict III. is commonly placed the famous pope Joan, by those who believe that such a pope ever existed. But before I inquire whether such a pope ever existed, or not, the reader will expect some account of the birth, of the education, of the various adventures, of so extraordinary a woman, before, as well as after, she attained to the pontifical dignity, as it has been delivered down to us by the writers, who speak of her as a real, and not as a fabulous person. She was, according to most of those writers, the daughter of an English missionary; who, leaving his own country, went over to Germany, with great numbers of his countrymen, to instruct the Saxons, whom Charlemagne had converted with his victorious army to the Christian religion. The missionary carried over his wife with him, which obliged him, as she was big with child, to stop at Ingelheim; and there she was delivered of a daughter, whom some call Joan, and others Agnes, Gerbert, Isabel, Marguerite, Dorothy, and Jutt. As Joan (so I shall call her, as she is most commonly known by that name) showed from her infancy a strong inclination to the study of letters, and her father, who was a man of great learning, indulging that inclination, took upon him to instruct her, she made under him such astonishing progress in the different branches of literature, that she was looked upon by all as a prodigy. Her passion for learning did not render her insensible to a passion of a different nature. As she was no less famous for her beauty and address than for her genius and her learning, a young monk, of the monastery of Fuld in Germany, fell violently in love with her; and his flame kindling one no less violent in her breast, it was agreed between them, that, to enjoy more freely the company of each other, she should privately withdraw from her father's house, should disguise her sex, and, in that disguise, apply to the abbot to be admitted into the same monastery. She was then only twelve years old; but her passion inspiring her with a resolution superior to her age as well as to her sex, she forsook her parents unaffected, and dissembling her sex, presented herself to the abbot, and so imposed upon him by an assumed modesty and a pretended desire of consecrating herself from her tender years to God, and avoiding the temptations of the world, that might, in confederacy with her passions when they grew stronger, rob her of her innocence, that he embraced her with great joy, and received her, as a most promising youth, amongst his monks. And now the

two lovers had, to their inexpressible satisfaction, opportunities every day of seeing one another, of conversing familiarly together, and expressing to each other the violence of their passion, undisturbed and unsuspected. However, they are said to have kept, notwithstanding the violence of their passion, within bounds in indulging it; but within what bounds we are not told; and to keep any bounds in indulging a violent passion, is a task to which few, if any at all, are equal. The lovers did not long continue in that happy state; but eloping together, for what reasons we are not informed, from the monastery, they came privately over to England, the young monk being a native of this country. Here they pursued their studies together with uncommon application. From hence they went to France, from France to Italy, and from Italy to Greece; stopping wherever they found masters or professors capable of improving them in the knowledge they had already acquired. In Greece they chose Athens for the place of their abode, to perfect themselves there in the knowledge of the Greek tongue. They had not been long at Athens, when the monk was taken ill, and died in a few days, in spite of all the care that could possibly be used to save his life. How deeply the surviving lover was affected with so fatal a blow, no words can express. Not able to bear the sight of any thing or place she had ever seen with him, she resolved, in the same disguise, to repair to Rome; not to visit the holy places there, but to divert her mind from dwelling too intensely upon the irreparable loss she had sustained, and alleviate her grief with the sight of so many great objects as would offer themselves there to her view. She had no occasion to repent of that resolution: her extraordinary talents made her soon known in that great metropolis; and her modesty, her address, her engaging behavior, gained her the esteem as well as the affection of all who knew her. To display her talents, she opened a school; and had the satisfaction of seeing it frequented by persons of the first rank and distinction, by the most learned men at that time in Rome; nay, and by the public professors themselves, not ashamed, nor thinking it any sort of disparagement for them to become her disciples. Thus she continued gaining daily new reputation and credit, not by her knowledge and learning alone, but by a conduct, in appearance, quite blameless, and an outward show of extraordinary sanctity, being ever the foremost in all public exercises of piety and devotion.

In the meantime died pope Leo IV. and

Joan is chosen pope. Is delivered of a son in the public street. Her adventures unknown to Marianus.

though men of extraordinary merit were not then wanting in Rome, yet was a woman preferred to them all, and, as of all the best qualified for so high a station, raised with one voice by the people and clergy to the pontifical throne. Thus did the world behold a woman sitting in the chair of St. Peter, and the keys, with the power of loosening and binding, fallen to the distaff. How long she was suffered thus to impose on the Christian world, is not agreed amongst authors; but in this all agree, that neither the people nor the clergy had occasion, till she was discovered, to repent of their choice; for she was discovered in the end, and the discovery of her sex was owing to the same passion that first prompted her to disguise it. Had she been as chaste as many other women, who are said to have disguised their sex before her time, as well as after it, she might have continued undiscovered, as well as they, to the hour of her death; but chastity was a virtue that she had been an utter stranger to ever since her infancy, and opportunities now offering daily to gratify an inclination that she never had the resolution to withstand, she yielded to it at all adventures, discovered herself to one of her domestics, on whose secrecy she knew she could rely, and disclosing to him all her secrets, took him in the room of her former lover. He was true to his trust; and to none was their intimacy known till the consequences, naturally attending it, betrayed it to the world. Her holiness proved with child; and we are told, that having presumed, in that condition, to exorcise a demoniac, and command the devil to tell her when he was to quit the body he possessed, the evil spirit answered, "Tell me first, you who are pope, and the father of fathers, when a she pope is to be brought to bed, and I will then tell you when I am to quit the body I possess."¹ That answer was understood by those who heard it as importing no more, than that the devil never would depart from that body; and no notice was therefore taken of it.

In the mean time her holiness advanced in her pregnancy; but not thinking herself so near her time as she really was, she unluckily ventured to assist at a procession, the annual procession of the rogation-week. In that week, the week preceding Whitsuntide, extraordinary devotions were performed to preserve the fruits of the earth yet tender and liable to be blasted; and the pope walked, in solemn procession, with all the clergy, from the Vatican basilic to the Lateran. She might have excused herself; and a woman of her art and address could not be at a loss to find pretences to excuse herself from attending so long and so fatiguing a ceremony: but she chose to attend it, not

apprehending that she was so near her time, say some writers; while others gravely tell us, that, touched with remorse, she sincerely repented of her wickedness; and that an angel being thereupon sent from heaven to offer her the alternative, to be either eternally damned in the other world, or endure in this the confusion that was due to her sins, she chose of the two evils the least. However that be, she set out in procession from the Vatican, attended, according to custom, by the clergy in a body, by the senate, and immense crowds of people, and walked with great ease till she came to the street between the church of St. Clement and the amphitheatre. There she was suddenly seized with pains incident to women in her condition; fell, overcome by the violence of those pains, to the ground; and while all about her were striving to help her up, and afford her some relief, not knowing what had befallen her, she was, in the public street, and in the presence of the whole multitude, delivered of a son, or, as a monkish poet expresses it, of a little pope.¹ Some say, that both the mother and the child died on the spot; and others, that the child died; but that the mother was preserved by a kind of miracle, to atone, as she did in a dungeon, for her wickedness.² They add, that, to perpetuate the memory of such an extraordinary adventure, a little chapel was built, and a statue erected, in the place where it happened, both to the mother and the child; and that, in detestation of the fact, the popes and the Roman clergy have ever since, in their processions from the Vatican to the Lateran, turned off from that street, choosing rather to go a good way about than to pass through so infamous a place. Not satisfied with thus showing their detestation and abhorrence of such a scandalous imposition, to prevent their being thus imposed upon for the future, they introduced the immodest custom of placing the new pope on a perforated stool, before he was ordained, and obliging the youngest deacon to satisfy himself and them, that the person, whom they had chosen, was not a woman; "mas est," cried the deacon; and the clergy answered, "deo gratias."³

Such is the account they give us of the birth, education, adventures, and unhappy end of the celebrated pope Joan. But it is to be observed, that of none of the various circumstances and incidents, with which they have embellished her story, has the least notice been taken by Marianus Scotus, who flourished two hundred years after her time, and is supposed to have been the first

¹ "Papa Pater Patrum peperit Papissa Papellum."

² She is, nevertheless, represented by Mantuanus, hanging, with her lover, at the entry into hell:

"Hic pendebat adhuc, sexum mentita virilem
Fœmina, cui triplici Phrygiæ diademate mitram
Suspendebat apex; et pontificalis adulter,"
says that poet.

¹ "Papa Pater Patrum Papissæ pandito partum;
Et tibi tunc edam de corpore quando recedam."

Not impossible that a woman should have been raised to the pontifical dignity. A woman said to have been raised to the see of Constantinople.

that mentioned her. All he said of her, if he said so much, was, that "to Leo IV., succeeded Joan, a woman, who held the see two years, five months, and four days." Whatever else we read of her, has been added by writers who lived, some one, some two, some three, and some four hundred years after Marianus, and may consequently be looked upon as fabulous. However, as a fact, true in itself, may be, and often is, related with such circumstances as render it incredible, I shall examine here the fact in question, abstracting from the circumstances with which later writers have embellished it, and only inquire, whether "Leo IV., was succeeded by Joan a woman?"

And, in the first place, I cannot at all agree with Panvinius, that God never would have suffered the see of St. Peter, founded by Christ himself, to be sacrilegiously profaned by a woman;¹ since he himself is forced to allow, and so is Baronius, the see of St. Peter, though founded, according to them, by Christ himself, to have been sacrilegiously profaned by the most wicked of men, by monsters of iniquity, by the lovers, the bullies, the bastards of public prostitutes, prostitutes governing Rome with an absolute sway, and raising their chief favorites to the see of St. Peter. Neither can I agree with those, who think it impossible that a woman should have disguised her sex so artfully, as to be raised, quite unsuspected, to the pontifical dignity; for instances are not wanting of women, who have disguised their sex no less successfully than Joan is said to have done, and have lived, quite unsuspected, till death discovered them, or they discovered themselves. Thus did Eugenia, daughter to Philip, governor of Alexandria, under the emperor Gallienus, disguise herself so as to be admitted into a monastery of monks, nay, and to be made abbot; and she would have continued undiscovered to the hour of her death, had she not discovered herself to save her reputation, being impeached of an intrigue with a woman of ill fame, to the great scandal of all the monks. The fact is related by Alcimus Avitus, who was archbishop of Vienne in the sixth century, in his poem upon Virginity.² In like manner Theodora of Alexandria, having committed a fault in her youth, resolved to conceal the sex she had disgraced, and atone for it in a monastery. She was accordingly admitted by the abbot in the disguise of a man, and thus disguised, acted her part so well, that one of her own sex conceived a violent passion for her; and being slighted by her, to revenge that slight, gave herself up to one capable of gratifying her vicious inclination, and laid to Theodora the child she had by him. Theodora might have easily confuted

the calumny; but she chose rather to be thought guilty, to be driven, with disgrace, out of the monastery, nay, and to bring up the child as her own, rather than to pull off the mask. Nicephorus Calistus,³ and the author of the "Golden Legend," to whom we are indebted for this account, add, that Theodora was re-admitted, after some years of penance, into the monastery; that she led there, quite unsuspected, a penitent and exemplary life; and that the secret was not discovered till after her death.

Many other instances occur in history of women, who have disguised themselves no less successfully than pope Joan is supposed to have done; nay, it was even said, and commonly believed, if pope Leo IX. is to be credited, that a woman had introduced herself into the patriarchal see of Constantinople. That report, indeed, the pope did not believe; but yet thought that such a thing might possibly have happened. And, in a letter he wrote to Michael, patriarch of Constantinople, he expresses himself thus: "Far be it from us to believe what is confidently reported to have happened to the church of Constantinople; namely, that by promoting, as she does, so many eunuchs to the patriarchal see, contrary to the first canon of the council of Nice, she had once placed a woman on that see. The enormity of the fact, joined to our fraternal benevolence, does not allow us to credit that report; but yet, when we reflect on the little regard you pay to the canons, and the custom, that obtains in your church, of admitting eunuchs not only to holy orders, but even to the patriarchal dignity, we cannot help thinking, that such a thing might possibly have happened."² Now, if it was not thought by Leo absurd or incredible, that God should have suffered the see of Constantinople, though founded, as is pretended, by the apostle St. Andrew, to be profaned by a woman, why should it be thought absurd or incredible that God should have suffered the see of Rome, though founded, as is pretended, by the apostle St. Peter, to be profaned by a woman? If Leo did not think it impossible for a woman to disguise her sex so artfully as to be raised, quite unsuspected, to the see of Constantinople, why should we think it impossible for a woman to disguise her sex so artfully as to be raised, quite unsuspected, to the see of Rome? The custom that prevailed at this time amongst the western, especially the Italian, clergy, of shaving their beards, contributed as much as the condition of an eunuch towards carrying on the imposition with success; nay, to that custom Calcondilas ascribes the raising of a woman to the apostolic see.³ And Pierius Valerianus, in an harangue he ad-

¹ Onoph. Panvin. ad Platin. in Johan. VIII.

² Alcim. Avit. Poemat. l. vi.

³ Niceph. Calist. Hist. Eccles. l. xvi. c. 5.

⁴ Leo IX. ep. l. ⁵ Calcond. Hist. Turc. l. vi. p. 200.

Pope Joan never existed. The female pope unknown to the contemporary Latin and Greek writers.

dressed to cardinal Hippolitus de Medicis, tells that cardinal, that had the western clergy never adopted the effeminate custom of shaving their beards, the world would never have seen a woman sitting in the chair of St. Peter.¹

That a woman, therefore, should have been raised, in the disguise of a man, to the see of St. Peter, is a thing neither absolutely impossible in itself, nor incredible. But yet, that such a thing never did happen, that no woman ever did sit in that see, and consequently that the famous pope Joan is a mere chimera or phantom, has been made so evidently appear by several protestant as well as Roman catholic writers, that I can scarce help charging those with want of candor, who still maintain so stale and so groundless a fable. In matters of fact, we are to stand to the testimony of the contemporary writers, if worthy of credit, or of those who lived the nearest to the times of which they write; and admit or reject what we read in the later writers, as it is consistent or inconsistent with what we read in them. Now, what we read in Anastasius, who lived at this very time in Rome, concerning the death of pope Leo IV. and the election of his successor, at which he was probably present, is absolutely inconsistent with what we read in the writers who flourished some ages after his time; namely, that Leo IV. was succeeded by a woman; for the bibliothecarian tells us, in express terms, that the people of Rome, the clergy and nobility, meeting as soon as Leo died (*moræ*) to choose him a successor, all agreed to a man to confer that honor on Benedict; that they went thereupon immediately in a body to the church of St. Callistus; and, having found him there at his prayers, they carried him from thence to the Lateran palace, placed him on the pontifical throne, and signing the decree of his election, sent it to the emperors Lotharius and Lewis.² Leo therefore was, according to Anastasius an eye-witness of what he writes, immediately succeeded by Benedict, and not by a woman.

The account of Anastasius is entirely agreeable to what we read in Hincmar, at this very time Archbishop of Reims, who writes thus in one of his letters to pope Nicholas, the immediate successor of Benedict III.: "I despatched," says he, "envoys, with letters to Rome, who, hearing on the road that Leo was dead, pursued, nevertheless, their journey, and arriving at Rome, obtained of Benedict the privilege which they were sent to demand."³ While the envoys were on the road, Leo died, and Benedict was chosen, as appears from the words of the letter: we cannot therefore suppose any other to have been chosen be-

tween them, and to have held the see two years and five months, as the female pope is said to have done, without supposing the envoys to have been two years and five months on the road from Reims to Rome; which no man can suppose or believe. The other contemporary writers were all as little acquainted with the female pope, as Anastasius and Hincmar. Thus pope Nicholas, the immediate successor of Benedict, in a letter he wrote to the bishops of the council of Soissons, eleven years after the death of Leo, speaks of Benedict as the immediate successor of that pope: "Leo, pontiff of the apostolic see," says he, "being dead, and Benedict, of holy memory, chosen to succeed him, under him the reverend Hincmar renews the war."¹ In like manner Ado, Archbishop of Vienne, who flourished at this very time, and died in 875, enumerating, in his chronicle, the popes from Gregory IV., to Nicholas I., places Benedict III. immediately after Leo IV. "The Roman pontiff, Gregory, dies," says Ado, "and in his room Sergius is ordained; to Sergius succeeds Leo; and to Leo is substituted Benedict. The Bertinian annalist, who flourished at the same time, and brought his annals down to the year 882, writes thus at the year 855, "Leo, bishop of the apostolic see, dies; to him succeeds Benedict; to Benedict, Nicholas; to Nicholas, Hadrian; and to Hadrian, John."²

The Greek writers of the ninth century knew, it seems, as little of a female pope as the Latin; for the famous Phocius of Constantinople, and Metrophanes of Smyrna, not only take no kind of notice of her, though both sworn enemies of the see of Rome, but expressly exclude her, placing Benedict immediately after Leo, Nicholas after Benedict, Hadrian after Nicholas, and John after Hadrian;³ and both writers were contemporary with these popes. The writers I have quoted all lived, and wrote, at the very time when the female pope is supposed to have been chosen, to have governed the church two years and five months, and to have at last been discovered in the manner we have seen; and yet not one of them takes the least notice of such an extraordinary event; not one of them mentions the she pope, but on the contrary, all absolutely exclude her, by making Benedict the immediate successor of Leo, and thus leaving no room for any other. Should therefore the writers, who lived and wrote ever so little a time after them, all to a man relate such an adventure; should they all perfectly agree in every circumstance attending it; their evidence, nevertheless, ought not to be regarded as contradicting the testimony of those, whom we must suppose to have been better informed than they. But even the earliest writers,

¹ Johan. Pier. Valer. pro Sacerdot. barb. ad Card. Med.

² Anast. in Benedict. III.

³ Hincmar. ep. 26. tom. ii. Edit. Sirmont. p. 298.

¹ Nich. ep. 46.

² Annal. Bertin. ad Ann. 855.

³ Phot. de Process. Spirit. Sanct. l. i. Metrophan. de Spirit. Sanct. divinitat.

An account of the female pope foisted into some copies of Anastasius. By whom this fable was invented. Her statue in the cathedral at Siena.

upon whom the account of a female pope has been fathered, lived two hundred years after the writers I have quoted; and scarce two of them agree in the account they give of her: and are we to believe, upon the testimony of such writers, so remarkable an event, though utterly unknown to all the contemporary historians, nay, and inconsistent with what they have writ? Who could inform them of what passed in former times, if the writers did not inform them who lived in those times, or, at least, nearer them than they?

I am well apprised, that, in some manuscript copies of Anastasius, an account is given of a woman pope between Leo IV. and Benedict III. But as that account is not to be found in the more ancient and authentic copies of that writer, if we may depend upon the testimony of many learned critics, protestants as well as Roman catholics, who have narrowly examined them,¹ and as it evidently contradicts the account given by Anastasius himself, and all the contemporary writers, of the election of Benedict, it is now, almost universally, looked upon as supposititious, as not given by Anastasius, but inserted, in later times, into his work by some injudicious and ignorant transcriber, unwilling that such an extraordinary adventure, whether true or false, should be wanting in his copy. And truly that the relation of this tale was added by some other hand to the manuscript copies of Anastasius, appears, I think, undeniable, from the manner in which the relator expresses himself; namely, "it is said that Leo was succeeded by a woman?" For can any man think that Anastasius, who lived in Rome at that very time, who was an eye-witness of what he wrote, and consequently must have known for certain whether or no Leo was succeeded by a woman, would have spoken of such an extraordinary event as a fact that was said to have happened, and not positively asserted, or positively denied it? Would any historian, who in our days should write the history of Great Britain, express himself thus in speaking of the succession of our kings, "it is said that George I. was succeeded by George II.?" This is one of the many reasons that inclined Mr. Sarrau, a zealous protestant, and very able writer, to conclude the above mentioned passage to have been added to the manuscript copies of Anastasius by one who made an ill use of his leisure hours;² and this reason the penetrating Mr. Bayle looked upon as a demonstration.³ As for the writers who flourished in the same century

with Anastasius, or in the following, it is not even pretended, that by any of them mention has been made of a female pope, and therefore it matters little whether she was first mentioned by Marianus Scotus, in the end of the eleventh century, by Siegebert, in the beginning of the twelfth, or by Martinus Polonus, about the middle of the thirteenth; for the same question or difficulty still occurs, how came they to know what was utterly unknown to, or, at least, passed over in silence, by all who wrote before them.

Who was the inventor of this fable, or by whom it was first related, is uncertain, it being by some charged upon Marianus Scotus, by some upon Siegebert, and by some upon Vincentius Bellovacensis, or Martinus Polonus; while others pretend no mention to be made of the female pope in the more ancient manuscript copies of these writers. But whoever was the first author of that tale, it was, in process of time, embellished with many circumstances or curious anecdotes unknown to those who had first related it. In the copies of Marianus, where mention is made of pope Joan, no more is said than that Joan, a woman, succeeded pope Leo IV. during the space of two years, five months and four days; but by those who wrote after him, we are told, as has been observed above, that the she pope was delivered of a son in the public street, between the church of St. Clement and the coliseo, or the amphitheatre of Titus; that thenceforth the solemn processions have ever avoided the same street; that a marble statute was erected there in detestation of such an event;⁴ and that the perforated chair, was, from that time forward, made use of, to prevent the like mistake in the election of the pope.⁵ But it does not appear that the solemn processions ever passed through that street; and, if they did, it was for other reasons, perhaps because it was too narrow, that they afterwards took another way. We cannot doubt that a statute was to be seen in the place where Joan was supposed to have been delivered of her son, being assured by Theodoric, of Neim, who passed the best part of his time at Rome, and was secretary to two popes, that it was still extant at the time he wrote, that is, in 1413. But from thence we cannot conclude the story to be true, but only that it was believed when the statute was erected,⁶ as it was believed when the statue of the she pope was placed in the cathedral of Siena, among those of the popes, from St. Peter to Pius II. and placed between Leo IV. and Benedict III. with this

¹ Onuph. in addit. ad Platin. Blondel. Eclairciss. de la quest. Si une femme, &c. Serran. ep. 133, 146. Florimond de Remond. l. i. Antipapasse. Bale, art. Papepe, Note A.

² Sarrauius, epist. 138.

³ Bayle Dict. Histor. Papesse Jeanne.

⁴ Theodoric. Niem. de Priv. et Juribus Imp.

⁵ Guillen. Hrevin. de sept. Romæ Eccles.

⁶ It was more probably an ancient statue; but believed by Theodoric of Niem to be pope Joan's, as it represented a woman and her child; and the fable of the she pope universally obtained in his time.

The perforated chair. The fable of the female pope invented by the Roman catholics. Conjectures concerning the origin of that fable.

inscription, Joan VIII. an English woman. In Baronius' time this statute was still to be seen in the cathedral of Siena; but cardinal Tarugi, archbishop of that city, applying to the grand duke, at his request the features were altered by his royal highness, and the statue of pope Joan was metamorphosed into that of pope Zachary; but as all knew that it had once represented the female pope, it was broken or removed before the year 1677, to abolish her very memory.¹ As for the perforated chair, three chairs were formerly made use of in the installation of the pope: The first was of white marble, stood in the porch of the Lateran church, and was not perforated; the other two were of porphyry, were both perforated, and they stood before the chapel of St. Silvester in the same church. In the first of these chairs the new pope was placed, after

¹ Pagi, ad Ann. 853. n. 17.

What care was taken at Siena to abolish all remembrance of pope Joan, as well as of the statue with which she was honored in the stately cathedral of that city, will appear from what happened to the very learned father Antonius Pagi, and is related by himself: as he passed through Siena in 1677, and was very desirous of being informed upon the spot of every particular relating to the famous statue of the she pope in that cathedral, he applied for information to the religious of his own order, the Minorites; but they, to his great surprize, pretended all to a man never to have heard of such a statue. Hereupon Pagi, finding they avoided, he knew not why, entering upon the subject, repaired to the cathedral, and addressing most of the prebendaries as they came out of the choir after vespers, told them, that he wanted to see the statue of pope Joan, and begged they would show it him, as it might afford him some new light to confute the fable, and confound the heretics; but they all walked off, without so much as deigning to return him an answer. When they were all gone, a man, advanced in years, accosting him, told him, that he had long belonged to that cathedral; and that, as it was not to gratify his curiosity, but, as he understood, for the good of the church, he wanted to be informed concerning the statue of pope Joan, he would give him what information should be thought necessary for so good a purpose, provided he engaged never to discover the person who had given it. With this condition Pagi very readily complied; and thereupon the good old man answered all his questions to his full satisfaction, showed him the place where the statue had stood, told him when it was changed into that of Zachary, when it was removed; namely, in the pontificate of Alexander VII., a native of Siena, &c.—(Pagi, ad Ann. 853. n. 17.) Thus Pagi; and I cannot help observing here, that the promise of secrecy insisted on by the old man, the clownish behavior of the dignitaries of the church in one of the most polite cities of all Italy, and the shyness of the friars, averse to enter upon the topic of the female pope even among themselves, and with a very learned man of their own order, who they knew, would make a good use of the information they should give him, plainly show, that an order had been issued, no doubt by the inquisition, commanding all the inhabitants of Siena to observe a strict silence with respect to pope Joan and her statue. And it is not at all to be doubted but the like order has been lately issued by the same tribunal in another city of Italy, enjoining the inhabitants to forbear all mention of one, whom they cruelly tortured and racked to death. In compliance with that order, they must all pretend never to have heard of such a man, as the friars of Siena pretended never to hear of the famous statue, which had stood so many years in that cathedral, and had but a little time before been removed. But an honest man, I trust, will one day, be found at Macerata, as well as at Siena, who will speak the truth, to the eternal infamy of the ministers of that hellish court, striving to conceal with lying certificates, and lying attestations, as remarkable an instance of their cruelty and injustice as any that occurs in history.

he had been acknowledged by the cardinals, and while he rose from it, the 7th and 8th verses of the 113th psalm were sung in Latin, "Suscitat de pulvere egenum, et de stercore erigit pauperem, &c.," and from thence that chair took the name of stercoraria. From that the pope was attended by the cardinals to the two other chairs; was placed in both; and, while he sat in the one, the keys of the Lateran church were delivered to him by the prior of St. Laurence, and he returned them to him while he sat in the other. The reader will find this ceremony described in verse by a cardinal, in a poem he wrote on the coronation of Boniface VIII.¹ At what time, or by whom the use of these chairs was first introduced, we know not. Cencius, who wrote in the twelfth century, is the first who mentions them, but it is not certain that notice was taken by any writer before the fifteenth century of the use that was then said to have been made of them; namely, to know whether the person they had chosen was a man or a woman. The chairs, especially the two perforated ones, are thought by learned antiquaries to have been used by the Romans (for they are ancient) in their hot baths; and they are said to have been discovered in the ruins of those baths. As the placing of the new chosen pope in them confirmed the ignorant people in the belief of the fable of the she pope, it was thought advisable to abolish that ceremony, and it was accordingly abolished in the sixteenth century.²

The female pope owes her existence and her promotion to the Roman catholics themselves; for by them that fable was invented, was published to the world by their priests and monks before the reformation, and was credited, upon their authority, even by those who were most zealously attached to the holy see, and among the rest by St. Antoninus, archbishop of Florence; nor did they begin to confute it till protestants reproached them with it, as reflecting great dishonor on the see of St. Peter. Æneas Silvius, afterwards pope Pius II., in the fifteenth century, was the first that questioned the truth of the fact, saying, "that the story was not certain."³ After him Aventinus, who was a Lutheran in his heart, absolutely denied it, and many others undertook to confute it; but none, perhaps, with better success than the two protestant writers, Sarau and Blondel, who have alledged such reasons against the existence of the she pope as are absolutely unanswerable: and indeed, had they not been convinced themselves of the falsity of the fact, no man can think, that two such zealous protestants would have taken so much pains to convince others.

Various conjectures have been offered by

¹ Cardin. Jacob. apud Bolland. tom. iv. Maii, p. 471.

² Mabil. Musæum Italic. part. i. p. 159.

³ Æn. Sil. ep. 130.

Benedict chosen;—[Year of Christ, 855.] The imperial envoys declare for Anastasius. Benedict is stripped of the ensigns of his dignity, &c.

those who have thought it worth their while to inquire into the origin of this fable: some say, with Baronius, that John VIII., betrayed so much cowardice in the cause of Photius, as I shall have occasion to relate hereafter, that it was thought he should rather be called a woman than a man. Aventinus will have the fable to have taken its rise from the election of pope John IX., raised to the see by the interest of Theodora, a noble and imperious courtesan. Onuphrius Panvinius is of opinion, that Joan Rainiere, another famous courtesan, who governed John XII., as well as the state,

with an uncontrolled power, was called in raillery the she pope. Many other conjectures have been alledged concerning the origin of a fable, that was for so long a time and so universally credited; but, as they are only conjectures, I shall not trouble the reader with them, the story of a female pope being now generally, not to say universally, rejected by men of learning, whether protestants or papists, as an event first mentioned by writers who flourished two hundred years at least after the fact in question, and absolutely irreconcilable with indisputable facts related by cotemporary historians.

BENEDICT III., THE HUNDRED AND THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[LOTHARIUS, AND LEWIS II., *Emperors of the West.*—MICHAEL, *Emperor of the East.*]

[Year of Christ, 855.] In the room of Leo, the Roman people, the clergy, and the nobility, chose immediately, says Anastasius,¹ and with one consent, Benedict, the third of that name, a native of Rome, the son of one Peter, and presbyter of the title of St. Callistus. He was at his prayers in that church when news was brought him of his election; and thinking himself unequal to so great a charge, he begged with many tears they would leave him where they found him. But the people, paying no kind of regard to his tears and entreaties, carried him in triumph to the Lateran church, and there placed him, with loud acclamations, on the pontifical throne. At the same time the decree of his election was drawn up, was signed by the clergy and the nobility, and sent, in compliance with the ancient custom, to the emperors Lotharius and Lewis.² But those who were charged with it, namely, Nicholas bishop of Anagui, and Mercurius, magister militiæ, being gained over by Arsenius bishop of Eugubio, as they passed through that city, promised to declare, upon their return to Rome, for the presbyter Anastasius, who had been deposed in a council, and excommunicated by the preceding pope.³ The Roman deputies, returning to Rome, were soon followed by those from the two emperors, sent to assist at the ordination of the new pope. But the latter being met at Horta, about forty miles from Rome, by the bishops Arsenius, Nicholas, and two others; namely, Rodoald of Porto, and Agatho of Todi, and three captains of the militia, they were prevailed upon by them to abandon Benedict, and side with Anastasius. Of this Benedict was no sooner informed, than he dispatched the two bishops Gregory and

Maio, with letters to the envoys. But they, paying no kind of regard to the pope or his letters, or even to the right of nations, ordered, no doubt at the instigation of Anastasius, the two venerable prelates to be bound, and strictly guarded. Hereupon Benedict sent Hadrian, secundicerius of the apostolic see, and duke Gregory, to meet the envoys; who, in the mean time, sent an order to Rome, requiring, in the name of the emperors, the clergy, the people, and the senate, to meet them the next day beyond Ponte Molle. They complied with the order; and the envoys, attended by them, entered the Leonine city, where Anastasius pulled down, and either burnt or broke in pieces the images that Leo had set up there in the church of St. Peter; among the rest an image of our Savior, and another of the virgin Mary; and effaced the representation of a council, perhaps of the council that deposed him, which Leo had caused to be painted on the gates of that basilic. From the Leonine city, Anastasius, advancing through Rome to the Lateran palace, and placing himself in the pontifical throne, ordered Benedict to be stripped of the ensigns of his dignity, to be cruelly beaten, and to be delivered up to the two presbyters John and Hadrian, whom pope Leo had deposed for their crimes. This occasioned a general grief and consternation among all ranks of men: the clergy and the bishops, who were then in Rome, attended by the people, repaired to the Æmilian church, to implore there the protection of heaven at so critical a juncture; but they were soon interrupted by the imperial envoys, who, breaking into the church, threatened them with present death, if they did not acquiesce in the election of Anastasius. The bishops answered with great firmness and

¹ Anast. in Benedict. III. ² Idem ibid.

³ See p. 218.

⁴ See Blondel. *Eclaircissement.* p. 85, &c.

The bishops refuse to consecrate Anastasius. He is abandoned by the imperial envoys, and Benedict consecrated. Æthelwulf, king of the West Saxons, with his son Alfred, at Rome. Presents sent by the emperor Michael, to the pope. Letter of Lupus, abbot of Ferrieres, to the pope. Benedict dies;—[Year of Christ, 858.]

intrepidity, that they would rather suffer a thousand deaths than be any ways accessory to the consecration of one deposed and anathematized by a council. The envoys, finding they were not to be frightened into a compliance, retired to a room in the basilic; and having ordered the bishops of Ostia and Albano to attend them there, they spared neither threats nor promises to gain them over to the party of Anastasius, and prevail upon them to perform the ceremony of his consecration. But the two prelates not only withstood both their threats and their promises, but had resolution enough to reprimand the envoys for thinking them capable of so enormous a crime as that of consecrating one, whom a council had deposed, and tempting them to it. The envoys, now sensible they could not prevail, began to relent; and the point being disputed on both sides with great warmth, in a conference they had with the bishops and the clergy in the Lateran palace, they yielded in the end; and, driving Anastasius from the palace, ordered Benedict to be set at liberty, and he was, three days after, carried in triumph to the church of St. Peter, and there ordained in the presence of the imperial envoys, of the bishops, and of the Roman people and nobility, and acknowledged, by all, even by the most zealous partizans of Anastasius, for lawful pope. Thus far the bibliothecarian:¹ and, in his account, one thing occurs worthy of notice; namely, that the "ancient custom" still obtained of sending the decree of the election of the new pope to the emperor, and not ordaining him till the emperor confirmed it, and sent deputies to assist at his ordination; for Anastasius tells us, that it was "in compliance with such an ancient custom that the clergy and nobility of Rome signed the decree of the election of Benedict, and sent it to the most invincible emperors Lotharius and Lewis." That custom, therefore, was not yet abrogated, as is supposed by Baronius, pretending that the emperors Lotharius and Lewis yielded to Leo, the immediate predecessor of Benedict, the right they claimed of confirming the election of the new pope, or interfering any ways in it.

Soon after the election of Benedict, Æthelwulf, king of the west Saxons, came to Rome with his son Alfred, and continued there a whole year; during which time, he made rich offerings to St. Peter, whereof the reader will find a long catalogue in Anastasius, and presents to the clergy, the nobility, and the people.² He is likewise said to have rebuilt the English school at Rome, that had been consumed long before by fire,³ and to have granted three hundred mancuses⁴ a year to the bishops of Rome, in honor

of St. Peter and St. Paul.¹ As he passed through France on his return to his own kingdom, he married Judith, the daughter of Charles the Bald, and brought her with him into England. In his absence, his eldest son Æthelbald usurped the crown; but as the Danes had already committed dreadful ravages in his dominions, and threatened them with a new invasion, Æthelwulf chose rather to compound with the usurper, than to kindle a war, at so critical a juncture, in the bowels of the kingdom; and he contented himself accordingly with the eastern provinces, that is, with Kent, Sussex, and Surry, and left his son in the quiet possession of the rest. Æthelwulf is greatly commended by the monkish writers for his piety, that is, for his prodigality in enriching the church at the expense of his subjects; but he would have better deserved the commendations they bestowed on him, if, instead of undertaking so long a journey to visit the pretended tombs of the apostles, and staying so long abroad, he had not stirred from home, where his presence was necessary to repulse the Danes, now become a very a troublesome and formidable enemy, but employed in the defence of his people the wealth he squandered away upon the priests, the saints, and holy places at Rome.

The following year Michael, emperor of the east, hearing of the election of Benedict, dispatched to Rome one Lazarus, a monk, and skillful painter, to congratulate, in his name, the new pope upon his promotion. By this monk the emperor sent many valuable presents to St. Peter, and among the rest the book of the Gospels covered with pure gold, and a golden chalice, both enriched with precious stones of various kinds.²

The same year the pope received a letter from Lupus, abbot of Ferrieres, a man greatly esteemed in this age, recommending to his holiness two monks of his monastery, who had undertaken a pilgrimage to the tombs of the apostles, and begging him to instruct them in the practices and customs of the Roman church, and to send him by them, upon their return, the following books—the commentaries of St. Jerom upon Jeremiah, from the sixth book to the end; Cicero de Oratore; the twelve books of Quintilian's Institutions; and the commentary upon Terence; which books, he says, he cannot procure in France, and will send back to his holiness as soon as transcribed.³

The pope died the 8th of April, 858, having governed the Roman see two years, six months and ten days. He was chosen, indeed, a few days after the death of Leo,

¹ Anast. in Benedict. III.

² Idem ibid.

³ Polyd. Virg. l. v. p. 96.

⁴ The Saxon mancuse is, according to the author of

the Thesaurus Septentrionalis, equal in value to three half-crowns of our money.

¹ Asser. Annal. ad Ann. 855.

² Anast. ibid.

³ Lupus, ep. 103.

Benedict's letters ;—[Year of Christ, 858.] Nicholas chosen. The first pope that was crowned. How honored by the emperor Lewis. The church of Bremen subjected to that of Hamburgh ;—[Year of Christ, 859.]

which happened on the 17th of July, 855, but he was not ordained till the 29th of September, of the same year. Of this pope two letters have reached our times; the one to Hincmar, of Reims, confirming the acts of the second council of Soissons, which Leo, his predecessor had refused to confirm, as those who were condemned by that council had appealed to Rome; the other is a letter to the bishops of the kingdom of Charles the Bald, wherein he enumerates the many crimes that a subdeacon, named Hubert, the son of count Boso, was accused of; namely, of murder, of adultery, of fornication, of spending his whole time in the company of actresses, and other lewd women, of seizing on the goods of the monastery of St. Maurice, in defiance of the privileges granted to that monastery by the apostolic see; of violently breaking into another monastery, which no woman had ever been allowed to set foot in, and rioting there, for several days together, with prostitutes, &c. The pope requires the subdeacon, by virtue of his apostolic authority, to appear at Rome within the space of thirty days after the receipt of his letter, in order to plead his cause

in person before the apostolic see, on pain of being excluded from the company of the faithful.¹ Two other letters are ascribed to this pope; the one confirming the privileges of the abbey of Corbie, and the other those of the abbey of St. Denis: But some question the genuineness of these letters. Benedict was buried in the Vatican, whither his body, attended by the bishops, and all the clergy, was carried by the deacons, among whom was his immediate successor, on their shoulders, and placed by them in the grave, pursuant to an ancient custom which he had revived, ordering all bishops, presbyters, and deacons, to assist at the funerals, and pray for the souls of their deceased brethren. He enriched the churches of Rome with many presents of great value, which Anastasius has taken care to enumerate, telling us that he was no less generous to the poor, to the destitute orphans and widows, than he was to the clergy and the churches. He is said to have been blessed with a sweetness of temper that endeared him to all; and he is commended on that account even by Photius of Constantinople, though a sworn enemy to the apostolic see.²

NICHOLAS, THE HUNDRED AND FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MICHAEL AND BASILIUS, *Emperors of the East.*—LEWIS II. *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ 858.] Benedict was succeeded by Nicholas, a native of Rome, the son of Theodore, and deacon of the Roman church. The clergy, the nobility, and the people, chose him, with one consent, a few days after the decease of his predecessor, and carrying him, by force, from the basilic of St. Peter, where he had concealed himself to avoid being chosen, to the Lateran palace, placed him there on the apostolic throne. The emperor Lewis had left Rome a little time before the death of Benedict; but he no sooner heard of it, than he returned to that city, and there assisted in person at the consecration of the new pope. That ceremony was performed, according to custom, in the basilic of St. Peter, on the 24th of April, 858, after the see had been vacant fifteen days; and from thence the pope was carried back to the Lateran church, and there crowned, amidst the loud acclamations of the Roman people.² The ceremony of crowning the pope was, it seems, first introduced at this time; no notice, at least, has been hitherto taken of it by Anastasius, or any other ancient writer. The emperor, having entertained the pope at dinner the third day after his election, retired from Rome to a place in

the neighborhood, called Quintus; and being informed while he staid there, that the pope, attended by the Roman nobility, was coming to visit him, he not only went out to meet him, but, dismounting as he approached, took hold of his bridle, and, forgetful of his dignity, led his horse the distance of a bow-shot on foot, and did so again at their parting.³ The state that the popes afterwards took upon them, was chiefly owing to these and such-like marks of extraordinary respect shown them by superstitious and bigoted kings and emperors; for, elated therewith, they began to look upon themselves as lords of the universe, and upon the princes of the earth as their vassals.

The first thing I find recorded of this pope is his confirming the union of the churches of Hamburgh and Bremen. As Hamburgh had been made an archiepiscopal see in the time of Gregory IV., but had no suffragans, Lewis, king of Germany, thought of subjecting to it the see of Bremen; and he did so accordingly, upon the death of Leuderic, the third bishop of that city. This change met at first with no opposition, the archiepiscopal see of Cologne, to which that of

¹ Benedict. III. ep. I. tom. iii. Concil. Gal.

² Anast. in Nichol. I.

¹ Benedict. ep. 2. tom. iii. Concil. Gal.

² Phot. de Process. Spirit. Sancti.

³ Anast. in Nichol. I.

The empress Theodora confined to a monastery. Ignatius of Constantinople driven from his see, and sent into exile. Photius raised to the patriarchal see in his room.

Bremen was suffragan, being then vacant. But Gunthier, the new archbishop, remonstrating against it as soon as he was chosen, the king, and the bishops of his kingdom assembled in council at Mentz, applied to him for his approbation and consent. Gunthier referred the whole affair to the pope; and his holiness not only confirmed the change of jurisdiction, but appointed Anscharius, then archbishop of Hamburgh, legate of the apostolic see to the Swedes, the Danes, the Slavi, and the other northern nations.¹

The deposition of Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople, and intrusion of Photius that happened in this or in the preceding year, engaged, above all things, the attention of the new pope, as the disturbances that arose from thence, and divided the eastern bishops into two opposite parties, gave him an opportunity of exerting the power and authority claimed by his predecessors over that patriarchal and rival see. Ignatius, originally, called Nicetas, was the third son of the emperor Michael, surnamed Rhangabe; but being obliged by Leo, the Armenian, when he drove his father from the throne, to take the monastic habit, he exchanged on that occasion the name of Nicetas for that of Ignatius, and lived retired in the islands of Hyatros and Terebinthus, which he is said to have peopled with monks, till the year 846, when he was raised to the patriarchal see by the interest of Theodora, guardian to her son Michael, the present emperor, and sister to Bardas.² This man Ignatius had frequently reprimanded, with the liberty becoming a person of his character and station, for divorcing his own wife, and living publicly with his brother's, and even refused him the eucharist, as he came to receive it on the day of the Epiphany with the other officers of the crown. This Bardas highly resented; but sensible that he could not wreak his vengeance upon the patriarch till Theodora, his great friend and protectress, was removed, he undertook, in the first place, to estrange the mind of the emperor from her, painting her to him as a woman of an unbounded ambition and restless temper; as one who engrossed the whole power to herself, and seemed determined never to part with it. He, therefore, advised him to shake off at last the female yoke, to take the reins of the government into his own hands, and to cause his imperious mother and his sisters, who would lay hold of every opportunity to disturb him in the exercise of his sovereign authority, to be shaved and veiled in a monastery. The emperor, jealous of his power, and suspecting no evil design in Bardas, hearkened to his advice; and sending immediately for the patriarch, ordered

him to consecrate on the spot his mother and his sisters to a religious life; it being his will and pleasure that they should spend the rest of their days in a monastery. The patriarch, surprised at such a proposal, remonstrated against it as repugnant to the canons, forbidding any to be consecrated to a religious life against their will, and absolutely refused to perform the ceremony. The emperor, impatient to get rid of his mother and his sisters, was highly provoked at the refusal of the patriarch; and Bardas, not to let slip so favorable an opportunity of compassing his ruin, took care to incense the emperor still more against him, pretending that he had encouraged one Gebus, a rebel, who, giving out that he was the son of Theodora by another husband, had gained by that means many followers. The charge was quite groundless; but the emperor believing, or pretending to believe it, ordered the patriarch to be forthwith driven from the patriarchal palace, and transported to the island of Terebinthus, where he had lived before his election. He had not been three days in the place of his exile, when the emperor sent first some of the leading men among the bishops, and a few days after some of the patrician order, and the chief judges, to persuade him to resign in due form the patriarchal dignity; but though they could neither by threats nor by promises prevail upon him to comply, they nevertheless declared him lawfully deposed; and Photius, then a layman, was chosen in his room.¹

Photius was descended of an illustrious family; had discharged the first employments of the empire with uncommon applause; was universally looked upon as a man of extraordinary abilities, as a consummate statesman, as the best skilled of all his contemporaries in grammar, in poetry, in oratory, in philosophy, nay, and in physic; and thought to rival the ancients themselves in every branch of literature. As his ambition and love of glory knew no bounds, he had likewise applied himself to the study of ecclesiastical matters, aspiring at, and not despairing of being one day able to attain to the patriarchal dignity in the imperial city. To that high station he was raised by the interest of Bardas; who now had none to share with him the power, and the emperor's favor, Theodora and her daughters having been veiled by one of the bishops of the court, and shut up in a monastery. As Photius was a layman at the time of his election, and the canons required all ecclesiastics to rise by degrees, he was the first day made a monk; the second, reader; the third, subdeacon; the fourth, deacon; the fifth, presbyter, and the sixth, he was consecrated patriarch by Gregory, surnamed Arbesta, bi-

¹ Rember. vit. Anschar. c. 30. 36. et Annal. Fuldens. ad Ann. 857.

² Nicetas in vit. Sancti Ignat. tom. viii. Concil. p. 1180, & seq.

¹ Nicetas in vit. Sancti Ignat. tom. viii. Concil. p. 1180, & seq.

Ignatius treated with great cruelty. He is excommunicated and deposed in a council;—[Year of Christ, 600.]
Photius applies to the pope.

shop of Syracuse, whom the patriarch Ignatius had deposed in a council for his irregular conduct.¹

The expulsion of Ignatius, and intrusion of Photius, occasioned great disturbances in the eastern churches, especially in the patriarchate of Constantinople, some of those bishops acknowledging the one, and some the other. They who acknowledged Photius insisted upon a promise from him in writing, that he would not molest or persecute the deposed patriarch; but, on the contrary, honor and respect him as his father. But he was scarce warm in the patriarchal chair, when, unmindful of his promise, he raised a most furious persecution against his rival, and the bishops who adhered to him, as well as his other friends, pretending they had conspired against the state, but, in truth, to oblige Ignatius by that means to resign his dignity. Under that pretence, his friends were seized, were cruelly beaten, and confined to the most inhospitable places of the empire. One of them, by name Basilus, who spoke with more freedom than the rest, had his tongue cut out, and was otherwise used with the utmost barbarity. Ignatius himself met with no better treatment than his friends: he was most inhumanly beaten, without any regard to his character, or his high birth, was loaded with irons like a common malefactor, and thus carried from the island of Terebinthus, where he lived in a most magnificent monastery built by the emperor his father, to several abandoned places, and lastly to Mitylene, and there strictly guarded.²

In the mean time, such of the metropolitans, and other bishops, as were the most zealously attached to Photius, meeting in a council at Constantinople, Ignatius was by them declared unworthy of the patriarchal

dignity; and they accordingly excommunicated and deposed him. This council was held in the church of the holy apostles; and in that of Irene was held another at the same time by the bishops of the party of Ignatius; and they, in their turn, condemned Photius as an intruder into the patriarchal see.¹ Photius, finding the bishops thus divided, resolved to apply to the pope, and get his election, by some means or other, approved by him. With this view, he persuaded the emperor to send a solemn embassy to Rome, and entreat his holiness to dispatch legates into the east, in order to restore there, jointly with him, the decayed discipline, and utterly extirpate the heresy of the Iconoclasts, that began to spring up anew. This embassy, he knew, would be acceptable to the pope; and he flattered himself that he should be able to prevail on the legates to confirm his election. Photius sent at the same time four bishops, in his own name, to acquaint the pope, that Ignatius had resigned the patriarchal dignity on account of his age and infirmities; that, upon his resignation, he had retired to a monastery in an island, where the greatest respect was shown him both by the emperor and the people; that the clergy and the metropolitans had unanimously chosen him to fill the vacant see, and forced him, jointly with the emperor, to accept of a charge, to which he knew himself to be altogether unequal.² "When I reflect," says he in his letter, "on the greatness of the episcopal dignity, on the weakness of man, and my own in particular, and recollect, that to me it had always been matter of the greatest astonishment that any one, liable to the infirmities of human nature, should take upon him so tremendous a charge, I cannot express the concern I am under at my being obliged to take that very charge upon myself. But the clergy, the metropolitans, and the emperor, kind to all, and cruel to me alone, have laid so heavy a burden upon me, without hearkening to my entreaties, or being affected with my tears."

The pope received the imperial ambassadors, of whom the chief was Arsa the protospatharius who brought many rich presents for St. Peter,³ and likewise the Aprocrisarii or legates of Photius, in the church of St. Mary ad Præsepe, now St. Mary the Greater; and being informed by them of the deposition of Ignatius, and ordination of Photius, he resolved, with the advice of a council, which he assembled on that occasion, to send legates to Constantinople, in compliance with the request of the emperor; and the two bishops, Rodoald of Porto, and Zachary of Anagni, were named for that legation. Their instructions were to conform to the decree of the seventh council in

¹ Nicetas in vit. Santi Ignat. tom. viii. Concil. p. 1180, & seq.

Photinus thought he should thus avoid the imputation of being raised to the episcopal dignity, without passing through the inferior orders of the church, as was required by the canons, especially by the tenth canon of the council of Sardica. And this is, perhaps, the first instance that occurs in history of such a practice; for, in the preceding ages, when a layman was, in case of necessity, or on account of his extraordinary merit, preferred to the episcopacy, he did not receive one order one day, and another the next, &c., but was ordained bishop at once. Photius really passed through all the inferior degrees to the episcopal ordination; but nevertheless pope Nicholas declared his ordination uncanonical, as his passing through them in the manner he did, no ways answered the end of the canon, which was, that, in every order, a man should give some proof of his faith and good conversation. However, the custom introduced by Photinus, and condemned by pope Nicholas and for a long time by his successors, now obtains in the church of Rome; for though that church, to avoid a breach of the canons, never confers all the orders at once, nor on so many following days, lest she should be thought to have adopted a practice brought into the church by Photius, and so much inveighed against by one of the greatest of her bishops; yet she confers them on so many following Sundays, by as manifest a breach of the canons, as if she conferred them all at once, or on so many following days.

² Nicet. in vit. Santi Ignat. tom. 8. Concil. p. 1160, &c.

¹ Epist. Metroph. apud Baron. ad Ann. 870.

² Nicetas, ubi supra. Anast. in hist. Synod. 8. Metrophan. ubi sup.

³ Anast. in Nicol.

The pope's letter to the emperor. His letter to Photius. His legates ill used;—[Year of Christ, 861.] Acknowledges Photius. A council assembled, and Ignatius summoned to it.

what they should determine or define concerning the article of images; but as the pope had not heard from Ignatius himself, they were ordered only to procure the necessary informations relating to his affair, and to refer the final decision to the judgment of the apostolic see.

The pope wrote by the legates both to the emperor and to Photius. In his letter to the emperor, he complains of their having deposed Ignatius without consulting the apostolic see, and appointed a layman in his room, in defiance of the canons of the church, and the decrees of the Roman pontiffs; declares that he cannot approve of the ordination of Photius, till his legates have informed him of every particular concerning it; will have Ignatius to appear in person before his legates and the whole council, that they may learn from himself the reason why he has forsaken his flock, and at the same time inquire, whether his deposition has been in every respect agreeable to the canons. When a true and faithful report, says the pope, shall be made to us of these, and other circumstances attending his deposition, we shall thereupon determine what shall seem to us most conducive to the peace and tranquillity of your church. In the next place, he recommends to the emperor the worship of images as agreeable to Scripture; entreats him to restore the patrimonies of the Roman see in Sicily and Calabria, which his predecessors had seized, and with them the authority and jurisdiction which the preceding popes had exercised, by the bishop of Thessalonica their vicar, over old and new Epirus, Illyricum, Macedonia, Thessaly, Achaia, both Dacias, Mysia, Dardania, and Prævalis; begs he will allow the bishop of Syracuse to be thenceforth ordained, according to ancient custom, by the Roman pontiffs; and closes his letter with a warm recommendation of the two legates.¹ The direction of the letter was, "Nicholas, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his beloved son Michael, glorious emperor of the Greeks."

The pope, in his letter to Photius, owns his belief to be altogether orthodox, for Photius had sent him a confession of his faith; but expresses no small concern at the irregularity of his ordination, in being raised from the condition of a layman to the dignity of a patriarch, by a manifest breach of the canons, and the decrees of the holy Roman pontiffs Leo, Celestine, and Gelasius; and he therefore tells him, that he cannot approve of his ordination, till the legates be is upon the point of sending to Constantinople have informed him of his manners, of his behaviour, and his attachment to the doctrine of the church.² These letters are both dated the 25th of September, no doubt of the

present year 860. I cannot help observing here, that in the confession of faith, which Photius sent to Rome, and the pope received as altogether orthodox, it is said, that the sixth council rejected or condemned pope Honorius, and all who held and taught with him the impious doctrine of one will in Christ, and one operation: A plain proof that it was not yet thought heterodox by the pope himself for a man to believe him capable of erring, and even of teaching heretical doctrines.

With the two above mentioned letters the legates set out for Constantinople, not doubting but they should meet with a favorable reception from the emperor, at whose request they were sent. But Michael no sooner understood that the pope had not acknowledged Photius, and that the legates were to communicate with him only as a layman, than he ordered them to be confined, and carefully kept from conversing, or even speaking, with any but their own people, lest the friends of Ignatius should inform them of the true state of affairs, and they the pope. When they had been thus closely confined, and strictly guarded, for the space of an hundred days, the emperor sent one to let them know that he was determined, if they did not comply and acknowledge Photius, to banish them to the most abandoned and barren places of the empire, where hunger would oblige them to feed upon their own vermin.¹ The legates, terrified with these menaces, and at the same time tempted with the promise of great rewards, yielded in the end, acknowledged Photius, and engaged to exert all their interest and credit in his favor. Hereupon a council was assembled, near as numerous as the emperor boasted in one of his letters to the pope, as the great council of Nice, at which were present three hundred and eighteen bishops. This council was held in the spacious church of the holy apostles, at Constantinople, the emperor assisting at it in person, with the pope's legates, and all the great officers of the crown. When they were all met, messengers were sent to summon Ignatius, who had been recalled from exile, to appear, without delay, before the great and holy synod, and answer the several charges brought against him. But Ignatius asking them whether he was to appear as a bishop, as a presbyter, or as a monk, they were at a loss what answer to return; and therefore telling him that they should let him know the next day, they went back to those who sent them, and coming again, summoned him a second time, in the name of Zachary and Rodoald, the pope's legates, to appear before the council in the habit that he thought he could take in conscience. Attiring himself therefore as patriarch, he ad-

¹ Nicol. ep. 2. tom. iii. Epist. Roman. Pontif

² Ibid. ep. 3

¹ Nicol. ep. 6.

Ignatius' behavior in the council. He appeals to the pope. He is deposed by the council, and treated with great barbarity by Photius.

vanced, thus attired, towards the place where the council sat, attended by some bishops and clerks, and a great number of monks and laymen. But being met in his way by a patrician, whom the emperor had sent to threaten him with death, if he presumed to appear in any other habit but that of a monk, he quitted the patriarchal robes, and appeared before the council only as a monk. Upon his entering the assembly, he was received by the emperor with most opprobrious language; but, taking no notice of it, he begged leave to speak to Zachary and Rodoald; and having obtained it, asked them who they were? and what they were come for? They answered, that they were the legates of pope Nicholas, who had sent them to judge his cause. He then desired to know whether they had brought letters from his holiness to him. The legates answered they had not, because they did not look upon him as a patriarch, but as one who had been deposed by the synod of his province, and should therefore proceed according to the canons. If so, replied Ignatius, begin with driving out the adulterer: If you cannot do that you cannot be judges. He commands us, the legates answered, pointing to the emperor, to be judges. In the mean time, the metropolitans who adhered to Photius, jointly with the ministers of state, left nothing unattempted to extort from Ignatius a resignation of his dignity. But, as he withstood both their threats and their promises, declaring with great firmness and intrepidity that he would never yield to another the church that had been committed to his care, the council was adjourned.

At their next meeting they sent two messengers to Ignatius, the one a deacon, the other a layman, to let him know they were met again, and order him, in the name of the great and œcumenical council, to appear before them. With that order he refused to comply, declaring that he did not acknowledge those for his judges, meaning the legates, who, instead of driving out the intruder, lived in great intimacy and friendship with him, feasted daily at his table, and had not even been ashamed to accept of his presents; that he therefore appealed to the pope and submitted to his judgment, being authorized therein by the fourth canon of the council of Sardica. At the same time he told the messengers, that they who sent them knew not the laws of the church; that, by those laws, an accused bishop should be summoned by two bishops to appear at a synod, and not by a deacon and a layman. But, in answer to that, they urged the positive order they had received, and Ignatius, upon their threatening to drag him with them, if he did not go of his own accord, thought it advisable to yield. He therefore appeared once more at that assembly; but as he continued, in spite of all their threats and

promises, unalterable in his resolution not to resign, the validity of his ordination was called in question; and no fewer than seventy-two witnesses were produced to swear that he was chosen by favor, and consequently that his election and ordination were both uncanonical. They then ordered the thirtieth apostolic canon to be read, where it is said, "If a bishop, applying to worldly princes, shall obtain a church by their favor, let him be deposed." It is added in the canon, "and let all be deposed who communicate with him;" but that part they suppressed, as they had all communicated with Ignatius. He excepted against the witnesses as evidently suborned, and attesting what he could prove to be false; and, as to the apostolic canon, he urged that they who had communicated with him, were, by that canon, to be deposed as well as he; and that, if he was no patriarch, they were no bishops, since they had been all ordained by him. But his deposition was resolved on; and the sentence, declaring him unworthy of the episcopal dignity, being read accordingly, he was first clothed with, and then, in a formal manner, stripped of the patriarchal robes by a subdeacon, who had been degraded by him for his wicked life, and was therefore chosen by Photius and the council to perform the ceremony.¹ His deposition was approved by the greater part of the bishops who were present at the council, and confirmed by the legates. However, as several metropolitans and other bishops still adhered to him, and had only through fear agreed to the sentence of the council, Photius, who knew it, apprehending he should not be allowed quietly to enjoy the usurped dignity, till Ignatius had resigned it, caused him, as soon as the council was dismissed, to be shut up in a painful prison, to be loaded with irons, and daily beaten with the utmost barbarity, hoping, that to redeem himself from the miseries he suffered, he would comply in the end, and resign. But, as he continued unalterable in his resolution to suffer all the torments his enemies could inflict, and death itself, rather than betray his trust, he was one day most inhumanly beaten by Theodore, one of his keepers; who, taking hold of his hand while he lay quite senseless on the ground, formed a cross with it on a blank page, and carried the page thus signed to Photius, who wrote upon it the following words: "I, Ignatius, of Constantinople, own myself to have been chosen against the canons, and to have governed the church as an usurper and a tyrant." Photius now pretended to be satisfied, as if Ignatius had really owned himself unworthy of the patriarchal dignity; and he was thereupon set at liberty, and allowed to retire to a palace that had formerly belonged

¹ Nicet. in vit. Ignat.

Ignatius makes his escape. Is allowed to return to his monastery. His appeal to the pope. The emperor sends the acts of the council that deposed Ignatius to the pope;—[Year of Christ, 862.] Photius' letter to the pope.

to his mother; but he had not been long there, when he was informed, that it was agreed between Photius and the emperor, that he should be made publicly to own he had been unlawfully raised to the episcopal dignity; that he should publicly read, in the church of the apostles, the act of his resignation, nay, and even anathematize himself; and that afterwards his eyes should be put out and his right hand cut off. He had scarce received this intelligence, when his house was surrounded by a numerous body of the imperial guards, sent to apprehend him. But he, in the disguise of a porter carrying two baskets, passed undiscovered through the midst of them, and got safe to the islands. Photius, transported with rage at his disappointment, caused all the monasteries in Constantinople and the neighborhood to be narrowly searched; and messengers were despatched into all parts, with orders to put Ignatius to death wherever they found him. But, by constantly flying from one place to another, and everywhere passing for a common beggar, as he could support himself by no other means, he had the good luck to escape the fury of those who sought his destruction, till providence interposed in his favor; for frequent and dreadful shocks of earthquake happening at Constantinople in the month of August, of the present year, the people construing them into a punishment from heaven for the barbarous treatment of their innocent patriarch, began loudly to complain of the cruelty of his persecutors, as drawing down upon the whole city the vengeance of heaven; inso-much that the emperor, to appease them, and prevent a general insurrection, was obliged to promise upon oath, and cause it to be publicly proclaimed, that Ignatius might safely discover himself; that he might safely return to his monastery; that he should be allowed to live there quite undisturbed; and that none of his friends should be any ways molested, not even those who had been aiding and assisting him in his flight, or had concealed him. Hereupon Ignatius discovering himself, and appearing before Bardas, was allowed by him to return to his monastery; and the earthquake ceased, says Nicetas, after it had shaken the city in a most dreadful manner for the space of forty days.¹

Ignatius had, before his flight, caused an appeal to the pope to be drawn up by Theognostus, formerly exarch, but at this time monk, and abbot of a monastery in Rome. It was addressed, in the name of Ignatius, of ten metropolitans, of several bishops, and an infinite number of presbyters, “to the most holy and blessed president and patriarch of all sees, successor to the prince of the apostles and universal pope.” These, and

such like titles, flattered the vanity and ambition of the popes; and they were freely given them by other bishops when they wanted their assistance and protection. Ignatius, in his appeal, gives the pope a minute account of every thing that passed on occasion of his expulsion, and the intrusion of Photius; of the proceedings of the council that deposed him; of the prevarication and corruption of the apostolic legates; and of the barbarous and inhuman treatment he had met with; begs the pope to undertake his cause, as his predecessor Innocent undertook that of Chrysostom,¹ and, treading in the footsteps of Fabian, Julius, Innocent, Leo, &c., to exert himself, as they had done, in the defence of one who had suffered so much, and so unjustly.²

With this appeal, request, or memorial, Theognostus set out for Rome, in the disguise of a layman; but the two legates, Rodold and Zachary, arriving there before him, informed the pope, by word of mouth, that Ignatius had been deposed and the election of Photius confirmed.³ They took no kind of notice of the part they had acted in that affair, nor of the violence that was used. Two days after arrived Leo, secretary to the emperor, and brought with him two volumes, which he delivered to the pope, in the name of the emperor; the one containing the acts of the council concerning the deposition of Ignatius; the other the acts of the same council relating to the worship of images, which was defined anew by that assembly.⁴ The emperor's letter has not reached our times; but it appears, from the pope's answer to it, to have been calculated to persuade his holiness, that Ignatius had procured the patriarchal dignity by indirect and unlawful means, and prevail upon him, on that account, to agree to his deposition, and the ordination of Photius in his room. The substance of Photius' letter, which was of an extraordinary length, but written with great art, is as follows:

“Charity is the first of all virtues; it joins those who are distant, unites those who are at variance, banishes all contention and discord, reconciles enemies, and strengthens the bond of friendship between friends. Charity endures all things; and it is charity that makes me patiently endure the severe reproaches of your holiness, and ascribe them not to passion, to enmity, or to hatred, but to the sincerity of your friendship for me, and your zeal for the honor of the ecclesiastic order. As I am fully convinced of the uprightness of your intentions, your holiness will forgive me, if I open my mind to you with that freedom which brothers use

¹ See vol. I. p. 134.

² Apud Baron. ad Ann. 861. n. 28, & seq.

³ Nicol. ep. 10.

⁴ Nicol. ep. 7.

¹ Nicet. in vit. Ignat.

Photius' letter continued.

with each other, and children with their parents. I shall speak nothing but the truth, and speak it not to contradict you, but only to defend myself. It behoved, then, one of your eminent virtue to have considered, that this heavy burden was forced upon me, and, upon that consideration, to have pitied, and not reproved me, to have condoled, and not found fault with me. God, from whom nothing is concealed, knows what violence has been offered me. I would have made my escape, but was detained against my will, was imprisoned, and guarded like a common malefactor, and in the end elected, in spite of my remonstrances, of my sighs and my tears. These things are publicly known, as they have not been transacted in a corner of the earth. Should not I, therefore, rather be comforted than upbraided? I have forfeited the undisturbed peace and tranquillity I enjoyed in the company of my friends, to whom I was dearer than their own relations. To no man have I ever given just cause of complaint; on the contrary, I have made it my study to oblige all men; and they never will, I hope, have reason to repent of the commendations they have on that account bestowed upon me. To my house resorted daily men versed in all the branches of literature; and with them I passed my time in the study of the sciences, human and divine. I frequently went to court, and they attended me thither, grudged the time I spent there, and accompanied me back to my house, where we resumed our studies. Who can bear the loss of such a life? What a flood of tears has it cost me? I knew, though I had not experienced it, what cares and anxieties attend the situation in which I have been placed. I was no stranger to the obstinacy and perverseness of the multitude, to their seditious, fickle, and restless temper. If you refuse them what they ask, they murmur; if you grant it, they insult you, as if you durst not refuse. All think themselves qualified to govern, and to dictate to their superiors; but what will become of the vessel that has no other pilot but the multitude; of the army that has no other commander? The vessel will inevitably be lost, and the army utterly destroyed. They who govern, must accommodate themselves to the tempers and the passions of those whom they govern; they must pretend to be cheerful when they are sad, and to be sad when they are cheerful; must seem to be angry when free from all anger, and thus live under a perpetual restraint. But, in private life, and among friends, a man may appear to be what he really is. I must, in my present situation, chide my friends, slight my relations agreeably to the command, show myself reserved with offenders, and thus incur hatred on all sides. This I foresaw, and therefore strove, but strove in vain, to avoid so troublesome a charge. If what I

say is believed, they injure me who believe it and do not pity me; if it is not believed, they injure me who do not believe me when I speak truth. You will say no violence ought to have been offered; and in that indeed we agree. But they are to blame who offered it, and not I to whom it was offered. But it is, you say, a breach of the canons to raise a layman to the episcopal dignity. Be it so; they are guilty of that breach who forced the episcopal dignity upon me, and not I upon whom it was forced. But to those canons we are here all entire strangers, as they have never obtained in the church of Constantinople. However that be, I am as willing to resign as I was unwilling to accept so toilsome a charge. It is not at all commendable, I own, to commit the government of the church to laymen, nor do I by any means approve of such a practice, and am therefore still in suspense; nor shall I give an entire consent to my promotion till the return of the apocrisarii I have sent to your holiness."

Photius employs the remaining part of his very long letter to show, that the canon, forbidding laymen to be ordained bishops, had never been received by the church of Constantinople, nay, that such a canon never had been heard of there; alleges several instances to prove it; namely, of Nectarius; of his great-uncle Tarasius; of Gregory the father of the divine; of Thalassius of Cæsarea, &c., who were all raised to the episcopal throne while they still were laymen, and cannot be supposed to have been guilty, in consenting thereunto, of the breach of any canons which they were acquainted with; observes, that the canon in question has been dispensed with even by the Latins; that Ambrose was preferred to the see of Milan while yet a layman; nay, that Ambrose, and Nectarius whose ordination was confirmed by a general council, were not only laymen, but catechumens, when raised to the episcopacy;¹ takes notice of several laws or canons that are observed by some, but have never been so much as heard of by others; and among them he reckons the canon forbidding the ordination of laymen received at Rome, but utterly unknown at Constantinople; and adds, that those laws alone are universally binding that are universally received; and that, instead of blaming those who are raised from the state of laymen to the episcopal dignity, we ought to honor and commend them for leading such lives as rendered them more worthy of that dignity than any of the priesthood. How-

¹ Nectarius was not a catechumen, but a neophyte, or newly baptized, when he was chosen to succeed Gregory Nazianzen in the see of Constantinople: for Socrates (Socrat. l. v. c. 8.) and Sozomen (Sozom. l. vii. c. 8.) tell us, that, at the time of his election he was still "clothed with his mystical garments," that is, the white garments, which the newly baptized used to wear.

The pope protests against the conduct of his legates. His letter to the emperor, and to Photius.

ever, that for the future no room might be left for complaints of this nature, he tells the pope, that, in the council lately held in the imperial city, he had consented to the issuing of a canon, forbidding any monk or layman to be thenceforth ordained bishop, without passing through all the inferior degrees; wishes that such a law had always obtained in the church of Constantinople, since it would have delivered him from the many cares and difficulties that attend his present situation, in which it is, he says, incumbent upon him to instruct the ignorant, to confirm the wavering, to animate the slothful, to inspire the avaricious with the contempt of riches, the proud with mean thoughts of themselves, the lewd with the love of purity, to check the impiety of those who insult Christ in his images, who confound or deny his natures, or introduce a new one, who curse the fourth council, &c. As the legates had applied to him for the restoration of the jurisdiction formerly enjoyed by the Roman see over Epirus, Illyricum, &c. he tells the pope, that he would, with great joy, restore those churches to their ancient mother, were it left to him, since he should be thereby eased of part of his burden; but that it is the province of the civil power, and not his, to settle the limits of countries, and, with the limits, the jurisdiction over them. On this occasion, he does not forget to commend the legates, as men who have distinguished themselves by their virtue, their prudence, their experience, and by their whole conduct have done honor to him who sent them. His holiness, he says, will learn of them many things which he would otherwise have written, but has not thought it necessary, as they can inform him of every thing by word of mouth, and are more worthy of credit than any body else. As many of the persecuted patriarch's friends had privately withdrawn from Constantinople to Rome, Photius, to prejudice the pope against them, and prevent by that means his being informed of the true state of affairs in the east, closes his letter with entreating him not to receive any who shall come from thence without letters of recommendation, since many, under color of piety and religion, resort to Rome, only to avoid the penance or the punishment that is due to their crimes. The direction of Photius's letter was, "To our most holy brother and fellow-minister Nicholas, pope of old Rome, Photius bishop of Constantinople, new Rome."¹

By these letters, and still more by the acts of the council, the pope understood, that Ignatius had been deposed, and Photius substituted in his room; that his legates had agreed to the deposition of the one, and the intrusion of the other; that they had acknowledged Photius, and communicated

with him as duly elected, and lawful patriarch. In order, therefore, to show to all the world, and in the most public manner, his disapprobation of their conduct, he immediately assembled the whole Roman church, and solemnly declared, in the presence of Leo, the imperial ambassador, that his legates had acted contrary to their instructions; that they were not authorized to confirm the deposition of Ignatius, and the election of Photius; and that he never had consented, that he never would consent, to the one or the other.¹

Upon the breaking up of the council, the pope wrote two letters in answer to those he had received from the emperor and from Photius, and delivered them to Leo, who was upon the point of returning to Constantinople. In his letter to the emperor, he protests against the proceedings of his legates, as well as of the council at which they assisted; ascribes their prevarication to the cruel treatment they met with, and the violence that was offered them; and wonders that the emperor should now charge Ignatius with having procured the patriarchal dignity by unlawful and indirect means, when he has in his hands letters from him to his predecessor Leo, and to himself, wherein he owns him to have been regularly elected, and lawfully ordained. As to his council having been composed of as many bishops as was that of Nice, which the emperor had boasted of in his letter, the pope tells him, that, as they had all departed from the regulations of that great and venerable assembly, it matters little whether they equalled, or even exceeded it in number; nay, that their number only served to add to their guilt.²

The pope, in his letter to Photius, takes it for granted, that, by the words, "thou art Peter," &c. the primacy was conferred upon St. Peter, and upon all who should succeed him in the see he had founded at Rome; and that it is therefore incumbent upon him, as the successor of that apostle, as presiding in the church that is the first and the head of all churches, to see that the institutions of the fathers, and the laws they have wisely enacted, be punctually complied with by all other churches, as well as his own. He then comes to the canon forbidding any to be raised to the episcopal throne, who have not passed through the inferior degrees of the church;³ reproaches Photius with a breach of that canon, in presuming to take upon him the episcopal dignity while yet a layman. And in answer to the instances he had alledged in favor of his ordination, the pope pretends Nectarius to have been raised to the patriarchal see while he was yet a layman, because not one ecclesiastic could be found at that time in the whole body of the

¹ Baron. ad Ann. 561. n. 9, & seq.

² Nicol. ep. 7. 20. 18.

³ Nicol. ep. 5.

⁴ Concil. Sardic. Can. 10.

The pope's letter to the faithful in the east. Contrivance of Photius to compass the ruin of Ignatius.

Constantinopolitan clergy quite free from heresy; and adds, that in such cases, cases of necessity, the canon may and ought to be dispensed with. As to the promotion of Tarasius, he quotes the words of his predecessor Hadrian, disapproving and censuring it as irregular; but nevertheless conniving at it, in consideration of Tarasius's known zeal for images. The election of Ambrose he ascribes to a miracle, and tells the following tale; namely, that the bees swarmed in his mouth while he was an infant, and asleep in his cradle; that from the cradle they flew up into the air quite out of sight; that from thence his father prognosticated the child would one day attain to some very high dignity; and that he was accordingly chosen, many years afterwards, while yet a catechumen, to succeed Auxentius the Arian bishop in the see of Milan, and miraculously chosen, an infant, that happened to be present at the election, crying out aloud, while the people were divided in their suffrages, "Ambrose is our bishop," and the whole multitude joining in the cry as a voice from heaven.¹ Thus, says the pope, were Nectarius, Tarasius, and Ambrose, preferred from the state of laymen to the episcopal dignity. But what can you plead in defence of your promotion, you who have not only been unlawfully ordained, but have intruded yourself into the see of another still living? Photius had said in his letter, that the canon of the council of Sardica, and the decrees of the popes, prohibiting the ordination of laymen, had never been received by the church of Constantinople. In answer to that, the pope tells him in plain terms, that he cannot believe him, as the council was held in the east, and is received by the whole church, as well as the decrees of the apostolic see, by whose authority all councils are confirmed. He then reproaches him with his unprecedented severity, that of a tyrant rather than a father, in persecuting Ignatius, and arbitrarily deposing bishops and archbishops, for no other reason but because they adhered to him; complains of the cruel treatment his legates had met with, and the violence that was offered them; declares that he cannot, and never will, acknowledge any other for lawful bishop of Constantinople, till he is satisfied that Ignatius has been lawfully deposed;

¹ The truth of it is: Ambrose was Prætor at Milan when the bishop of the place died; and the whole city being in an uproar on account of the disagreement among the inhabitants about the election of a new bishop, Ambrose, on whom it was incumbent, as prætor, to appease the tumult, repairing to the place where the electors were met, exhorted them to unity and concord with so elegant and so affecting a speech, that, laying aside their dispute, they all cried out with one voice, "We will have Ambrose for our bishop." This sudden and unexpected agreement the emperor looked upon as miraculous; and therefore ordered him immediately to be baptized, for he was yet a catechumen, and a few days after to be ordained bishop. Thus Paulinus, (Paulin. vit. Ambros.) Rufinus, (Ruffin. l. ii. c. 11.) Theodoret, (Theod. l. iv. c. 6.) Socrates, (Socrat. l. iv. c. 30.) and Sozomen, (Sozom. l. vi. c. 24.)

and closes his letter with assuring Photius, that he is not influenced therein by envy, hatred, or any ill-will he bears him, but only by zeal for the observance of the canons, of the traditions of the fathers, and the decrees of the apostolic see. The pope, to show that he looked upon Photius only as a layman, gave him no other title in the direction of his letter but that of a most prudent man; "Nicolaus episcopus servus servorum dei prudentissimo viro Photio."¹

At the same time, the pope wrote a circulatory letter to all the faithful in the east, to acquaint them with the deposition of Ignatius, the intrusion of Photius, and the prevarication of his legates consenting thereunto, contrary to the instructions he had given them; and addressing himself, in the close of his letter, to the three patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, to the metropolitans and other bishops in those parts, he declares, that it is the fixed resolution of the apostolic see to reinstate the venerable patriarch Ignatius in his former dignity, and drive out the most wicked Photius, who has usurped it in defiance of the canons; and he enjoins and commands them, by virtue of his apostolic authority, to think as he does with respect to the expulsion of Photius, and restoration of Ignatius, and to cause his letter to be published in their respective dioceses, that it may be known to all.² This letter, as well as that to Photius, is dated the 18th of March of the present year 862, and the letter to the emperor of the 19th of the same month.

About this time, one Eustratius arriving at Constantinople in the habit of a monk, went straight to the patriarchal palace; and giving out that he came from Rome, publicly delivered two letters to Photius, the one from Ignatius, as he pretended, to the pope, the other from the pope to Photius. Ignatius, in the letter that was supposed to have been written by him, gave the pope a minute account of the persecution he had suffered, and painted the emperor in the blackest colors. That letter, Eustratius said, the pope would not receive, and he had therefore brought it back. The pope, in his letter, was made to apologize for the misunderstanding that had hitherto subsisted between him and Photius, and to express an earnest desire not only of communicating with him, but establishing a lasting peace and harmony between the two sees. These letters Photius immediately communicated to the emperor, and to Bardas, in order to incense them anew against Ignatius, whom they had suffered, ever since the time of the earthquake, to live undisturbed in a monastery. He was accordingly taken into custody, and strictly guarded; but Eustratius pretending, upon his examination, the letter for the pope to have been delivered to him

¹ Nicol. ep. 6.

² Nicol. ep. 4.

Lotharius, king of Lorraine, charges his wife Theutberga with incest. She is cleared and recalled to court; but afterwards forced to own herself guilty. Lotharius allowed by a council to put her away and marry another. The king acquaints the pope with the decision of the council.

by one Cyprian, a disciple, as he said, of Ignatius, and no such person being anywhere found after the most diligent inquiries, the imposture was discovered, and Austrarius most severely whipped by an order from Bardas, in spite of the most pressing instances of Photius in his favor.¹ These letters are both supposed to have been forged by Photius himself, hoping that the emperor, provoked at the odious picture that was drawn of him in the letter to the pope, would, in the transport of his wrath, order the supposed writer to be put to death without further inquiry. But so wicked an attempt raised in all men, says Nicetas, the greatest indignation against Photius, and a general compassion for Ignatius.

An affair of far greater moment in the west than the quarrel between Ignatius and Photius about the see of Constantinople in the east, engaged at the same time the attention of the pope; and he exerted his authority with no less steadiness in the one than he did in the other: Lotharius king of Lorraine, or Austrasia,² son of the late emperor of that name, and brother to the present emperor Lewis, had married Theutberga, sister to Hubert duke of Burgundy; but wanting to divorce her, and to marry Waldrada one of his mistresses in her room, he accused her of incest with her brother. The queen denied the charge in an assembly of bishops and all the chief lords of the kingdom, whom the king had called together to examine into that affair; nay, and to convince them of her innocence, underwent with their consent, if not by their command, the trial, or, as it is called, ordeal, by hot water. She was excused, in consideration of her rank and her sex, from undergoing that trial in person; but the man, whom she chose to act in her room, received not the least hurt from the scalding water; and the queen was thereupon declared innocent by the whole assembly, was by the king recalled to court (for he had caused her to be shut up in a monastery,) and restored to all the prerogatives of her royal dignity.³ But, notwithstanding so convincing a proof of the queen's innocence, Waldrada still engrossed the king's affection, and his passion for her allowed the unhappy Theutberga but a very short respite from her troubles; for Lotharius, determined at all events to part with her, in order to make room for Waldrada, appointed, soon after the above-mentioned trial, some of the chief bishops of his kingdom to meet at Aix-la-Chapelle;

and there arraigning the queen anew of incest, prevailed upon them to declare, that he could not in conscience live with her as his wife, though not a single evidence was produced in support of the charge. This point being gained, the king assembled the same year, 860, another council in the same place; and having, with terrible menaces, obliged the queen to own herself, in their presence, guilty of the crime she was charged with, he applied to the bishops for leave to marry again, since they had declared, that it was not lawful for him to cohabit with Theutberga as his wife.¹ I do not find, that, in this council, the bishops came to any determination with respect to the king's request: they only ordained, that Theutberga, convicted by her own confession, should do public penance for her crime. But she escaped into France to her brother Hubert, who had taken refuge there, and was well received by the king, Charles the Bald, uncle to Lotharius.²

Two years after, that is, in 862, a third council was held at Aix-la-Chapelle, at which were present Gunthier archbishop of Cologne, Teutgaud archbishop of Treves, and the bishops of Metz, of Verdun, of Tongres, of Utrecht, and Strasburgh; and the time-serving bishops declared all to a man, that the king might lawfully dismiss Theutberga, and marry another in her room; nay, and alledged several passages out of the fathers, and some canons of the church, to justify the declaration they had made. We are told, that, in this affair, the archbishop of Treves, and the other bishops, were misled and imposed upon by the archbishop of Cologne, a man of great authority among them, whose niece the king had promised to marry, provided he could get his marriage with Theutberga declared null by a council.³ The queen, on her arrival in France, had written to the pope, to acquaint him with the base treatment she had met with from the king, and the bishops of his kingdom, and at the same time to implore his protection. Of this the bishops were aware, and had therefore dispatched Teutgaud of Treves, and Hatto of Verdun, to entreat the pope, in the king's name and their own, not to give ear to, nor suffer himself to be prejudiced by, the false reports and misrepresentations of their enemies, since, in the affair of Theutberga, they had proceeded upon her own confession, and had hitherto only ordered her to do public penance for her sin, which she had avoided by quitting the kingdom, and flying into France. The pope had heard all they said with great attention; but returned them no other answer than "that it was an affair of great importance, and ought to be thoroughly examined:" the king therefore, upon the breaking up of the last council, sent two

¹ Nicet. in vit. Ignat.

² In the division of the French empire made by the emperor Lotharius amongst his children, the ancient kingdom of Austrasia was allotted to Lotharius his second son, with the addition of several provinces; and it was thenceforth called in Latin Lotharingia, from its new king Lotharius; and from Lotharingia they derive the name of Lorraine.

³ Hincmar. de divort. Loth. & Theutb. Annal. Bertin.

¹ Annal. Bertin.

² Ibidem.

³ Annal. Metens.

The king marries Waldrada. Count Boso complains to the pope of Lotharius for harboring his wife who had eloped from him. Letters written by the pope on that occasion. Council appointed to meet at Metz, to determine the affair of Lotharius. The pope sends legates to assist at it. Letters he wrote on that occasion.

counts to Rome, to acquaint the pope with the decision of that assembly, to beg his holiness to confirm it, and assure him, that he should wait for, and acquiesce in, the judgment of the apostolic see. To them the pope returned the same answer he had given to the bishops; adding, that he should send legates to inform themselves of the whole upon the spot; and entreating the king, in the mean time, not to act over-hastily in an affair of such moment and concern. From this answer, and from the pope's refusing to confirm the sentence of the council, the king concluded, that his holiness was by no means inclined to consent to his marriage; and therefore, suffering his passion to prevail over all other regards, he married Waldrada publicly soon after the return of the two counts from Rome, gave her the title of queen, and built her a stately palace for her habitation.¹

In the mean time came to Rome count Boso, to complain to the pope of Lotharius, for harboring in his dominions his wife Ingeltrude, the daughter of count Matfrid, who, eloping from him with her adulterer, had taken refuge in the kingdom of Lorraine, and there, to the great disgrace of her own family and her husband's, led the life of a common prostitute. The count had, for the space of seven years, frequently invited her to return to her duty, with the promise of an unlimited pardon, and a kind reception; had applied to Lotharius, entreating him not to countenance her in her lewdness, but to drive her from his dominions, and had omitted nothing in his power to reclaim her. But finding that no regard was paid by her to his offers, nor by the king to his pressing and repeated instances, he resolved in the end to apply to the pope, and undertook for that purpose a journey to Rome. The pope, having heard his complaint, wrote, before the count left Rome, to the French bishops, to the kings, and to Lotharius himself. In his letter to the bishops, he required them to excommunicate Ingeltrude, if she did not forthwith return to her husband: in his letter to the kings, namely, Charles king of France, Lewis king of Germany, and Charles king of Provence, he exhorted them to interpose their good offices in favor of Boso, and prevail upon Lotharius, if by any means they could, to banish the noble prostitute, as the pope styles her, out of his dominions, and not to admit her into theirs, that she might thus be obliged to throw herself at her husband's feet, who was ready to receive and forgive her. In his letter to Lotharius, he threatened him with the censures of the church, if he continued to countenance Ingeltrude in her wickedness, or suffered her to remain any longer in his kingdom.²

These letters the pope delivered to the count himself; and taking the affair of Lotharius into serious consideration upon his departure, he thought it a matter of too great importance to be finally determined by the bishops of the kingdom of Lorraine only. Of the same opinion were Hincmar and Ado, the one archbishop of Reims, the other of Vienne; and the proceedings of the three councils held at Aix-la-Chapelle were censured by the other Gallican bishops, as repugnant to the canons, and the practice of the church, and only calculated to gratify the passion of their sovereign, which it was their duty to check and restrain. The pope therefore, paying no kind of regard to the decisions of those councils, resolved to cause the affair to be examined anew in an assembly of all the bishops of France and Germany, and to send legates, since both parties had appealed to him as an arbiter, to assist at that assembly in his name. The city of Metz was the place appointed for the meeting of the council; and the pope chose Rodoald bishop of Porto, and John bishop of Ficoela in Romania, to preside at it, with the character of his legates *a latere*.¹ The pope charged them with letters to Lotharius, to Lewis, king of Germany, to Charles king of France, his uncles, to Charles, king of Provence, his brother, desiring them to send two bishops each to the council, with a circulatory letter to all the bishops of France and Germany, and with one to the bishops who should be present at the council.² In his letter to Lotharius, he recommends his legates to him; tells him, that, in compliance with his desire, he would have sent them sooner, had he not been diverted from it by affairs of the utmost importance; desires that two bishops from the kingdom of Lewis king of Germany, two from that of Charles king of France, and two from the kingdom of Charles king of Provence, may be allowed to assist at the council; and wishes, that, upon the return of his legates, he may have occasion to rejoice, to return thanks to the Almighty, and to send to the king his apostolic benediction. The pope, in his letter to the bishops, informs them, that Theutberga, whom Lotharius had put away to marry another in her room, had applied to him, desiring that her cause might be judged by the apostolic see; and that he had thereupon sent two legates to judge it, jointly with them, in a council that was to meet at Metz; requires them to repair to the council, in order to assist his legates with their advice; tells them, that, when the said legates were

¹ As the bishop of Porto had lately betrayed his trust in the east, it is not a little surprising that the pope should have employed him on the present occasion, since he could no longer doubt of his misconduct there, though he had not yet received any authentic proofs of it.

² Nicol. ep. 17, 13, 19.

¹ Nicol. ep. 38. Annal. Bertin.

² Apud Baron. ad Ann. 862. n. 38.

The pope mediates a reconciliation between Charles of France and Baldwin, count of Flanders. Instructions given to the legates who were to assist at the council of Metz.

upon the point of setting out from Rome, he had learned that Lotharius had dismissed Theutberga, and married another woman, without waiting for the judgment of the apostolic see, to which he had appealed, and promised to submit; and he therefore desires, that the king may be summoned to appear, and plead his cause in person before them and his legates, on pain of being cut off by the apostolic see from the communion of the faithful.¹ In the letter that was addressed to the bishops of the council, and was to be read to them at their first meeting, the pope exhorted them to judge justly, without respect of persons; and required them to transmit to him the acts of the council, in order to their being confirmed by the apostolic see, if in every respect agreeable, or corrected, if any way repugnant to the laws of justice and the rules of the church.²

At the same time the pope wrote, and sent by his legates, two letters concerning a very different affair; the one to Charles the bald, the other to Hermentrude his queen: Judith, their daughter, had married Æthelwulph king of the west Saxons, as has been related above;³ and she married, upon his death, Æthelbald, the deceased king's eldest son. But he dying soon after that incestuous marriage, she returned to France, and, by her father's appointment, lived at Senlis, under the direction of the bishop of the place, to whose care the king had recommended her, as she was yet very young. During her stay there, Baldwin, count of Flanders, a man of great distinction, but the king's vassal, fell passionately in love with her, and she with him; but being both sensible that the king would never be brought to agree to their marriage, Baldwin, with her consent, and the consent of her brother Lewis, duke of Maine, carried her off; and they fled for refuge to the kingdom of Lotharius. Charles, highly provoked at such an insult offered him by one of his own subjects, had recourse to the bishops; and having assembled those of his kingdom, he prevailed upon them to thunder out the sentence of excommunication against Judith, as well as Baldwin, agreeably to the decree of pope Gregory the great, excommunicating all who should steal widows, and all who should communicate with them.⁴ Baldwin, struck with terror at this sentence, undertook a journey to Rome; and there, throwing himself at the pope's feet, owned his crime, begged his holiness to absolve him from the excommunication, and to interpose his good offices with the king in his behalf. The pope did not think it advisable to absolve him from the excommunication till the king was reconciled to him, but readily undertook to mediate a reconciliation; and wrote ac-

cordingly the above mentioned letters to Charles and Hermentrude, warmly recommending to both the penitent count, who, he apprehended, might call in the Normans, if driven to despair, and, jointly with them, make war upon France. His mediation had the wished-for effect; Baldwin and Judith were received by the king into favor; the marriage was solemnized in due form at Auxerre; and the count reinstated in the government of Flanders, with the title of count of the kingdom; by virtue of which he was to defend the kingdom of France against the Normans, or, as the pope calls them, Northmans, and all the northern barbarians.¹

Besides these letters, the pope delivered to his legates their instructions in writing, called, in the language of those days, *commonitorium*, being calculated to admonish or put them in mind of the principal heads of their charge. As Lotharius pretended to have been married to Waldrada, by the late emperor his father, while he was yet very young, and consequently that he could not, in conscience, cohabit with Theutberga as his wife, the legates were directed, first of all, to examine with great care into the truth of the fact; to cause the marriage treaty to be produced, as well as the witnesses who were present; to inquire why the king put her away to marry the daughter of Boso, that is, Theutberga, in her room; and not to proceed till these points were all cleared up to their entire satisfaction. If, upon examination, the king's marriage with Waldrada was found to be a mere invention or pretence, the legates were, in that case, to come to the charge brought against Theutberga. And here the pope informed them, that she had implored three different times the protection of the apostolic see against the violence that was offered her; that she had indeed confessed the crime she was charged with to some bishops of the kingdom of Lorraine; but had sent a person to Rome before she made that confession, to complain of the violent means that were used to extort from her the confession of a crime which she had never committed, and at the same time to declare, in her name, that if she should own that, or any other crime, it was not because she was guilty, but to save her life, that she owned it. The pope therefore charged the legates to call Theutberga to the council, that she might plead her cause in person before them; and to reverse the sentence that had been pronounced against her at Aix-la-Chapelle, if she retracted the confession that had given occasion to it, as not voluntary, but extorted by force, or by menaces.²

¹ Annal. Bertin. Flodoard. l. iii. c. 12. Meyer. annal. Fland. l. ii. Nicol. ep. 20, 21.

² Ivo., part. 8. c. 334. Gratian. quæst. 2. c. Lotharius, apud Baron. ad Ann. 562. n. 61—65.

¹ Nicol. ep. 22.

² See p. 228.

³ Nicol. ep. 23.

⁴ Annal. Bertin.

The legate Zachary deposed in a council for consenting to the deposition of Ignatius;—[Year of Christ, 863.]
Sentence pronounced in that council against Photius and Gregory of Syracuse.

With these instructions the legates set out for Metz, where the council was to meet; and in the mean time the monk Theognostus, of whom I have spoken above, arrived at Rome, with the appeal of Ignatius, containing an account of his deposition, of the intrusion of Photius, and of the prevarication of the legates Rodoald and Zachary. The pope, in reading it, was not more affected with the sufferings of Ignatius, which were there minutely described, than provoked at the conduct of his legates, who, instead of complying with, had acted in direct opposition to the instructions he had given them, and even endeavored, after their return, to impose upon him, by misrepresenting to him the whole affair. In order therefore to clear the apostolic see from the imputation of having been any ways accessory to such irregular and unjust proceedings, and at the same time to afford to the persecuted patriarch all the comfort and relief in his power, he resolved to exert his whole authority in his defence, and to punish, in a most exemplary manner, the prevarication of the legates. With that view he assembled, soon after the arrival of Theognostus, a numerous council of the western bishops, in Rome, who met first in the Vatican, but were soon obliged, by the cold, to adjourn from thence to the Lateran. In this council were read, in the first place, the acts of that which Photius had held at Constantinople, the emperor's letters to the pope, and, no doubt, the act of the deposed patriarch's appeal to the apostolic see, all translated from the Greek into Latin. In the next place, Zachary was brought before the council, was strictly examined, and being convicted, by his own confession, of having consented to the deposition of Ignatius, and acknowledging Photius, he was by the council excommunicated and deposed. The judging of Rodoald, his fellow-legate and accomplice, sent lately into France, was put off till his return to Rome and the meeting of another council.¹

In the same council, the following sentence was pronounced by the pope against Photius, with the unanimous consent of all the bishops who composed it: "Whereas Photius, raised from a secular and military occupation to the episcopal dignity, and ordained by Gregory, of Syracuse, long since condemned, has, in the life time of our brother Ignatius, patriarch of the holy church of Constantinople, intruded himself into his see, and entered the sheepfold not by the door, but like a thief and a robber; has communicated with those whom pope Benedict our predecessor had excommunicated and deposed; has presumed to assemble a council of his followers, all deposed and condemned, excommunicated and anathematized, and to condemn, anathematize, and depose, jointly

with them, our fellow-minister, the patriarch Ignatius; has, in defiance of the law of nations, offered violence to the legates of the apostolic see, and forced them to act contrary to the orders they had received; has sent into exile the bishops who would not communicate with him, and appointed such only in their room as were partakers with him in his wickedness; has persecuted, and continues to persecute, with unheard of barbarity, the holy patriarch Ignatius, and all who stand up in defence of his innocence, and the laws of the church; the said Photius guilty of these and such like enormities, is, by the authority of Almighty God, of the blessed princes of the apostles, Peter and Paul, of all the saints, of the six general councils, and the judgment which the Holy Ghost pronounces by us, divested of the priesthood, and all sacerdotal honors: so that if, after this decree (issued by the council with one consent, and dictated, as we believe, by the Holy Ghost) comes to his knowledge, he shall attempt to preside in the see of Constantinople, or shall any ways disturb Ignatius in the government of the church committed to his care, or presume to perform any function of the sacred ministry, he shall never again be admitted to communion, but remain, with all who shall communicate with him, or support him, anathematized, and excluded from partaking of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, except at the point of death."²

The like sentence was pronounced against Gregory of Syracuse, for having presumed to ordain Photius, and perform several other functions of the episcopal office, after he had been divested of the episcopal dignity, and all the power attending it; and an anathema was denounced against him, if he thenceforth took upon him to exercise any ecclesiastical function whatever,² if he raised new disturbances against Ignatius, or attempted to divert any from communicating with him as their lawful bishop. By a third sentence, all were excommunicated and degraded, whom Photius, the Neophyte, as the pope calls him by way of contempt, and usurper

¹ That the pope's excommunicating and deposing the bishop of Constantinople, or any other bishop, is no argument of his supremacy, has been shown elsewhere, on occasion of the excommunication and deposition of Acacius of Constantinople by pope Felix, the second of that name.—(See vol. I. p. 277, 283.)

² Excommunication and anathema were two different things: an excommunicated person was excluded from partaking of the eucharist and the prayers of the faithful, and besides suspended, if an ecclesiastic, from all ecclesiastical functions; but he still continued a member of the church, and might assist at the service of the catechumens, that is, at the psalmody, at the reading of the Scriptures, and the sermons. But such as were anathematized, were totally expelled the church, and debarred from all communion with the faithful, who were not even allowed to receive them into their houses, to eat at the same table, or converse familiarly with them. From them no offerings or oblations were received; nor were they buried, though absolved before death, with the same rites as all other Christians were.

¹ Nicol. ep. 7.

Sentence in favor of Ignatius. The use and worship of images confirmed, and the Theopaschites condemned. Lotharius gains over the pope's legates.

of the patriarchal see of Constantinople, had preferred to any order in the church. The pope then, proceeding to the restoration of Ignatius, pronounced the following sentence, in the name of the council and his own :

“As our most reverend and most holy brother Ignatius, patriarch of the holy church of Constantinople, has been driven with violence from his see by the emperor; has been anathematized by the usurper Photius and his accomplices, whom Benedict of holy memory, our predecessor, had long since excommunicated; and has been stripped of the ensigns of his dignity by the legates of the apostolic see, contrary to our express orders; we declare, by the authority of the supreme judge our Lord Jesus Christ, that he has never been anathematized or deposed; since they, who judged and condemned him, had received no such power from the apostolic see: we therefore, by virtue of the power conferred by our Lord upon us in St. Peter, by the authority of the canons, and the decrees of our predecessors, restore our said brother Ignatius to his former dignity, to his see, to the rank of patriarch, and to all the badges of his office; and whoever, after the publication of this our decree, shall dare to molest or disturb him in the exercise of his ministry, shall separate himself from his communion, or presume to judge him anew, without the previous consent of the apostolic see, shall be deposed, if he is a clerk, and condemned, with the traitor Judas, to eternal punishment: if he is a layman (be who he will,) he shall be excommunicated, accursed, and sentenced by the eternal judge, unless he repents, to the same punishment. As for the bishops and clerks, of what order soever, or degree, who have been banished or deposed on occasion of the unjust expulsion of Ignatius, we command them to be recalled, and restored to their sees and respective ranks; and anathematize all who shall presume to oppose the execution of this our decree. If any crime is laid to their charge, let them be first restored, and then judged; and by none will we suffer them to be judged but by us, and our see, being authorized therein by the canons.” Lastly, a decree was issued by the council, confirming what had been decreed by the popes, and other councils, concerning the images of our Savior, of the blessed virgin Mary, of all the saints, whose life and conversation had been pleasing to God, from the time of Abel to the present; and anathematizing John of Constantinople, with his followers, teaching that images ought to be broken, and trampled under foot.¹ To these the pope added two decrees of a council he had held in Rome the preceding year; the one declaring against the Theopaschites, whose heresy began, it seems, to spring up

anew, that Christ had suffered in his humanity, and not in his divinity, as they pretended; the other anathematizing all who should maintain, teach, or propagate the opposite doctrine.¹ How the pope's thundering edicts were received at Constantinople, we shall see in the sequel.

This council was held in the month of March of the present year, as is said by the pope in a letter he wrote to Ado, archbishop of Vienne, when he sent him the pall;² and in June following, another was convened likewise in Rome, to examine the acts of the council of Metz relating to the divorce of Lotharius and Theutberga, an affair that engaged the attention of the pope no less than that of Ignatius. He had appointed a council to assemble at Metz, which was to consist, as has been related above, not of the bishops of the kingdom of Lorraine only, who were justly suspected of partiality for their prince, but of all the bishops of France and Germany; and both parties, Theutberga as well as Lotharius, were to plead their cause in person before them and the legates; but the final decision of the point in dispute, the lawfulness of the divorce, was to be referred to the judgment of the apostolic see. With these instructions the two legates, Rodold and John, set out from Rome; and repairing, in the first place, in compliance with their orders, to the court of Lorraine, they communicated them there to the king. Lotharius well knew, that his whole conduct in this affair had given great offence to all the Gallican bishops, except those of his own kingdom; that they all loudly exclaimed against the decision of the council of Aix-la-Chapelle; and consequently that they would oblige him to dismiss Waldrada, and take Theutberga again to his bed. As for his former marriage with Waldrada, and the crime he laid to the charge of the queen, he was sensible that neither would stand the test of an impartial and strict examination: the only possible means, therefore, that occurred to him of surmounting all difficulties, and carrying his point, was to prevent any other bishops from assisting at the council but his own, whose complaisance he had already experienced in three different councils. He applied accordingly to the legates, and, with rich presents, and immense sums of money, “*immensis opibus*,” (says Regino) prevailed upon them to suppress the pope's letters to the French kings, desiring them to send each two bishops to the council; and likewise the circulatory letter to all the Gallican and German bishops: so that the council only consisted of the bishops of Lorraine; and they indeed were all present, except Hungarians of Utrecht, who was prevented by sickness from attending with the

¹ Nicol. ep. 7. Libellus Synodic.

² Bibl. Floriac. p. 53.

Waldrada declared by the council Lotharius' lawful wife. The council of Metz condemned by the pope, and the archbishops of Cologne and Treves deposed; who apply to the emperor. The emperor goes to Rome; [Year of Christ, 864.]

rest. By the instructions given to the legates, the queen was to be admitted to the council, was to plead her cause in person before them, and if she denied the crime laid to her charge, and retracted her confession, they were to revoke the sentence pronounced by former councils against her. But the legates, departing in every thing from their instructions, did not so much as acquaint the queen with the meeting of the council, nor did they at all inquire, as they were strictly charged to do, into the pretended marriage of Lotharius and Waldrada; but having heard some suborned witnesses against Theutberga, and caused the acts of the council of Aix-la-Chapelle to be read to them, they confirmed those acts, and declared Waldrada to be "the lawful wife of the most glorious and religious king Lotharius." One of the bishops, whose name is not recorded, in signing that decree, added, "that nothing ought to be finally determined till it was submitted to the judgment of the pope." But these words were cancelled by the archbishop of Cologne, and the bishop's name only left, as if he had subscribed without any restriction, as well as the rest.¹

As the legates, and the other bishops of the council, were conscious to themselves of the irregularity and injustice of their proceedings, it was agreed among them, that the two archbishops should repair to Rome in person, should deliver the acts of the council to the pope, and at the same time represent the affair to his holiness, by word of mouth, in the most favorable light. This province the two prelates readily undertook; and being admitted to the pope's presence as soon as they arrived in Rome, they delivered the acts into his hands, telling him, that they had neither done more nor less than what was there contained. As, before their arrival, the pope had been informed by several persons come to Rome, as well as by letters, probably from the Gallican and German bishops, of every thing that had passed at Metz, he asked them whether they would stand to what they had done? They answered, they would not contradict with their lips what they had signed with their hands. The pope said no more; but, dismissing them, caused the acts they had brought to be read in a council that was then sitting in the Lateran palace; and they were found so full of profane and unheard of propositions, says the Bibliothecarian, that the bishops of that assembly could not help looking upon those of Metz as men seized with a kind of phrenzy. The judgment, therefore, which they had given, was, with one consent, annulled by the pope, and all the bishops who were present, as only calculated to encourage adultery and adul-

terers; and the council itself was stigmatized with the name of a brothel. The two archbishops, Theutgaud and Gunthier, were deposed, and forbidden, on pain of excommunication, to exercise any sacerdotal or episcopal functions whatever. The other bishops, their accomplices, were threatened with the like sentence, if they did not repent, ask pardon, and repair the scandal they had given. Ingeltrude, the wife of count Boso, who had been excommunicated by the pope,¹ but was absolved from that excommunication by the council of Metz, was excommunicated anew, with all who should favor or countenance her, or communicate with her. However, she was promised forgiveness, if she returned to her husband, or, repenting of her past wickedness, applied for absolution to the apostolic see. Lastly, all were anathematized who did not pay due obedience to the decrees of the apostolic see concerning the catholic faith, the ecclesiastic discipline, and the reformation of manners.

The two prelates, highly provoked at the haughty and arbitrary proceedings of the pope and his bishops, in thus condemning them and a whole council, without having first heard what they had to alledge in their defence, left Rome, and repairing to the emperor, who was then at Benevento, complained to him of the unworthy treatment they met with as an affront not only offered to his brother the king of Lorraine, whose deputies they were, but to himself, and the whole royal family; represented to him the deposing a metropolitan, without the approbation of the prince, and the consent of the other metropolitans, as a thing never before heard of, as a notorious breach of the fundamental laws of the church, and an encroaching on the prerogatives of princes, as well as on the rights of all other bishops; and therefore entreated him to exert his authority to restrain the growing power of the pope within the limits prescribed by the canons, and oblige him to restore those whom he had so unjustly deposed, to their former rank and degrees. The emperor readily interposed, and wrote to the pope in their favor; but finding him unalterable, and being at the same time, animated against him by the archbishops, he resolved to let him know that he was his lord and his master. He set out accordingly for Rome, with the empress, with the two archbishops, and a body of troops, determined to make the pope pay dear for his disobedience, if he did not, in compliance with his will, reinstate the deposed bishops in their sees. The pope, informed of the resolution of the emperor, ordered a public fast, with public prayers and processions, to implore the protection of

¹ Nicol. ep. 58. Annal. Bertin.

¹ See p. 239.

The pope takes refuge in the church of St. Peter. The emperor reconciled with him. Gunthier's letter to the bishops of Lorraine and the pope.

heaven, and beseech the Almighty, in whose hands are the hearts of kings, to inspire the prince with a more favorable disposition of mind for the see of St. Peter. The emperor took up his abode near the church of St. Peter; and the people coming thither in procession to the tomb of that apostle, his guards, alarmed upon seeing the populace assembled in such crowds, fell upon them as they were going up the steps to the church, threw some of them down, beat others, broke their crosses and banners, and dispersed the whole multitude. The pope, who was then in the Lateran palace, being informed of what had passed, and at the same time told that the emperor designed to seize on his person, privately withdrew from thence, and embarking on the Tyber, took refuge in the church of St. Peter, and remained there two whole days, without eating or drinking. In the mean time the emperor was, very seasonably for the pope, seized with a fever; and it was given out, that one died suddenly, who, in the late tumult, had broken a cross, which St. Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, had formerly given to the Roman church, and in which was inclosed some of the wood of the true cross. Whether this was true, or, what is more probable, a mere invention of the pope or his friends, we know not. But it had the wished for effect; for the emperor believing it, and thereupon suffering superstition to prevail over his good sense, sent the empress in person to let the pope know that he might quit his asylum with great safety, and to invite him to a conference. In this interview, the pope, no doubt, informed the emperor of the true state of the affair of his brother Lotharius, and the shocking proceedings of the council of Metz: and the result was, that the emperor, abandoning the protection of the two archbishops, ordered them back into France. As the emperor came to Rome full of wrath against the pope, the troops he had with him committed, at first, most dreadful disorders; they plundered the houses, and burned them; broke into the churches, and stripped them of all their valuable ornaments; murdered the men, and ravished the women, not sparing even those who were shut up in the monasteries.¹ But if the emperor came like a lion, he went away like a lamb; and repairing to Ravenna, he there kept his Easter, which, in the present year, 864, fell on the 2d of April.

The archbishop of Cologne, finding himself forsaken by the emperor, and thereupon despairing of being ever restored to his see, drew up, in the name of the archbishop of Treves, as well as his own, a kind of protest, or rather an invective against the pope, and sent it to the bishops of the kingdom of

Lorraine. He there entreated those bishops not to credit the reports they might hear to his prejudice and his colleague's; exhorted them not to think the worse of either for any thing Nicholas had done, Nicholas, said he, who is called pope, but affects the empire of the whole world; encouraged them to continue united among themselves, to visit their king frequently, to assist him with their advice, to engage as many as they could in his cause, and, above all things, to keep his uncle Lewis king of Germany steady in his interest. Gunthier, having thus far directed his speech to the bishops of Lorraine, addresses himself in the next place to the pope, in the following words: "we were deputed to you by the bishops our brethren to acquaint you with the judgment we had given, and lay before you the authorities and reasons that induced us to give it. We communicated them to you accordingly in writing, in order to know whether you approved or disapproved of what we had done; and humbly entreated you to teach and instruct us, being ready to embrace what should be thought best. But you, after keeping us for three whole weeks in suspense, only declared one day in public, that, according to what was set forth in our writing, we seemed innocent and excuseable. At last you sent for us; and when we were brought into your presence, suspecting no ill treatment, you caused the doors to be shut, and we were first set upon by a mixed crowd of clerks and laymen; and then, without any synod, or any canonical examination; without accusers, witnesses, or any proofs from authority or reason to convince us; without our own confession; without the concurrence of other bishops or other metropolitans; you arbitrarily condemned us, out of your tyrannical rage, being instigated thereto by your only counsellor Anastasius, a condemned, deposed, and anathematized priest: we do not therefore submit to your wicked sentence, but reject and despise it as a curse uttered in the transport of your fury, contrary to justice, to reason, to the canons. And satisfied with the communion of the catholic church, which you arrogantly despise, and of which you have rendered yourself unworthy by your pride, we exclude you from our communion, as an abettor of excommunicated persons, and one who communicates with them. You have anathematized yourself in anathematizing those who do not observe the apostolical precepts, when you yourself have transgressed them in so many instances, annulling, so far as in you lies, the institutions of your predecessors, and with them the divine laws, as well as the laws of the church. It is not to revenge the injustice you have done to us in particular that we thus address you, but to vindicate the dignity, and assert the rights of our order, which you have so iniquitously

Gunthier's letter is laid on the tomb of St. Peter. The other bishops retract the judgment they had given. answer to the bishop of Metz.

invaded." He closes his letter with declaring, that, notwithstanding the judgment given by pope Nicholas and his council, Waldrada was, by the laws divine, civil, and canonical, not the concubine, but the lawful wife of the king of Lorraine.¹ The direction of this writing was, Gunthier and Theutgaud to pope Nicholas, though Theutgaud was no ways concerned in it. Gunthier sent copies of it to all the bishops of Lorraine; one he transmitted to Photius, desiring his communion, and entering into a kind of alliance with him against the pope; and one he charged his brother Hilduin to deliver into the pope's own hands, and, if he would not receive it, to lay it on the tomb of St. Peter. Hilduin went accordingly, attended by a troop of armed men, to present it to the pope while he was in the church of St. Peter; but the pope refusing to receive it, and the keepers of the church striving at the same time to prevent him from approaching the tomb of St. Peter, his men fell upon them sword in hand, killed one of them, wounded others, and thus made way for Hilduin, who laid the writing on the tomb of the apostle, and then withdrew to his brother, who was, it seems, still in Rome; but he soon after returned to Cologne, and there said mass on Maundy Thursday, consecrated the chrism, and performed every other function of the episcopal office.²

Of all the bishops who had assisted at the council of Metz, Gunthier alone had the courage to oppose the uncanonical and arbitrary proceedings of the pope. As for the archbishop of Treves, he acquiesced, from the beginning, in his sentence, and abstained from all episcopal functions; and the rest of the bishops, finding themselves threatened with excommunication and deposition, if they did not retract the judgment they had given, thought it advisable to submit; and they wrote accordingly to the pope, owning or excusing their fault, and begging his holiness to forgive them. Of the several letters that, on this occasion, were written to the pope by the penitent bishops, that only of Adventius of Metz has been transmitted to us. He begins it with extolling the pope for the inimitable sanctity of his exemplary life, and excusing himself, on account of his age, of the gout, and other infirmities, for not repairing in person to the thresholds of the apostles, and his most desirable presence. He then declares, that he no longer looks upon Gunthier and Theutgaud as bishops, though the latter submits to his sentence, forbears exercising any episcopal functions, confesses his fault, and owns himself to have been led astray by the perverse obstinacy of the other, meaning Gunthier; and on him he lays chiefly the blame,

exaggerating his guilt in presuming to perform the functions of the archiepiscopal office, though degraded and excommunicated by the authority of the apostolic see. As for himself, he protests before God, before the angels and archangels, that, in the affair of king Lotharius, he verily believed the facts that were related in the council, relying on the veracity of those who related them;¹ that, agreeably to the canons, he submitted his judgment to that of the metropolitans, as it did not become him to oppose them and so many bishops, all his seniors in the episcopacy; that too much credulity, and a blind deference to the opinion of his superiors and his brethren, are the only things that can be laid justly to his charge; that he was no ways concerned in the absolution of Ingeltrude; that he not only abstains himself, but exhorts others to abstain, from the communion of such as have been excommunicated by the vicar of St. Peter, if they presume to perform any sacred functions; that he is guilty of no sedition or conspiracy, but involuntarily attached to the see of the prime apostle, whom our Savior had trusted with the keys of the kingdom of heaven. In the close of his letter, he excuses his delay in sending to Rome this his declaration; ascribes it to his having first endeavored to persuade the rest of his brethren to act in concert with him; and beseeches his holiness to let him know, by the return of the messenger, that he has forgiven him, that, as he is near his end, he may have the satisfaction of dying in his communion.² With this letter Adventius sent another, written at his request to the pope, by Charles king of France; wherein that prince warmly recommended him to his holiness, as one whom his uncle Drogo, the immediate predecessor of Adventius in the see of Metz, had educated, and thought worthy of his friendship, and whom he himself had always loved and esteemed.

The pope received the apology of Adventius, such as it was, and so he did that of all the other bishops, upon condition that they renounced the communion of Gunthier, and encouraged the king, as was incumbent upon them, to repair the scandal he had given. Adventius has said in his letter, that he had submitted to the king agreeably to the command of the apostle, "Submit yourself to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, &c."³ In answer to that, the pope, in his

¹ The improbable tale that Lotharius married Waldrada by the command of the emperor Lotharius his father, while he was yet very young, and was afterwards forced by count Hubert, surnamed Acepale, to marry his sister Theutberga, was related in the council of Aix-la-Chapelle, by this very bishop, as a fact not to be questioned; nay, and is supposed to have been invented by him, to gratify the king.

² Apud Baron. ad Ann. 853. n. 59, & seq.

³ St. Peter, c. 11: v. 13.

Lotharius abandons the archbishop of Cologne, who discloses the whole to the pope; but is not, therefore, restored to his see. The legate Rodoald excommunicated and deposed.

letter, approves the saying of the apostle; but adds, "See whether the princes and kings, to whom you submit, be really princes and kings; whether they govern themselves well, and likewise their subjects; for to whom will he be good, who is not good to himself? See whether they have a right to the title of princes, otherwise we ought to look upon them as tyrants rather than princes or kings, and, instead of submitting to them, resist and oppose them; since we cannot submit to them without favoring their vices. Submit, therefore, to the king as supreme, or as exceeding all by his virtues, and not by his vices; and submit to him for the Lord's sake, as the apostle commands, and not against the Lord." We have here a notable disagreement between the two popes, pope Peter and pope Nicholas. Pope Peter thought obedience was due to princes, be they ever so bad; for Nero, that monster of wickedness, was king or emperor when he commanded the faithful to submit themselves to every ordinance of man, whether it be to the king, &c. But pope Nicholas teaches a very different doctrine, namely, that obedience is not due to bad princes, perverting for that purpose the words of his pretended predecessor; "be subject to the king as excelling, that is," says he, "as excelling in virtues, not in vices:" whereas the apostle evidently meant an eminency in power, abstracting from the vices, as well as the virtues, of him in whom it was vested. Besides, the pope here supposes that a prince may forfeit his crown and his title by personal vices that hurt none but himself; and that, for such vices, we ought to look upon him as a tyrant, and, instead of submitting to him, resist and oppose him: a most seditious and impious doctrine!

The two archbishops were not so much concerned at the conduct of their brethren on the present occasion, as at that of the king. They had acted in this whole affair as he had directed them, and it was to gratify him that they had incurred the displeasure of the pope. But he, instead of supporting them, no sooner heard of the sentence pronounced against them at Rome, than he withdrew from their communion, and no longer looking upon them as bishops, would not assist at the mass that Gunthier, his grand chaplain, said upon his return to Cologne. He even wrote to the pope by Rabold, bishop of Strasburgh, highly disapproving the refractory behavior of the archbishop of Cologne, and at the same time commending the opposite conduct of his colleague, the archbishop of Treves, in submitting to his sentence, and abstaining from all the functions of his office. In another letter which he wrote at this time to the pope, he referred the point in dispute to the judgment of the apostolic see; offered to go to Rome to plead his cause there in person; solemnly

declared that it was against his will the archbishop of Cologne had said mass; and that, far from countenancing him in his disobedience, he had advised and exhorted him to acquiesce, as the other had done, in his sentence. The king did not content himself with thus only disapproving the conduct of Gunthier; he soon after entirely forsook him, confirmed the sentence of his deposition, and, to recommend himself the more effectually to the favor of the pope, appointed him a successor in the see of Cologne, namely, Hugh, cousin-german to Charles the bald, and nephew to the late empress Judith, who was only a subdeacon, and led a life unworthy of a good layman. Gunthier, highly provoked at the ingratitude of Lotharius in thus acknowledging his services, plundered the treasury of his church, and, repairing to Rome with all the wealth he found in it, disclosed to the pope, without reserve, the various artifices and inventions that had been made use of by himself and the king in the affair of Theutberga and Waldrada, to impose upon the other bishops, as well as the apostolic see. He flattered himself, and so did Theutgaud, who went to Rome at the same time, that the pope, satisfied with their public confession, would absolve them from the excommunication, and perhaps restore them to their sees, if the emperor, to whom they designed to apply, interposed in their favor. But Nicholas, instead of revoking, confirmed, in a council assembled in the Lateran, the sentence he had formerly pronounced against the two prelates, and acquainted therewith, by a circulatory letter, the German and Gallican bishops, that they might not plead ignorance in treating them thenceforth as bishops, or communicating with them.¹

It was probably in this council that the legate Rodoald, bishop of Porto, whose avarice and scandalous conduct both in the east and the west, reflected so much disgrace on the holy see, was excommunicated and deposed. Conscious of his guilt, he had absconded after the council of Metz; but returning to Rome when the emperor and the two archbishops were there, he unexpectedly appeared before the pope while he was shut up, and surrounded by his enemies, in the church of St. Peter. As the pope could not then convene a council to judge him, he ordered him to remain in Rome till the meeting of one, when he should have an opportunity of justifying his conduct; assured him, that, in the meantime, he had nothing to fear; but threatened him with excommunication and deposition, if, without his leave, he withdrew, and absconded anew. Rodoald well knew what would be the consequence of his being judged by the pope and a council; and therefore leaving Rome pri-

¹ Annal. Bertin.

Dispute between Hincmar and Rothade. Rothade is suspended, and appeals to the pope. Hincmar puts a stop to his journey to Rome. Rothade deposed in a council, and imprisoned.

vately, he first plundered his church, that of Porto, and then fled to some other country, where he was never more heard of. Hereupon the pope, looking upon his flight as a confession of his guilt, excommunicated and deposed him; threatening at the same time to anathematize him, if he communicated with the anathematized Photius, or gave any trouble to the patriarch Ignatius.¹ The pope, it seems, apprehended, that he had fled into the east, to put himself there under the protection of his friend Photius.

In this same council, or in one held about the same time, was determined the dispute between Rothade, bishop of Soissons, and his metropolitan, the celebrated Hincmar, archbishop of Reims. Rothade had deposed a presbyter of his diocese guilty of fornication. But Hincmar, to whom the presbyter appealed knowing that he had long borne a secret grudge to the bishop of Soissons, ordered him to be restored after three years; and excommunicating in the meantime the presbyter, whom Rothade had appointed in his room, insisted on his being forthwith removed from his church, and shut up in a prison. As the judgment given by Rothade had been confirmed by no fewer than thirty bishops, he refused to comply with that of the metropolitan, who having thereupon assembled a council in the suburbs of Soissons in 861, suspended him, for his disobedience, from episcopal communion, till he obeyed. The following year, Charles the bald having appointed a council to meet at Pistes, now Poissi, Rothade repaired thither, to assist at it with the rest of the bishops; but finding they would not admit him, alledging that he had been excluded by his metropolitan from episcopal communion, he appealed to the apostolic see; and his appeal was allowed by the council. He therefore returned to Soissons, in order to prepare for his journey to Rome; but, before he set out, he wrote to the king, and to Hincmar, recommending his church to their care in his absence; and likewise to one of the bishops, his particular friend, desiring him to apply to the other bishops, and implore, in his name, their assistance. The bishop, to whom this letter was addressed, was returned to his diocese, when the presbyter, who was charged with it, arrived at Poissi. But Hincmar and the king, who were still there, obliged him to produce it; and Hincmar, having got it into his possession, laid hold of what was said in it to put a stop to Rothade's journey to Rome. He pretended that Rothade, by imploring the protection of the bishops of France, had consented to his being judged by them, and dropped his appeal to the pope. He was therefore ordered, in the king's name, not to stir from his diocese; and Hincmar repairing from Poissi, with the bishops who still re-

mained there, to Soissons, summoned him to appear before them, in order to be judged by those whom he himself had chosen for his judges, and from whose judgment there lay no appeal, agreeably to the universally received canon of the council of Carthage, "ab electis iudicibus appellare non licet," "it is not lawful to appeal from judges of one's own choosing." Rothade refused to comply with the summons, solemnly declared it had never entered into his thoughts to choose the bishops of France for his judges, taxed Hincmar with unfair dealing, in intercepting and misinterpreting a letter he had written to a friend, and renewed his appeal to the pope.

In the mean time the king coming to Soissons to assist at the council, Rothade had an interview with him, and was graciously received; but he could not prevail upon him to agree to his going to Rome, without the consent of his metropolitan, and the bishops of the council, whose province it was, he said, to determine that point. After this interview, he was summoned the third time, and, upon his still refusing to appear, taken into custody, and shut up in a cell, to wait there for his sentence. He had not been thus long confined, when three bishops came to acquaint him, in the name of the council, that he was deposed, and no longer a bishop. From this sentence Rothade appealed anew to the apostolic see; but Hincmar, paying no kind of regard to his appeal, caused him to be imprisoned, and even ordained another in his room. He offered him, however, a rich abbey, upon condition that he withdrew his appeal, and acquiesced in his sentence. This offer Rothade rejected with scorn; and Hincmar in the mean time, having caused the fornicating priest, whom he had deposed, to be made an eunuch (perhaps the only effectual remedy against the incontinence of priests) restored him to his church. Thus Rothade in the act of his appeal to the pope.¹ But the Bertinian annalist, who lived at this time, approves of his deposition, styles him a new Pharaoh, on account of his obstinacy in not submitting to his sentence, and speaks of him as "a man changed into a brute, homo mutatus in belluam."² However that be, he was, it seems, greatly beloved by the people of his diocese; for when the legates, Rodoald and John, came to Soissons to deliver the pope's letter in favor of Baldwin to the king,³ they crowded from all parts, demanding, with loud cries, the liberty and restoration of their bishop, though Hilmerade, bishop of Chalons, commanded them, in the name of the king and the archbishop, to desist, and endeavored to disperse them with blows, as well as with menaces. I cannot persuade myself that he would have been so

¹ Apud Baron. ad Ann. 863. n. 81.

² Annal. Bertin. ad hunc. et Ann. Nicol. ep. 29.

³ See p. 240.

The pope orders Hincmar to restore Rothade to his see. Letters from Hincmar to the pope, and from the pope to Hincmar. Rothade released, and allowed to go to Rome.

dear to his flock, had he answered the character that Hincmar and the Bertinian analyst, perhaps partial to Hincmar, have given him. The pope speaks of him very favorably;¹ but his appealing from his metropolitan and a national council to the apostolic see, was enough to recommend him to his holiness' favor.

The pope was soon informed by several persons of what had passed at Soissons; and he no sooner received that information, than looking upon the deposition of Rothade as contrary to the canons, and derogatory to the privileges of the apostolic see, he wrote to Hincmar, ordering him to restore the deposed bishop within the term of thirty days after the receipt of his letter, to grant him leave to come to Rome, and either to come with him, or to send a deputy to act in his name, on pain of being "ipso facto" suspended from saying mass; and that sentence he extended to all the bishops who had consented to the deposition of Rothade. Upon the receipt of this letter, Hincmar, and the other bishops of the council of Soissons, dispatched Odo, bishop of Beauvais, to Rome, with the acts of that council, and letters to justify their conduct, and entreat the pope to confirm the judgment they had given. The king wrote at the same time, and so did Hermentrude the queen, at his request, to beg the pope not to patronize or protect one whom the other bishops had judged unworthy of the episcopal dignity, and deposed in a council. But those letters, and much more, the acts of the council, only served to engage the pope more warmly in the defence of Rothade, or, as he pretended, of the violated privileges of his see: he therefore wrote to Hincmar, expressing great surprise and concern at his presuming to judge and depose one who had appealed to the apostolic see, nay, and to appoint him a successor, notwithstanding his appeal, in defiance of the canons received by the whole church. This, he tells Hincmar, he cannot bear, nor dissemble being determined to maintain, to his last breath, the just rights of his see; exhorts, or rather commands him to set Rothade forthwith at liberty, and no longer to obstruct his journey to Rome under any pretence whatsoever, since he should think himself obliged, if he did not obey after the third admonition (and this, he tells him, is the second) to proceed to the sentence that his disobedience and obstinacy deserved.² The pope wrote at the same time a letter, much to the same purpose, in answer to that of the bishops of the council; for he there declared the sentence they had pronounced to be repugnant to the canons, to those of Sardica in particular; to be inconsistent with the privileges of his see, and consequently null; ordered them to send Rothade to

Rome, and two or three bishops with him, or, at least, two deputies, in order to his being judged anew, and either condemned or absolved, according to the canons; and concluded with threatening to treat them as they had treated him, if they did not obey within the space of thirty days after the receipt of his letter.¹ In this letter, the pope lays it down as a general rule, that when the canons and the imperial laws, which the bishops had alledged against appeals, interfere with one another, the canons ought to take place; which, in effect, was not only establishing one empire within another, "imperium in imperio," but subjecting the secular empire to the ecclesiastic, the state to the church, and princes and emperors to the pope and the clergy. The pope wrote at the same time to the king, Charles the Bald, desiring him to grant Rothade liberty to come to Rome;² and likewise to Rothade himself, to acquaint him with what he had written to Hincmar and the other bishops, and encourage him to pursue in spite of all opposition, his appeal to the see of St. Peter.³

Upon the receipt of these letters, Hincmar, unwilling to quarrel with the pope, released Rothade from his confinement; and the king, in a council held at Verberie, consented in the end to his going to Rome.⁴ They took care to acquaint the pope immediately therewith by the deacon lindo, whom they dispatched to Rome for that purpose; and by the same deacon, on his return to France, the pope wrote to the king, to the queen, and anew to Rothade. In his letter to the king, he expressed great satisfaction at his having granted to Rothade the so long wished for liberty of coming to Rome, and exhorted him to supply him with what was necessary for his journey.⁵ He excused himself, in his letter to the queen, for not complying with her request, since he could not abandon one, who, thinking himself injured, had appealed to him;⁶ and encouraged Rothade anew, in his letter to him, to adhere to his appeal, provided he was conscious to himself of his innocence; but, if he was not, to acquiesce in his sentence, and not give himself and others unnecessary trouble.⁷

Hincmar, finding his conduct gave great offence at Rome, wrote a long letter to the pope, to show that Rothade had no reason to complain of any injustice done him; but, on the contrary, that they had treated him with more lenity than he deserved, and had acted agreeably to the canons both in judging and condemning him. The only charge brought against him by Hincmar in the council, was his obstinately refusing to restore the presbyter whom he had deposed, notwithstanding the express command of

¹ Nicol. ep. 32. ² Idem, ep. 30. ³ Idem, ep. 29.

⁴ Annal. Bertin. ⁵ Epist. 35. ⁶ Epist. 36.

⁷ Epist. 37.

¹ Nicol. ep. 29.

² Idem ep. 28.

Hincmar's letter to the pope. He taxes him with acting contrary to the canons. Rothade goes to Rome, and is reinstated in his dignity, and restored to his see;—[Year of Christ, 865.]

his metropolitan, to whom he owed obedience. But, in his letter to the pope, he charges him besides with having alienated and squandered away the revenues of his church, with having disposed of many rich offerings made by his predecessors, and others, for the redemption of their souls; with having pawned a golden chalice enriched with precious stones, without the knowledge of the other bishops, of his metropolitan, or even of the œconomus, or steward of the church; and, lastly, with having lived, in spite of repeated admonitions, in a manner unworthy of any ecclesiastic, and much more of a bishop, to the great scandal of the flock committed to his care. Hincmar, in the next place, proceeds to show, that Rothade had acted contrary to the canons in appealing, after his condemnation, to the pope, and not the bishops of the council in rejecting his appeal, and not suffering him to pursue it at Rome. But, to prove this, he takes it for granted, that Rothade had withdrawn his appeal, and consented to be judged by the bishops of the same province; which he absolutely denied, as has been observed above. As the pope had, in all his letters, reproached Hincmar, as well as the other bishops of the council of Soissons, with a manifest breach of the canons, especially of the canons of the council of Sardica, in not permitting Rothade to go to Rome after his appeal, and plead his cause in person, at the tribunal to which he had appealed; Hincmar, in answer to that reproach, allows the pope to have been empowered by the council of Sardica to receive appeals from the judgment of the metropolitans and provincial synods; and that, by virtue of such a power, he may order the cause to be judged anew. But he observes at the same time, and very justly, that this is not to be done at Rome, but in the province; it being ordained by several councils, and even by that of Sardica itself, that all disputes should be determined in the places where they arose; and that the pope may therefore cause the judgment to be renewed in the province where it was given, and send, if he pleases, a legate to assist at it in his name; but is not authorized by the council of Sardica, or any other council, to summon the deposed bishop, or those who deposed him, to Rome. He adds, that nevertheless, at the desire of his holiness, Rothade has been set at liberty, and may undertake, when he pleases, his intended journey to Rome; but that if the pope should reverse the sentence pronounced against him by his metropolitan and the bishops of the province, the judgment of provincial as well as national synods would, for the future, be quite disregarded; that the greatest offenders, when condemned by them, would recur to Rome as to a safe asylum; and that, as for himself, he would never again take upon

him to judge any other, but should only admonish them, and, if they did not hearken to his admonitions, refer them to the judgment of the apostolic see.¹

As the pope had, in all his letters to Hincmar and the other bishops of the council of Soissons, insisted on their sending deputies to Rome, to maintain the judgment they had given, they yielded at last; and their deputies set out accordingly, together with Rothade, and Robert, bishop of Mans, who was charged with letters from the king to the pope, and probably with the letter which I have just mentioned from Hincmar. But the emperor refusing to let them pass through his dominions, they stopped at Besançon; and from thence the bishop of Mans and the deputies, not displeased at the disappointment, wrote to the pope to acquaint him with it, and then returned to France. But Rothade, pretending sickness, staid at Besançon, till, by means of his friends at the courts of Lotharius and Lewis king of Germany, he obtained the emperor's permission to pursue his journey to Rome, where he arrived in the month of June, 864. Some time after, deputies arrived, sent by Hincmar with the letter mentioned above, and two more from him to the pope.² But as those deputies were not commissioned to accuse or prosecute Rothade, and nobody else appeared against him, the pope, after performing divine service on Christmas eve in the church of St. Mary the Greater, went up into the reading desk; and having from thence related and explained the whole affair of that bishop, as set forth by him in his memorial, and observed in particular, that he never had withdrawn his appeal to the apostolic see, as was falsely and maliciously asserted by Hincmar, he declared him worthy of the episcopal ornaments, and ordered him to resume them; which he did accordingly, with the consent and approbation of the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, who were present, and the whole assembly, promising to answer his accusers when any should appear against him.³ Thus was Rothade reinstated in his dignity; but the pope, waiting for his accusers, did not restore him to his see, nor allow him to perform any episcopal functions, till the 21st of January, the festival of St. Agnes, when officiating in the church of that saint, he declared him, in a most solemn manner, to have been unjustly deposed, to appear innocent of the charge brought against him, since none had attempted to make it good during the long stay he had made at Rome, and consequently to have never forfeited the right he had to preside in the see of Soissons. The act of his restoration was then publicly read; and he thereupon said mass with

¹ Apud Flodoard. l. iii. c. 13. & Baron. ad Ann. 865. n. 35.

² Idem, l. xii. c. 14.

³ Anast. in Nicol.

Arsenius sent into France, with the character of legate *a latere*, to determine the affair of Lotharius. Charged with several letters. He repairs to the courts of the French princes, with letters in favor of the emperor.

great solemnity in the neighboring church of St. Constantia.¹

Soon after Rothade set out from Rome on his return to France, accompanied by Arsenius, bishop of Orta, in Tuscany, a man of a most haughty and imperious temper, whom the pope sent with him to see him reinstated in his see, and at the same time to determine the affair of Lotharius. Arsenius was charged with letters from the pope to Charles the Bald, to Hincmar, and to the Gallican bishops, all tending to ascertain the right he claimed of receiving appeals from national as well as provincial synods; of obliging the parties to plead their cause at Rome; and of confirming or annulling the judgment given in the provinces, as it should be found agreeable or repugnant to the decisions of the councils, or the decrees of the apostolic see. But the only proofs he alleged to maintain his pretended right, were either taken from the canons of councils falsified or misunderstood, or from such decretals as are now universally allowed to be spurious. However, Nicholas declared them all to be ancient, genuine, and of great authority in the church; and because the greater causes, *causæ majores*, were said by Gregory the Great to belong to the first bishop, or the bishop of Rome, by greater causes, he understood the causes of bishops; and from thence, concluded that they could be finally determined only at Rome. In his letter to Hincmar, he acquaints him with the judgment given in favor of Rothade, and commands him, by virtue of his apostolic authority, either to come in person to accuse him, or to acquiesce in that judgment, on pain of being himself degraded, and forever cut off from the communion of the catholic church.² He tells the Gallican bishops, in his letter to them, that Rothade did not withdraw his appeal, that he could not withdraw it, and consent to his being judged by them, all appeals from a superior to an inferior tribunal being in themselves void and null. He adds, that they are still free to make good, if they can, the charge brought against him at the tribunal to which he appealed; but insists on their first reinstating him in his see, and restoring him to his former condition; which was requiring them to reverse their own sentence. To this the Gallican bishops would not agree; and therefore, unwilling to quarrel with the pope, the rather as they apprehended that the king, who, at this juncture, wanted his assistance, would not support them, they suffered Rothade to take undisturbed possession of his see.³

¹ Anast. in Nicol.

² Nicol. ep. 41.

³ From the letters of Hincmar, and the whole conduct of the Gallican bishops on this occasion, it appears. I. That they knew of no other tribunal for the judging of bishops but the council of the province. II. That they allowed of appeals to the apostolic see after, but not before, judgment was given by the

The restoration of Rothade was not the only commission that the legate Arsenius was charged with. As Charles, king of Provence, brother to the emperor Lewis, and to Lotharius, king of Lorraine, died at this time without issue, and a war was thereupon likely to ensue about his dominions, between the two brothers of the deceased prince and the two uncles, Lewis, king of Germany, and Charles, king of France, the pope interposed at the request of the emperor; and glad of an opportunity to oblige him, as he wanted his assistance against Lotharius, he ordered his legate to repair to the courts of France and Germany, and exert the whole authority of his see in diverting those princes from any attempts upon a kingdom, to which the emperor had, he said, an hereditary and unquestionable right. He wrote by Arsenius to both princes, exhorting them to peace and concord; and likewise to the bishops of their respective kingdoms, requiring them to promote, to the utmost of their power, a friendly correspondence between the two kings and the emperor, that the emperor might not be obliged to turn against the faithful the sword which he had received from the vicar of the prince of the apostles to be employed against the infidels,¹ but might be allowed to govern, with piety and justice, the kingdoms which had devolved to him by inheritance, and he had been confirmed in by the sovereign pontiff placing the crown on his head. He closes his letter with threatening to excommunicate, and exclude forever from the church, all the enemies of his son the emperor, and all who shall presume to make war upon him, or invade his dominions.²

bishops of the province. III. That they acknowledged no power in the pope, when appealed to, of removing the cause to Rome, but that only of ordering the judgment to be renewed in the province, and sending, if he pleased, legates to assist at it in his name. And truly no other power was granted to the pope by the canons of Sardica; nay, by those canons, the pope was not empowered to re-examine the cause upon an appeal; but only to determine whether it should or should not be re-examined. If he found that it should, because it had not been sufficiently discussed, or the judges had been influenced by favor or hatred, he was, in that case, to order the judgment to be renewed in the province, either by the same bishops only, and his legate or legates, or by the bishops of the neighboring province together with them. Leo the Great was the first who claimed a power of summoning bishops to Rome, and judging their cause anew there.—(See vol. I. p. 194. note 1.) Hincmar and the Gallican bishops were sensible, that, in this whole affair, the pope had acted contrary to the very canons he quoted to authorize his conduct. Both loth to break with him, which, they apprehended, would be attended, with no small disturbances in the state, as well as the church, they did not oppose the restoration of the deposed bishop, how arbitrary soever and uncanonical, the rather as the person they had named to succeed him was dead; but contented themselves with remonstrating, in all their letters, against it, as repugnant to the canons, as tending to subvert all discipline, and encourage offenders to pay no sort of regard to the judgment of the metropolitans and provincial synods.

¹ The pope had crowned the emperor; and he alludes here to that ceremony.

² Nicol. ep. 25.

Arsenius is well received by the king of Germany. His insolent and haughty behavior at the court of Lorraine obliges Lotharius to take back Theutberga.

With these letters Arsenius repaired first to the court of Lewis, king of Germany, who was then at Frankfort; and he not only received him with extraordinary marks of honor and respect, but agreed, at his request, to meet the two kings, Charles and Lotharius at Cologne, and there to renew, jointly with them, the treaty of peace, which they had concluded among themselves and with the emperor, before the death of the king of Provence.¹ The legate, at the same time, engaged the king to concur with him in persuading his nephew, the king of Lorraine, to dismiss Waldrada, and to be reconciled to his lawful wife Theutberga. As it was chiefly to determine that affair Arsenius had been sent into France, and the pope had vested him for that purpose with all his power and authority, from Frankfort he pursued his journey to Lorraine, where he was no less honorably received by Lotharius than he had been in Germany by Lewis. The king granted him a public audience the day after his arrival, attended by most of the bishops and the great lords of the kingdom, received him, as representing the vicar of St. Peter, with all possible marks of distinction, and declared himself ready to comply in all things with the admonitions and directions of the holy pope Nicholas. In return for these civilities, the haughty legate abruptly told him, that he was sent by the sovereign pontiff to remove the scandal he had given by putting away his lawful wife, and marrying a prostitute in her room; and that he must therefore consent to dismiss the one, and take back the other, or he would that instant pronounce the sentence of excommunication against him. The king was no less provoked than surprised at the boldness of the legate; but apprehending that, were he excommunicated, the kings of France and Germany would lay hold of that opportunity to invade his dominions, he thought it advisable to yield. But the legate, not satisfied with his promising to drive Waldrada from his bed, obliged him to swear that he would never recall her; that he would break off all correspondence with her; that he would ever thenceforth treat Theutberga as his lawful wife, and marry no other in her life time. The same oath was taken, in the king's name, at the desire of the legate, by twelve of the chief counts of the kingdom.²

Arsenius, proud of the success of his negotiations at the court of Lorraine, proceeded from thence, pursuant to his instructions, to that of Charles of France, to persuade that prince, as he had done Lewis, of Germany, to renew the treaty of peace with the emperor, as well as with the king of Lorraine: and his negotiations were attended

there with the same success as at the other two courts; for Charles not only confirmed the peace, but agreed to an interview with his nephew Lotharius, who had solicited the legate to procure it, in order to settle some points that might create a misunderstanding between him and his uncle, and establish by that means a perfect harmony between the two kingdoms. Lotharius no sooner heard of the peaceable disposition of his uncle, than he repaired to Attigni, where Charles then was; and there, by the interposition of the legate, matters were settled in a very short time, to the entire satisfaction of the two kings. As Theutberga had taken refuge in the kingdom of Charles, upon the death of her brother, count Hubert, with whom she had lived in the territories of the emperor, Arsenius sent privately for her before Lotharius left Attigni, and, in order to render the reconciliation more authentic and solemn, presented her to him when he least expected it, in the presence of the king his uncle, of all the great lords of his court, and of a great many bishops, whom he had assembled for that purpose, telling him with an air of authority, that he presented to him his lawful wife, in the name of the prince of the apostles, and the sovereign pontiff his vicar; that if, unmindful of his oath, he refused to take her back, if he ever parted with her again, or persecuted her anew as he had hitherto done, in defiance of the most sacred laws, human and divine, he declared him excommunicated in this world, and eternally damned in the other. Lotharius was, as we may well imagine, highly provoked at the haughty and imperious behavior of the legate; but, dissembling the indignation it raised in his breast, as he knew that the king his uncle, and the whole court, favored the queen, he offered her his hand with a cheerful countenance, declaring, that he was ready to comply in all things with the directions of the holy pope Nicholas.¹

The legate, having thus happily executed the chief commission he was charged with, published, before he left Attigni, a letter from the pope, fraught with most dreadful curses, such, says the Bertinian annalist, as had never before been heard in France, against certain persons, who had robbed the legate of a considerable sum of money some years before, if they did not restore it. At the same time he thundered out anew, in the pope's name, the sentence of excommunication against Ingelrude, the wife of count Boso, who, abandoning her husband, as has been related above, had taken refuge, with her adulterer, in the kingdom of Lorraine. The legate, availing himself of the great regard shown by Charles for the apostolic see, demanded, and obtained of him, the restitution of certain lands that Lewis the Debon-

¹ Annal. Fuld.

² Annal. Bertin. & Metens. ad ann. 865, 866. Nicol. ep. 58.

¹ Annal. Bertin. & Metens. ad ann. 865, 866. Nicol. ep. 58.

Theutberga reinstated in her dignity. The legate sets out with Waldrada on his return to Rome. Ingeltrude joins them; but soon leaves them and is excommunicated anew. Waldrada recalled by Lotharius.

naire had formerly granted to St. Peter, and a count named Wido had possessed for many years.¹ On this occasion Arsenius presented Rothade to the king, and warmly recommended him, in the name of his holiness, to his protection and favour; and he governed the church of Soissons in peace and tranquillity to the hour of his death.

From Attigni the legate set out, in the month of August of the present year 865, with the king of Lorraine and queen Theutberga, for Gondreville, a royal palace belonging to that prince on the Moselle. Upon their arrival there, Arsenius, encouraged by the success that had hitherto attended him, and more by the dread the king stood in of the excommunication, with which he was threatened, insisted on his publicly repairing the scandal he had publicly given by putting away his lawful wife, and marrying another woman in her room. To this too the king consented, much against his will; and on the 15th of August, the festival of the assumption of the virgin Mary,² the legate said mass with great solemnity; and the king and queen assisted at it in their royal habits and their crowns, attended by the bishops, and all the grandees of the kingdom.³

The legate was not yet satisfied; but apprehending that the presence of Waldrada would soon rekindle the king's passion, and make him forget all his good resolutions, he ordered her to attend him to Rome, to be there absolved by the pope from the heinous sin she was guilty of in living with the king as his wife. Waldrada, awed by the anathema with which the legate threatened her, durst not disobey; and Lotharius had the mortification to see her set out with the legate on her journey to Rome. Arsenius

passed, in his return to Italy, through Germany and Bavaria, to recover, by the favor of king Lewis, some patrimonies of St. Peter that lay in those countries. He found the king at Worms; and there Ingeltrude, being driven by Lotharius from his dominions, unexpectedly presented herself before him, in order to go with him to Rome, and there obtain of the pope, by his mediation, absolution from the excommunication he had twice thundered out against her. At Worms she took the following oath, in the presence of the legate, and probably at his request: "I, Ingeltrude, daughter of the late count Mattefrid, and wife of count Boso, swear to you lord Arsenius, bishop, envoy, and apocrisarius of the holy catholic and apostolic see, and in you to my lord Nicholas, sovereign pontiff and universal pope; I swear, I say, by the Father, by the Son, by the Holy Ghost, and by the four holy Gospels, which I kiss with my mouth, and touch with my hands, that I shall quit the wicked life I have led to the disgrace of the above-mentioned Boso, my husband; shall return, like a strayed sheep, to the fold of the catholic church, upon such terms as it shall please my lord Nicholas, sovereign pontiff and universal pope, to prescribe; shall travel into Italy, either before you or with you, as you shall think proper; and shall comply in all things with the injunctions of my apostolic lord."¹ Arsenius chose she should go with him, flattering himself that he should enter Rome in a kind of triumph, being attended with two such illustrious penitents. But his vanity was disappointed; Ingeltrude attended him no farther than the Danube; for her heart failing her as they were upon the point of crossing that river, she forgot her oath, and, under color of visiting a relation in that neighborhood, who, she said, would furnish her with horses to pursue her journey, she left the legate, assuring him that she would meet him at Augsburg. But, instead of keeping her appointment, she returned to France, which Arsenius no sooner knew, than he wrote to all the bishops of France and Germany to acquaint them with her flight, notwithstanding the oath she had taken, and require them, in the name of St. Peter, and of the sovereign pontiff and universal pope Nicholas, not to admit her into their dioceses, but to declare her excommunicated and anathematized for the breach of her oath, as well as for her other crimes, till she appeared in person before the pope, and was absolved by his holiness himself.² What became of her afterwards we know not, no further mention being made of her in history.

As for Waldrada, the other penitent, she pursued her journey with the legate as far as Lombardy. But when she was there upon

¹ Annal. Bertin. & Mentens. ad ann. 865, 866. Nicol. ep. 58.

² The assumption of the virgin Mary, in soul and body, into heaven, was never heard of till the eighth century, abbot Authpertus, who died in 778, being the first who spoke of it, and used the word assumption; and from his words it appears, that, in his time, some believed that she was assumed in her body, and some that she was assumed out of it. "sive in corpore," says he, "sive extra corpus assumptam super celos credamus."—(Vit. S. Ambros. Authpert. apud Mabil. sect. iii. Benedict. part. ii.) However, that she was assumed in soul and body into heaven is now generally believed in the church of Rome; and woe to the man who should assert the contrary in Spain or in Italy, though it has not the least foundation in the sacred writings, in those of the fathers of the first eight centuries, or in history. The reader will find in Pellart, who wrote in the fifteenth century, and dedicated his book to pope Sixtus IV., a very particular and curious account of the death of the virgin Mary, at which assisted all the apostles, conveyed on white clouds to her house from the different corners of the earth; of her resurrection, and her assumption into heaven in soul and body. As she was thus assumed, we have no relics of her besides her milk; but of that there is such a quantity, as sufficiently supplies the want of all other relics. As to the passage in the chronicle of Eusebius, and the pieces ascribed to St. Austin, to St. Jerom, and to Dionysius the areopagite, wherein mention is made of the assumption, they are now universally allowed to be spurious.

³ Annal. Bertin. & Metens. ad ann. 865, 866. Nicol. ep. 58.

¹ Apud Baron. ad ann. 865. n. 63.

² Ibid.

Waldrada excommunicated by the pope. Adventius writes to the pope in favor of Lotharius. Lotharius writes to him at the same time. The queen writes to the pope for leave to resign her dignity, which he refuses;— [Year of Christ, 867.]

the point of setting out from Pavia in her way to Rome, she received a letter from Lotharius, ordering her, as he could no longer bear her absence, to return with all speed to his dominions. Upon the receipt of that letter, which the messenger privately delivered to her, pursuant to his instructions, her good resolutions all vanished in an instant; and leaving the legate abruptly, she hastened back to Lorraine. Arsenius, thus disappointed of his expected triumph, entered Rome alone, and gave an account of the whole to the pope; who, no less provoked than he at the behavior of the two pretended penitents, immediately confirmed the excommunication of Ingeltrude, and, on the 2d of February, 866, solemnly excommunicated Waldrada, and transmitted to all the bishops of Italy, France, and Germany, the sentence he had pronounced against her, ordering them to publish it in their respective dioceses. He tells the bishops, in his letter, that though Lotharius is no less guilty than Waldrada, yet he has not excommunicated him, for just reasons, which he is not obliged to communicate to them, the apostolic see, that is trusted with the care of all churches, being accountable to none for its conduct.¹

Lotharius, hearing of the excommunication of Waldrada, and apprehending that the pope might be brought at last, by his enemies and the queen's friends, to pronounce the same sentence against him, got Adventius, bishop of Metz, to write to his holiness in his favor; and the letter the aged bishop wrote, plainly shows him to have been as simple a man as any of his time, or as great a sycophant; for, in that letter, he assured the pope, that the king had had no intercourse or correspondence with Waldrada since the departure of Arsenius; that he earnestly and constantly exhorted her to comply with the injunctions of his holiness; that he treated Theutberga in every respect as his lawful wife; that he assisted with her at divine service, admitted her, as he ought, to his table and his bed, and showed, on all occasions, an entire submission to the authority of the apostolic see.² The direction of this letter, was, "To the most holy, most blessed and angelic lord Nicholas, sovereign pontiff, and universal pope." Lotharius himself wrote, and sent by the chancellor Grimlandus, a very submissive letter to the pope, more submissive than was consistent with his dignity; for, in that letter, prostrate at his holiness' feet, he professes an unreserved obedience to the orders of the apostolic see; humbly beseeches the pope not to raise his equals above him (meaning, as appears from the context, not to excommunicate him, which would afford his uncles a pretence to invade his dominions;) and de-

clares, that he will be subject to none but to God, to St. Peter, and to his holy lord and father, pope Nicholas. As for Waldrada, he solemnly protests that he has never been in her company, nor so much as seen her, since the departure of Arsenius, and her return from Italy; and gives the lie to any who shall say that he has.¹

Lotharius flattered himself that he should thus impose upon the pope. But Nicholas was, in the mean time, informed by several persons worthy of credit, that the king met Waldrada in private; that he persecuted the queen more cruelly than he had ever yet done; and that, blinded by his passion, he seemed determined to remove her out of the way by some means or other, and make room for Waldrada, pretending that she, and not Theutberga, was his lawful wife. Hereupon the queen, apprehending her life to be in danger, wrote to the pope to acquaint him therewith, and at the same time to beg leave, as she saw no end of her troubles, to resign her dignity, to yield her place to Waldrada, and spend the rest of her days in retirement. To induce the pope to comply with her request, she even pretended in her letter, that the king had married Waldrada before he married her; and consequently that he could not live with her as his lawful wife, nor she with him as her lawful husband. But the pope well knew, that it was only to gratify the king, and purchase some respite from her troubles, that she wrote thus, and turned evidence against herself: He therefore told her, in his answer to her letter, that he did not receive her confession, having been assured by several persons no less eminent for their rank than their piety, that it was not voluntary, but extorted by menaces; reproached her with want of courage in thus yielding to her adverse fortune, in betraying her own cause, and owning herself guilty when she was conscious of her innocence; exhorted her to speak the truth at all events, since she had better suffer death by the hand of another for speaking it, than kill her own soul by departing from it. He added, that were he to admit her confession, and declare her marriage null, every husband who disliked his wife, would be thereby encouraged to use her ill, in order to extort from her by that means the like confession; that should he even grant her leave to quit Lotharius, their marriage would not therefore be dissolved, nor could the king marry Waldrada, or any other woman, in her life time; and that she must not think of living in a married state as if she were not married, unless the king solemnly promised to live so too. The queen had begged the pope's leave to come to Rome, and unburden her mind in person to his holiness. But he, not thinking it proper

¹ Nicol. ep. 49.

² Apud Baron. ad ann. 866. n. 31, & seq.

¹ Apud Baron. ad ann. 866. n. 38, & seq.

The pope writes to Charles of France, to Lotharius, and the bishops of his kingdom. Adventius' letter to Hatto of Verdun. What restrained the pope from excommunicating Lotharius. Lewis of Germany, and Charles of France, endeavor to reclaim Lotharius.

that she should be at such a distance from the king while Waldrada was so near him, would not allow her to undertake that journey unless the king sent Waldrada to Rome before her.¹ This letter is dated the 24th of January, 867.

The pope wrote at the same time to Charles of France, to the bishops of Lotharius' kingdom, and to Lotharius himself. In his letter to Charles, he commends him for his generosity in taking the persecuted queen into his protection, and exhorts him to continue to her the same protection, till it shall please God to put an end to so cruel and so unjust a persecution.² He reproaches the bishops, in his letter to them, with an unpardonable neglect of their duty in not seconding him in his endeavors to reclaim their king from his wickedness; assures them, that he did not grant Waldrada leave to return to France, as was, it seems, reported; declares her excommunicated for the third time; and threatens to pronounce the same sentence against them as abettors of adultery, if they continued to connive, as they have hitherto done, at the scandal which it was their indispensable duty to remove.³ From the pope's letter to Lotharius it appears, that the king laid great stress on the confession of the queen owning that Waldrada was his first, and consequently his only lawful wife. But, in answer to that, the pope tells him in his letter, that all France knew Theutberga was his first and only lawful wife; and that the confession she had made was not voluntary, but extorted by force and by menaces; entreats him to lay aside all thoughts of putting her away, and marrying any other in her room, since the apostolic see, he might depend upon it, never would consent to the one or the other; expresses great concern at the king's attempting thus to impose upon him, and, in the end, threatens him with excommunication, if he did not break off all correspondence with Waldrada as an excommunicated person, and repair the scandal he had given.⁴

Adventius of Metz, hearing that the pope had threatened the king with excommunication, and being at the same time informed, that it was the fixed and unalterable resolution of the apostolic lord Nicholas to exclude him from entering into the church, if he did not dismiss Waldrada by the eve of the purification, wrote, under the greatest concern, to Hatto of Verdun, his intimate friend,

¹ Nicol. ep. 48.

² Idem, ep. 50. *Annal. Bertin.*

³ Idem, ep. 49.

What opinion must we entertain of the bishops of Lotharius' kingdom, among whom not one was found, who had courage or zeal enough to say unto the king, with the words of the Baptist, "It is not lawful for thee to have her;" nay, not one who did not prostitute his sacred character to his lawless lust, and countenance him in a crime that gave such offence to the honest laity, especially to the princes of the royal family.

⁴ Nicol. ep. 51.

earnestly entreating him to repair without delay to the king, to apprise him of his danger, and persuade him to ask pardon for his past offences, in the presence of at least three bishops, with a firm resolution and promise to mend his life in time to come: that, being thus absolved, he might enter the church, and celebrate the festival, without exposing, as he otherwise would, himself and his kingdom, as well as them, to irretrievable ruin. He desires his brother Hatto to tell the king, that as for his sin against God, or his public adultery, he has no occasion to make himself uneasy about it, God having promised by his prophet to forgive the sinner the moment he repents of his sin. The good bishop seems to have thought it matter of more importance to obtain of the pope than of God forgiveness of his sin. He tells his brother, that he has thus written to him "sub sigillo confessionis," under the seal of confession; and therefore conjures him to show his letter to none but the king, and to suggest such counsels to him, as may rescue from imminent ruin both him and them.¹ Adventius apprehended, that, if the king was excommunicated, his uncles would be thereby encouraged to invade his dominions, which would involve the whole kingdom in the utmost confusion, and end, in all likelihood, in his ruin.

The pope, however, did not think it advisable to proceed to such extremities, the rather as a perfect harmony subsisted between the emperor Lewis and Lotharius, though Lewis was no less offended than his uncles at the conduct of his brother in the affair of Theutberga and Waldrada, and had frequently pressed him to dismiss the one, and be reconciled to the other. Nicholas, therefore, unwilling to disoblige the emperor, contented himself with writing most pressing letters to the two kings Lewis and Charles, entreating them to interpose their good offices anew with the king of Lorraine, to employ such means to reclaim him, as should appear to them the most effectual, and in particular to assure him in his name, that what declarations soever he might force from Theutberga, he would ever oppose with all the authority of the apostolic see, his marrying any other.²

Upon the receipt of these letters, the two kings had an interview, the result of which, was, that Charles should go and communicate them in person to the king of Lorraine; that he should represent to him, in the strongest terms, the obligation he was under of removing the scandal his treatment of Theutberga had given to all good men, and entreat him, in the name of both, to satisfy the pope, since he could entertain no hopes of ever prevailing upon his holiness to ap-

¹ Apud Baron. ad ann. 867, n. 121.

² Nicol. ep. 53.

Lotharius writes most submissive letters to the pope, and thus wards off the sentence with which he was threatened. The emperor Michael writes to the pope concerning the affair of Photius. The pope's answer to his letter.

prove of, or even to connive at, a conduct which he had so often and so loudly condemned. Charles and Lotharius met, by appointment, on the borders of their respective kingdoms, the former being attended on that occasion by a bishop. But their meeting had not the wished for success; Lotharius chiefly insisted on the declaration of the queen, which he maintained not to have been forced, as had been represented by his enemies to the pope, but quite free and voluntary, as she, who ought to be credited before them, had publicly owned; complained as much of the unworthy treatment he had met with from the pope, as the pope complained of the treatment Theutberga had met with from him; protested, that, to gratify his holiness, he had never suffered Waldrada to approach the court; that he had never seen her since her return from Italy. He added, that his enemies made it their business to sow the seeds of discord between him and the other princes of the royal family; that they had misrepresented the whole affair both to them and the pope: but that he was determined to go to Rome, and treat with his holiness in person, not doubting but he should be able to undeceive him, and confound his enemies.¹ With this his intention he acquainted the pope by a most submissive letter, entreating him, in the mean time, not to hearken to the suggestions of those who strove to estrange his holiness from him, and raise, by that means, disturbances in his kingdom. As a numerous body of Saracens had lately landed in Italy, and committed dreadful ravages there, he offered, in the same letter, to join his forces to those of the emperor against the common enemy, to head them in person, and defend, if necessary, even at the expense of his life, the patrimonies of St. Peter.² But the pope well knew, that he wrote thus only to amuse him; that he still continued to correspond privately with Waldrada, excommunicated as she was; that she governed with an absolute sway both him and his kingdom, while Theutberga had but the empty title and bare name of queen. He therefore desired the two kings, in his answer to their letter, to divert by all means the king of Lorraine, their nephew, from his intended journey to Rome, till he had given such proofs of the sincerity of his reformation, as left no room to question it, lest he should not meet with the reception he expected.³ The proofs required by the pope, were, that he should not only break off all correspondence with Waldrada, but send her to Rome; that he should treat Theutberga so as to satisfy all France that he looked upon her as his lawful wife; and that, to leave no hopes to Gunthier and

Theutgaud, who had countenanced him in his adultery, of being ever restored, he should cause others to be chosen for the still vacant sees of Treves and Cologne, in their room.¹ These terms seemed too hard to Lotharius; and therefore, laying aside all thoughts of his journey to Rome, he continued, during the short time pope Nicholas lived, to ward off, with most submissive and respectful letters and protestations, the sentence of excommunication with which he was threatened. What was the issue of this affair, we shall see in the pontificate of the succeeding pope.

From the great pains the pope took in the affair of Lotharius, and the numberless letters he wrote relating to it, one would conclude that it had engrossed his whole attention; but he had at the same time many other matters on his hands that required no less attention, resolution, and address; and among the rest, what he most of all labored to bring about, as it would most of all redound to the honor of his see, the restoration of the patriarch Ignatius. Nicholas had, as we have seen,² in a council held at Rome in 863, solemnly excommunicated Photius as an usurper, with all his adherents, and declared Ignatius to have never been deposed, but only driven with violence and unjustly from the patriarchal see. With this sentence the pope designed to acquaint the emperor Michael, and had already written a letter giving him an account of the proceedings of that council. But, in the meantime, the emperor was by others informed of the whole; and, before the legates set out for Constantinople with the pope's letter to him, Michael the protospatharius arrived at Rome with one from him to the pope, fraught with invectives, reproaches, and menaces. The pope happened to be greatly indisposed when he received the emperor's letter; and the protospatharius, impatient to return as the winter approached, left Rome, without taking leave, soon after he delivered it, inasmuch that the pope was obliged, ill as he was, to write his answer in great haste, and send it after him to Ostia. The emperor's letter has not been suffered to reach our times; but what it chiefly turned upon we learn from the very long letter the pope wrote in answer to it, notwithstanding his illness, and the hurry in which he wrote it. He begins it with an address to heaven, beseeching the Almighty, in whose hand is the king's heart, to suggest to him what may make an impression on the mind of the emperor, and at the same time to dispose his

¹ Nicol. ep. 55.

² Apud Baron. ad ann. 867. n. 123, & seq.

³ Nicol. ep. 53.

¹ Hugh, nearly related to Charles of France, had been nominated by Lotharius for the see of Cologne, as has been said above; but that nomination did not, it seems, take place. Indeed the sword and the helmet better became the abbot Hugh, as he is commonly styled, than the crosier and the mitre.

² See p. 211.

The pope's letter continued.

mind to receive that impression, and profit by it. He then proceeds to answer, one by one, the various articles, or, as he styles them, blasphemies against God and St. Peter, contained in his letter. Michael had, it seems, complained of the treatment he had met with from the apostolic see, though no emperor, since the time of the sixth general council had, as he pretended, honored and respected those who sat in it, however worthless, more than he. In answer to that complaint, the pope tells him, that it is quite groundless; that he has on no occasion used him ill, but only admonished and rebuked him for the welfare of his soul, which it was incumbent upon him to do, as well as upon every other bishop; and that, as to the respect and regard he had shown for the apostolic see, some of his predecessors, ever since the sixth council, had not been wanting therein no more than he; but that most of them were heretics, with whom the holy see could not communicate, nor have any intercourse. The emperor, alluding to one of his former letters to the pope, had said, "we commanded you, &c." That word was grating to the ears of the haughty pope Nicholas; and, in his answer, he pretends the words "we pray, we entreat, we exhort," to have been used by other emperors in writing to the popes, and by none of them the imperious expression "we command;"¹ nay, he maintains the words "we beg and conjure," and not "we command," to have been made use of by Michael himself in the very letter he quotes; and concludes, that he either does not know what he wrote, or repents of his laudable submission and humility. The emperor had called the Latin tongue a barbarous and Scythic language, which the pope highly resented, gravely reproaching him with having reviled, in the height of his fury, a language instituted by God, and made use of in the inscription on the cross. He adds, that if he despises, because he does not understand the Latin tongue, it is quite absurd and ridiculous that he should be styled emperor of the Romans, who is utterly ignorant of the language of the Romans; that the language he takes the liberty to brand with the epithets of barbarous and Scythic, is used in divine service by the whole Latin church, nay, and by the Greek church too, the epistles and gospels being read in Latin in the stations at Constantinople,² before they are read in Greek.

¹ Baronius himself owns the words "we command" to have been used by the emperor Mauritius in writing to the pope; and ascribes all the misfortunes that befel him, and his unhappy end, to his having used it.—(Baron. ad ann. 865. n. 83.)

² By stations are meant the assemblies of the faithful on Wednesdays and Fridays; for these two days were particularly sanctified from the earliest times; Wednesday, because on that day the Jews conspired to put our Savior to death; and Friday, because he suffered on that day.—(Tertul. de jejun. c. 14. Orig. hom. 10. in Levit. Petr. Alexandrin. can. 15, &c.) On both days the service began early, and did not end till

The emperor had said, that it was not to judge Ignatius anew, but to determine the dispute about images, that he had commanded the pope to send legates to Constantinople. Nicholas answers, that the event proves the contrary; that Ignatius was actually judged anew in the presence of his legates; and that it was for that purpose, but under color of the dispute about images, that he was desired to send them to Constantinople. He enlarges here on the unjust and irregular proceedings of the council that condemned Ignatius; declares, that his legates acted contrary to their instructions in consenting to his condemnation; and maintains, that there is scarce an instance of a bishop of Constantinople being deposed, unless by heretics or tyrants, without the knowledge, the approbation, and the concurrence of the Roman pontiff. In answer to what the emperor had advanced against the pre-eminence, primacy, and privileges of the Roman see, the pope tells him, that those privileges have not been granted by the councils, but by Christ himself to St. Peter, and in him to his successors in the Roman see; that the councils have only acknowledged and revered them; that they are perpetual, immutable, and will remain, in spite of all human efforts, so long as the Christian name shall be preached in the world. The emperor wanted the pope to send back to Constantinople the monk Theognostus, and other monks friends to the deposed patriarch, who had taken refuge at Rome. But the pope, after showing the unreasonableness of such a demand, assures the emperor, that he has no cause to complain of Theognostus, nor of the other monks, who have told him nothing but what he had heard before from many others come from Alexandria, from Jerusalem, from Constantinople, &c., nay, and from his own ambassadors, and what all the world knew to be true. As to the emperor's menaces, for he had threatened the city of Rome with utter destruction, if the sentence against Photius was not revoked; the pope bids him defiance, telling him, that the angels watch over the safety of Rome, and putting him in mind of Senacherib and his numerous army. As the Saracens had lately invaded Crete, had ravaged Sicily, had made themselves masters of several provinces belonging to the Greeks, and even set fire to the suburbs of Constantinople; the pope takes occasion from thence to reproach the emperor with injustice and

three in the afternoon; and from the length of the service those assemblies were called stations, and the days, on which they were held, stationary days.

¹ That no privileges were granted to St. Peter, but what were common to the other apostles with him; that all bishops were originally alike absolute and independent in their own churches; and that the privileges, prerogatives, and pre-eminence, which, in after ages, some bishops enjoyed over others, were granted to them by the councils, or were a free gift of the emperors; has been shown in many places of this history.—(See vol. I. p. 221, 222, 225, & alibi passim.)

The pope proposes the sending of Ignatius and Photius to Rome. He sends legates into the east with several letters.

cowardice, in tamely suffering himself to be thus insulted by the enemies of the Christian name, and threatening to wreak his vengeance upon him and the unarmed Romans, who have done him no injury. This, says the pope, is acting like the Jews, who discharged the murderer, and condemned the Author of life—released Barabbas, and put Jesus to death.

The pope, having thus answered the chief heads of the emperor's letter, comes to the case of Ignatius, which, though already fully examined, and even determined by the unbiassed judgment of the apostolic see, he declares himself willing to examine anew, and has the assurance to desire the emperor to send for that purpose both Ignatius and Photius to Rome, and, together with them, the bishops who adhered to the one and the other. In the close of his letter, he exhorts the emperor to tread in the footsteps of his pious predecessors Constantine, Constans, Theodosius the elder, Valentinian, &c., who made it their study to exalt, honor, and enrich the Roman church, and have thereby acquired immortal fame; declares that, as he has been trusted with the care of all churches, he will not neglect that of Constantinople; that he never will suffer the patriarchal see of the imperial city to be polluted by an usurper; that no menaces shall ever deter him from complying with his duty; and that he is determined to stand up, to his last breath, in defence of truth and injured innocence. To this letter he adds the following postscript:—"Whoever shall read this, our letter, at Constantinople, and conceal any part of it from our most august son Michael, let him be anathema: whoever, in translating the said letter, shall alter any thing in it, shall add to it, or take any thing from it besides what the Greek idiom requires, unless it be done through ignorance, let him be anathema."¹

This letter the pope consigned to the protospatharius returning to Constantinople; but apprehending that it might be either entirely suppressed or falsified, as had happened to most of his letters, by the friends of Photius, he resolved, with the advice of the neighboring bishops, to write another, and send it by legates, who should deliver it into the emperor's own hands. For that dangerous legation Nicholas chose Donatus, bishop of Ostia, Leo, presbyter, and Marinus, deacon of the Roman church; and by them he wrote, not only to the emperor, but to the bishops and clergy subject to the see of Constantinople, to Photius, to Bardas.² to Igna-

tius, to the empresses Theodora and Eudoxia, the one the mother, the other the wife of the emperor, and to such of the senate as befriended Ignatius.¹ These eight letters bear all the same date, the 13th of November, 806. The pope, in his letter to the emperor, warmly recommends the legates to his protection, as representing the vicar of St. Peter, and in him St. Peter himself; maintains the ordination of Photius by Gregory of Syracuse, who had been deposed, and was no longer a bishop, to be null; puts him in mind of the account he was to give on the last day for supporting an usurper on the episcopal throne, who has no power to perform any episcopal functions; declares his unalterable resolution of acknowledging Ignatius for lawful patriarch, till the apostolic see shall judge, condemn, and depose him; exhorts the emperor to disown the blasphemous letter he sent him by his ambassador Michael, and order it to be publicly burnt, otherwise he will excommunicate the authors of it in a council of all the bishops of the west, and cause the letter itself, as he cannot put up with so gross an affront offered to the pontifical dignity, to be fixed to a stake, and thus burnt, to his shame and disgrace, in sight of the different nations that flock from all parts of the world to the tomb of St. Peter. The pope, in his letter to the bishops under the see of Constantinople, and the clergy of that city, acquaints them with the whole proceedings of the council of Rome in the affair of Ignatius and Photius, and loudly complains of the practice of raising laymen to the episcopal dignity, a practice, he says, countenanced by princes, as laymen are more apt to connive at their wicked lives than those who are brought up in the discipline and service of the church. He reproaches Photius, in his letter to him, with his numerous prevarications, which he enumerates, and exhorts him to atone for by a sincere and timely repentance. He tells Bardas, that he is said to have been the chief author of the expulsion of Ignatius, and of all the evils attending it; expresses great concern at his not answering the good opinion he had entertained of him; and exhorts him to repair the mischief he has done by espousing the cause of the lawful patriarch, and withdrawing his protection from the usurper of his see. Happy Bardas, says here Baronius, had he hearkened to the fatherly exhortation of the pope; but he disregarded it, and therefore vengeance from heaven soon overtook him.² But the murder

utter aversion to all manner of business, and spent his whole time in sports and banquets, he immediately committed the management of public affairs to Basilus; and soon after, that is, on the festival of Whitsuntide, which, in 806, fell on the 26th of May, declared him his partner in the empire.—(Porphyrogen. n. 42.)

¹ Nicol. ep. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16.

² Baron. ad ann. 806. n. 14.

¹ Nicol. ep. 8.
² Bardas was murdered by order of the emperor Michael, grown jealous of his power, on the 21st of April of the present year, as Porphyrogenetus informs us.—(Porphyrogen. n. 41.) But the news of his death had not reached Rome in the month of November, when the pope wrote to him. The death of Bardas made room for Basilus, the chief author of it, and at that time great chamberlain; for as Michael had an

The legates not admitted. Photius excommunicates and deposes the pope in a council. Photius charges the Roman church with erroneous doctrines and practices condemned by the canons.

of Bardas, the vengeance from heaven which the annalist here speaks of, happened, as we have seen, near seven months before the pope wrote his exhortatory letter. The pope, in his letter to Ignatius, acquaints him with what he has done in his favor; assures him that he never will forsake him; and encourages him to bear his sufferings with the same patience and resignation as he has hitherto done, till it shall please God to relieve him. He comforts the empress Theodora, confined, as has been said, to a monastery, telling her, that the time is come when "children shall rise up against their parents;" but that, by patiently bearing the loss of a temporal kingdom, she will earn an eternal one; recommends his legates to the empress Eudoxia; and repeats, in his letter to the friends of Ignatius in the senate, what he wrote to the bishops and the clergy subject to the see of Constantinople.

With these letters the three above mentioned legates set out for Constantinople; but as they traveled by land, in company with two other legates, sent at the same time into Bulgaria, (of which legation I shall speak in the sequel) they no sooner entered the territories of the empire bordering upon that country than Theodore, who guarded those frontiers, meeting them, and striking the heads of their horses, an affront which the bibliothecarian cannot digest, told them, that "the emperor did not want them," and they might therefore return home. However, they did not return till they were informed, and they waited forty days for that purpose, that they were stopped by the emperor's order. Indeed it happened fortunately for them that they passed through Bulgaria; for the emperor told the king of Bulgaria's ambassadors, that, if they had not come through their country, they should never have seen him, nor Rome again so long as they lived.¹ Such was the issue of this second legation; and thus was all intercourse now broken off between Constantinople and Rome.

In the mean time Photius, now determined to keep no measures with the pope, proposed to the emperor Michael the assembling a council at Constantinople, in order to judge, depose, and excommunicate Nicholas with the same solemnity as he had judged, deposed, and excommunicated him in a council at Rome. To this proposal the emperor readily agreed; and a council accordingly met by his order, consisting of several bishops under the immediate jurisdiction of the see of Constantinople, and some obscure persons, who called themselves the legates of the three other great sees, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. Before this assembly accusers appeared, who arraigning pope Nicholas of many crimes, and deploring his wickedness, applied to the holy œcumenical council for justice. Witnesses

were likewise produced to attest what the accusers had laid to his charge. But Photius, pretending to take the pope's part, urged in his favor, that no man ought to be judged while he is absent. But his reasons being answered, as was agreed before-hand, by the bishops of his party, the pope was judged, was found guilty of innumerable crimes, was solemnly deposed as altogether unworthy of the episcopal dignity, and excommunicated, with all who should communicate with him. The acts of this council were signed by a very small number of bishops, and the pretended legates of the three above mentioned sees; but to their signatures Photius added those of both emperors, Michael and Basilius, of the whole senate, of a great many bishops who had never heard of that council, of almost all the abbots in the east, and of a vast number of ecclesiastics of all ranks and degrees, in order to send the acts thus signed to the pope.¹ In the same acts he caused acclamations to be inserted in honor of the emperor Lewis and his wife Ingelberga; and in those acclamations he gave the title of emperor to Lewis, and to Ingelberga that of empress, and of a second Pulcheria, flattering himself, that, by distinguishing them with those titles, he should bias them in his favor, as the Greeks had hitherto looked upon the emperors of the west only as kings, and given them no other title.

Photius, not satisfied with thus condemning, excommunicating, and deposing the pope, wrote a circulatory letter to the patriarch of Alexandria, and the other patriarchs and bishops of the east, charging the Roman church with several erroneous doctrines, and various practices countenanced by the popes, but repugnant to the decrees and the canons of the church universal. These are, I. At Rome they fast on Saturdays, by a manifest breach of the sixty-fourth canon of the apostles, deposing such clerks as should fast on Saturdays, except the Saturday before Easter-day, or on Sundays, and excommunicating laymen; and likewise of the fifty-fifth canon of the sixth œcumenical council, censuring the Roman church for fasting on Saturdays, and ordering them to correct that practice.² II. They cut off the first week of

¹ Metrophan. in liter. ad Michael. Patric. Auct. lib. de Synod. Sinod. 150.

² The words of the canon are: "Whereas we understand, that, in the city of Rome, the Sabbath in lent is kept as a fast, contrary to the rule and custom of the church; it seemed good to the holy synod, that, in the Roman church also the ancient canon should be revived and enforced, which says, 'If any clergyman be found to fast on the Lord's day, or on the Sabbath, one only excepted (the Saturday before easter-day) let him be deposed; if a layman, let him be excommunicated.'" Saturday, or the Sabbath, was observed from the earliest times, by all the eastern churches, as a festival, with the same religious ceremonies as Sunday, or the Lord's day. There was only this difference between these two great festivals of the week, as they were called, that Christians were not required to rest from bodily labor on the Sabbath; nay, they who did so, were excommunicated as Judaizers by the twenty-ninth canon of the council of

Different modes of keeping Lent.

Lent, indulging themselves in that week in the use of milk and cheese.¹ III. They do

Laodicea. The observation of the Sabbath is commonly, and most probably, thought to have been continued by the Christian churches to gratify in this, as they did in many other different things, the Jewish converts, who still retained a great veneration for the Mosaic institutions.—(See Cave, Prim. Christ. l. i. c. 7.) Some writers are of opinion, and among the rest Abaspinæus, that the Sabbath was originally observed as a festival by the Latin churches, as well as by the Greek, even by that of Rome.—(Abaspin. Observat. l. i. c. 13.) However that be, it was certainly kept very early by the Roman church as a fast, and her example was, in process of time, followed by all the western churches. The church of Milan, though so near to Rome, was one of the last that turned the festival into a fast, for St. Ambrose, bishop of that city, tells us, that, in his time, not only the Lord's day, but every Sabbath, except the great Sabbath before Easter, was observed there, even in Lent, as a festival.—(Ambros. de elem. & jejuniu, c. 10.) He did not, however, condemn the contrary practice; for being consulted by St. Austin upon this particular point, he told him, that he could give him no better advice than to do as he himself did; "for when I am at Rome," said he, "I fast on Saturday as they do at Rome; when I am here, I do not fast."—(August, ep. 86 & 118.) In St. Austin's time, some pretended the custom of fasting on Saturdays at Rome to have been introduced by St. Peter, who being to contend with Simon the sorcerer on a Sunday, fasted the preceding day; and having overcome him, continued ever afterwards, with the Roman church, to fast on the same day. But this tradition was, as St. Austin informs us, looked upon in his time, and very deservedly, as a mere fable by some of the Romans themselves.—(Aug. ep. 86.) However, it was alleged by Raturannus, in his answer to Photius's letter, to justify the Roman practice. But neither he, nor Æneas bishop of Paris, take any notice, in their answers, of the apostolic canon, or of that of the sixth council.

¹ There was anciently great variety as to the number of weeks in the Lent fast. Some churches began it six weeks before Easter, some seven, some eight, some nine, and some even ten; and yet none of them hit on the precise number of forty days. The churches that kept their fast six weeks, excepted all Sundays out of it; and such as kept it seven weeks, excepted all Saturdays, but one, as well as Sundays. Thus they agreed in the number of fasting days, namely, thirty-six, while they disagreed in the number of weeks. The churches, that began their fast eight, nine, and ten weeks before Easter, excepted so many days, that their fasting days did not exceed that number. Pope Gregory the first, or as others will have it, the second of that name, added to the thirty-six days of the six weeks, Wednesday, and the three following days of the seventh, to make them completely forty. Of this addition notice is taken by Raturannus in his answer to Photius; and he concludes from thence, that the quadragesimal fast is observed more exactly in the Roman church than it is in that of Constantinople. I cannot help observing here, that neither the Lent fast, nor any other, anciently consisted, as it does now in the church of Rome, in a change of diet from flesh to fish, but in a total abstinence from food till evening; and they then thought it indifferent whether they refreshed themselves with fish, flesh, or any other food. Indeed fasting, as it is commanded by the church of Rome, is mere mockery; for, according to their casuists, no drink breaks a fast, be it wine, be it chocolate; so that a man may drink as much chocolate as he pleases, may, and may get drunk with wine, or any other liquor, and yet fast as the church commands; since he would in that case, say they, break the command of God against drunkenness, but not the law of the church about fasting.—(Pasqualig. Praxis Jejunii decis 116. Escobar. Lessius, &c.) Pasqualigius, who has written most fully on this subject, adds, that, "as it is not wholesome to drink without eating, you may eat (two ounces of bread, says Escobar) when you drink, that not being forbidden, because it is taken by way of medicine;" and for this practice he quotes a great number of casuists.—(Pasqualig. Praxis Jejunii decis. 119.) All are allowed a collation in the evening, and there is no certain rule, says Lessius, for the quantity of it.—(Less. Instruct. Sacerdot. l. vi. c. 2.) In short, fasting in the church of Rome consists merely in a change of food, or in an abstinence from flesh, and every thing that comes from flesh: so that a papist may in Lent,

not allow their priests to marry, and separate those from their wives who were married before they entered into orders; and to this practice, adds Photius, it is owing that we see so many children, but know nothing of their fathers.¹ IV. They anoint anew with the holy chrism those who have been already anointed by presbyters, pretending, that bishops alone are authorized to perform that ceremony.² V. They teach, that the Holy Ghost proceeds not from the Father alone, but from the Father and the Son; and thus divide the undivided Deity into two principles. This, says Photius, is the most horrid blasphemy that ever was, or ever can be uttered, not only against the Holy Ghost, but the whole Trinity, and alone deserves a thousand anathemas.³ VI. They raise deacons to the episcopal dignity, without conferring upon them the order of priesthood. VII. In imitation of the Jews, they consecrate a lamb at Easter, and offer it on the altar with the body of the Lord.⁴ VIII. Their clergy shave their beards.⁵

and on all other fasts, riot upon salmon, sturgeon, and other such delicious fish, may drink the richest wines, and yet obey the command of his church, and earn heaven by fasting. But should he taste any flesh, however coarse, or the liquor it was boiled in, or any lactinia or milk-meats, he would disobey her command; and her commands are all no less binding, on pain of damnation, than those of the decalogue.

¹ "It were to be wished," says Alvarus Pelagius, bishop of Silva in Portugal, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, "that the clergy had never vowed chastity, especially the clergy of Spain, where the sons of the laity are not much more numerous than the sons of the clergy.—(Alvar. de planctu Eccles. l. ii. art. 27.)"

² All persons, children as well as the adult, were anciently anointed with the holy unction, and received the imposition of hands, as soon as they were baptized; which ceremony we now call confirmation. In the Roman church, several unctions were used on that occasion, namely, of the forehead, of the eyes, nose, mouth, and ears. That of the forehead, which was always attended with the imposition of hands, was reserved to the bishop as his peculiar office; but presbyters were allowed to perform all the other unctions, and, in most of the eastern churches, even that of the forehead, and the imposition of hands, with the permission of the bishop. The chrism, used in these unctions, was a mixture of oil and balsam, which the bishop alone was allowed to consecrate, and it was always consecrated at Easter. When this ceremony, which was originally but one of the parts or rites of the sacrament of baptism, began first to be used, is uncertain; but Tertullian and Origen, who flourished in the third century, are the first who speak of it. However, in the church of Rome it is one of the seven sacraments, and is believed to be of divine institution, and to imprint an indelible character.—(Concil. Trid. de Sacram. can. 9.)

³ This point is the subject of three whole books out of the four that Raturannus wrote in answer to the objections of Photius. The first consists of passages from Scripture, and the other two of passages from the fathers, to prove the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son.

⁴ That such a gross piece of superstition as that of consecrating a lamb at Easter, and eating the flesh of it, once prevailed in the Roman church, appears from Walafridus Strabo, who severely censures it; (Strabo de reb. Eccles. c. 18.) and likewise from the old Ordo Romanus, where a form is set down for the consecration of a lamb at Easter. But as Strabo takes no notice of their offering it on the altar with the eucharist, that was probably an aggravation of the thing, and perhaps putidum mendacium, as cardinal Bona calls it.—(Bona rer. Liturg. l. ii. c. 8.)

⁵ The clergy were forbidden, by the fourth council of Carthage, to let their hair grow long, or to shave their beards, "Clericus nec comam nutriat, nec barbam radat." As the contrary custom, with respect to the

Photius exhorts the Eastern bishops to join him against the pope. The pope recurs to the Gallican bishop for an answer to the reproaches of Photius. The emperor Michael murdered. Photius deposed, and Ignatius restored.

These were the chief articles of the charge brought by Photius against the Roman church, in his letter to the eastern bishops; and in the same letter, he exhorts them to concur with him in reforming that church, and to send their deputies to assist, in their name, if they cannot assist in person, at the œcumenical council that is appointed to meet for that purpose. He tells them, that he has received a synodical letter from Italy, filled with unheard-of complaints from all ranks of people against their bishop, whose tyranny they can no longer bear; and therefore entreat him to deliver them from so galling a yoke. In the close of his letter, he exhorts the patriarchs and bishops, to whom it was addressed, to receive the seventh council, that condemned, under his uncle Tarasius, the heresy of the Iconoclasts, and established the opposite doctrine. In his letter, he takes notice of the conversion of the Bulgarians, and likewise of the Ruteni or Russians, styling them a nation that exceeds all other nations in slaughters and cruelty.¹

The pope finding the Roman church and his see thus attacked, applied to Hincmar and the other metropolitans of Charles's kingdom, desiring them to assemble their respective suffragans to examine and answer, jointly with them, the reproaches of Photius, levelled against all churches that used the Latin tongue, as well as the Roman, and to transmit their answers to him.² The bishops met, in compliance with the desire of the pope; and having examined, with their Metropolitans, the points in dispute, answered one by one the objections of Photius. The answers of the bishop of the province of Sens, collected by Æneas, bishop of Paris, have reached our times; but those of the bishops of the province of Reims, collected by Odo bishop of Beauvais, are lost.

beard, obtains in the Latin church, and they will not allow any of their practices to be contrary to the ancient canons, but will have them all, however indifferent, to be pregnant with some mystery, Bellarmine pretends, that the word *radat* should be left out; and he reads the canon thus; "Clericus nec comam nutriat, nec barbam," a clergyman shall neither let his hair grow long nor his beard.—(Bellarmin. de monach. l. ii. c. 40.) But that the other is the true reading has been unanswerably proved from the ancient manuscripts.—(See Savaro not. in Sidonium, l. iv. ep. 24, & Spodan. epit. Baron. ad ann. 858.)

¹ In the year 861, they over-ran many provinces of the empire, committing every where most dreadful ravages, and shocking barbarities, and even laid siege to Constantinople itself; but not succeeding in that undertaking, which Porphyrogenetus ascribes to the prayers of Photius, they returned home, and, upon their return, embraced the Christian religion, received a bishop, and of enemies became friends and allies of the empire. To what so sudden a change was owing in so cruel, so fierce, so inhuman a nation, as Porphyrogenetus calls them, or by whose means it was brought about, neither he nor Photius has informed us. But they relapsed afterwards into idolatry; for St. Adelbertus, who was sent by Otto king of Germany, in 959, to preach the gospel to that people, found no other Christian among them but Helena their queen, who had been baptized at Constantinople in 954.—(Cedren. p. 636. Herbest. rer. Muscovit. p. 3. Europalates, Zonar. &c.)

² Nicol. ep. 70. apud Baron. ad ann. 867. n. 46, &c.

Ratramnus, one of the most learned men of his age, wrote on the same subject, probably at the desire of the bishops; and his performance, which is still extant, far exceeds that of Æneas.

In the meantime happened in the east an unexpected change of affairs both in the church and the state: the emperor Michael was murdered by his guards, either at the instigation of the friends of Basilius, or by a decree of the Senate, says Porphyrogenetus, exculpating his grandfather Basilius. But the other Byzantine historians, and among them Leo Grammaticus and Symeon Logotheta, tell us, that Basilius being informed, that Michael designed to remove him out of the way, and raise a patrician, by name Basiliscianus, to the imperial throne in his room, he resolved to save his own life at the expense of the emperor's; and that, entering accordingly his room one night while he was drunk and asleep, he first cut off both his hands as he held them up, and then dispatched him with innumerable wounds, after he had reigned twenty-seven years and four months. Basilius, now sole master of the empire, ordered Photius the very next day to be confined to a Monastery; and having sent for Ignatius, commanded silence upon his appearing before him, bestowed upon him the highest commendations, and restored him to his see, eleven years after he had been driven with violence from it.¹ Nicetas writes, that the emperor deposed Photius in a council, which must have consisted of such bishops only as happened then to be at Constantinople, since he was deposed the very next day after the murder of his colleague Michael. Zonaras, and, long before him, Leo Grammaticus, Symeon Logotheta, and George the monk, ascribe the deposition of Photius to his having pushed back Basilius as he approached the altar to receive the eucharist, telling him that he could not administer it to him, as his hands were still reeking with the blood of his benefactor. But of that no notice is taken by Porphyrogenetus, more ancient than any of those writers, nor by Nicetas, who was an eye-witness of what he relates, and would scarce have ventured, how prejudiced soever against Photius, to pass so remarkable a circumstance over in silence. And truly that Photius was a man to flatter princes in their wickedness, rather than to reprimand them, sufficiently appears from the letter he wrote to the emperor Michael when he received the news of the death of Bardas, murdered by his order; for though he owed, as we have seen, his promotion to Bardas alone, yet, in that letter, he approved of his murder, nay, and painted his deceased friend and benefactor as the most wicked of men, and richly deserving the fate he had met with.

¹ Nicet. in vit. Ignat.

The papers of Photius seized, and among them the acts of his pretended council. The emperor acquaints the pope with the restoration of Ignatius. Contest between the pope and the Gallican bishops, concerning the ordination of Wulfade, and other clerks.

Photius being driven from the patriarchal palace, the emperor sent the governor Bahanes to him, with an order to deliver up all the writings he had taken with him. He pretended to have taken none; but, in the mean time, word was brought to Bahanes, that his domestics were just gone out with seven sacks full of writings. These Bahanes immediately ordered to be siezed, and carried to the emperor; who, upon opening them, found two books amongst them with very rich coverings, the one containing the acts of the council that had deposed Ignatius, the other the acts of that which had deposed the pope. The former was divided into seven sessions, to each of which was prefixed some representation of Ignatius done by Gregory of Syracuse, the most skilful painter in miniature of his time. Before the first session, he was represented dragged to the council, and beaten by those who dragged him, with the word "the Devil" over his head. Before the second he was buffeted, spit upon, and otherwise insulted by his keepers; and the inscription was, "the Beginning of Sin." In the beginning of the third, the fourth, and the fifth sessions, he was seen divested of his patriarchal robes, anathematized, and fettered like a common malefactor, with the mottoes, "the Son of Iniquity;" "Simon the Sorcerer; exalting himself above all that is called God." Before the sixth and the seventh, he was drawn as condemned to death, and carried to the place of execution, with the inscriptions, "the Abomination of Desolation;" "the Antichrist." The other book contained the acts of the council that deposed the pope, the crimes that were laid to his charge, with their proofs, and the sentence that was pronounced against him, with the forged subscriptions mentioned above. Of these books two copies were found, Photius intending to keep one for himself, and to send the other to the emperor Lewis, with many rich presents, and a flattering letter, which fell likewise into the emperor's hands, wherein he acquainted Lewis and his wife Ingelberga with the deposition of the pope by an œcumenical council, as he called it, and at the same time entreated them to drive him from Rome, in compliance with the decree of that council.¹ These books were, to the unspeakable mortification of Photius and his friends, publicly shown by the emperor to the senate and the clergy of Constantinople, and afterwards consigned to the flames by order of the eighth general council.

Photius being thus driven from the patriarchal see, and Ignatius reinstated in his former dignity, the emperor dispatched immediately Basilus the protospatharius to acquaint the pope therewith; and with him John, metropolitan of Sylæum, was sent by

Ignatius, and Peter, metropolitan of Sardis, by Photius, the emperor, who affected great impartiality, allowing him to send one to plead his cause at the tribunal of the apostolic see. But the metropolitan of Sardis was shipwrecked in the gulf of Dalmatia; and pope Nicholas died before the arrival of the other two at Rome, bereaved by death of the satisfaction the restoration of Ignatius, which he had laboured, during the whole time of his pontificate, to bring about, would have given him. The envoys therefore delivered the letters they were charged with to his successor, who strove, as we shall see in the sequel, with no less zeal than his predecessor had done, to bring this affair to a happy issue.

Besides this dispute with Photius and his partisans in the east, Nicholas was engaged, during the two last years of his life, in a warm contest with Hincmar and the other Gallican bishops in the west, on the following occasion: Ebbo, archbishop of Reims, having sided with the children of the emperor Lewis the Debonnaire in their rebellion against their father, was, on that account deposed in a council held at Thionville in 835, but, on the death of Lewis, restored to his see by the emperor Lotharius, in a council convened in 840 at Ingelheim on the Rhine. Upon his restoration, he applied to pope Sergius II., desiring to be reconciled to the church by the authority of his see. But the pope only granted him lay communion, declaring him unworthy of communicating in the quality of a clergyman. He was, however, prevailed upon by the emperor Lotharius to order his cause to be examined anew; and Gunbold archbishop of Rouen, and the other bishops of Charles the Bald's kingdom, met for that purpose at Paris in 846. But Ebbo did not appear at that council; and he was thereupon banished the diocese of Reims till his cause was finally determined in a general assembly.¹ Being thus obliged to quit his diocese, he withdrew into Germany, where he was kindly received by king Lewis, and appointed bishop of Hildesheim in the country of the Saxons, that see happening to be then vacant. Ebbo had ordained some clerks after his deposition in 835, and those, Hincmar, who succeeded him in 845 in the see of Reims, would not receive, alledging their ordination to be null, as they had been ordained by one who was divested of all episcopal power and authority. Hereupon the clerks, among whom was Wulfade, who had been preceptor to Carloman the son of Charles the Bald, and was therefore greatly favoured by that king, applied to a council that was held at Soissons in 853, and consisted of the bishops of five provinces, Hincmar presiding at it, with the arch-

¹ Nicet. in vit. Ignat.

¹ Flodoard. Hist. Remens. l. iii. c. 2.

Wulfade appeals to the pope. Council of Troyes. Letter from the king to the pope in favor of Wulfade.

bishops Venilo of Sens, Paul of Rouen, and Amauri of Tours. But by that council a decree was issued, declaring the ordination of those clerks to be null; and that decree was, at the request of Hincmar, confirmed by pope Benedict, the immediate successor of pope Nicholas.

However, Wulfade, encouraged by Charles of France, who wanted to prefer him, appealed from the judgment of the council to that of the apostolic see; and Nicholas, ever ready to countenance, right or wrong, all who had recourse to his see, not only received his appeal, but having caused the papers in the archives of the Roman church, relating to that affair, to be examined, declared the acts of the council of Soissons to be uncanonical and null; and, at the same time, wrote to Hincmar, to Herard of Tours, and to all the bishops of France and Neustria, requiring them to reinstate Wulfade and the other clerks in their respective degrees, or to examine their cause anew in a general assembly. He appointed the time for the meeting of that assembly, namely, the 16th of August, 866; and added in his letter, that if any difficulties arose, or the clerks appealed to the holy see, they should grant them leave to come to Rome, and either come with them in person, or send deputies to act in their names. The pope's design in this, was, either to make the Gallican bishops restore Wulfade and the other clerks in this second council, and thus reverse the judgment they themselves had formerly given, or to have the cause, if they confirmed their first judgment, removed to Rome, as he did not doubt but, in that case, Wulfade, supported by the king, would appeal to the apostolic see. But the Gallican bishops, apprised of his design, instead of annulling, confirmed the judgment of the former council, commended Hincmar for not restoring the deposed clerks after the receipt of the pope's letter, as they had been deposed by a council; but added, that, by way of favor, they might be reinstated in their former degrees, which they left, they said, to the pope, out of their great regard to the see of St. Peter. This they notified to the pope, assuring him, that they were ready to execute what his holiness should ordain; but lest he should think that they had revoked the decree of the other council, Herard of Tours declared, in the name of all the bishops who were present, that they did not depart from the judgment they had given, but only consented, by a merciful charity, to the mitigation of a sentence which they had pronounced according to the rigor of justice, imitating therein the fathers of Nice, who had received in like manner those whom Melitius had ordained.¹ Many letters passed, on this occasion, between the pope and the

Gallican bishops. The pope pretended that Hincmar had misrepresented the proceedings of the first council of Soissons to his predecessor Benedict, and surreptitiously obtained of him a confirmation of the said council; complained of their not having transmitted to him a distinct and authentic account of the deposition of Ebbo, and the controverted ordination of Wulfade and the other clerks; and required them to meet again and inform him minutely of the whole. They met accordingly at Troyes, on the 25th of October, 867, and, in compliance with the pope's request, acquainted him, in their synodical letter, with every particular relating to the deposition of Ebbo, to his pretended restoration, and the ordination of Wulfade and the other clerks, after his deposition. Actard, bishop of Nantes, was appointed by the council to go with that letter to Rome, and deliver it into the pope's own hands.

But the king, Charles of France, obliged him to deliver it to him; and having opened and perused it, though sealed with the seals of five archbishops, he wrote another to the pope more favorable to Ebbo and to Wulfade, whom he had already named to the vacant see of Bourges; for, in that letter, he assured his holiness that Ebbo had been preferred by the emperor to the see of Reims merely in consideration of his merit, and that the people had received him with joy; that, in the first rebellion of the children of Lewis the Debonnaire, his conduct was that of a loyal subject; but, being unluckily drawn into the second by the faction of Lotharius, he had publicly acknowledged his fault in the church of St. Stephen at Metz; that the emperor had written to pope Gregory, desiring him to confirm his deposition, and the pope had answered his letter; but, as the emperor kept the contents of his holiness' letter secret, and did not name another to the see of Reims, it was highly probable that Gregory did not approve of the deposition of Ebbo; that, upon the death of the emperor Lewis, he was acknowledged for lawful bishop of Reims by all the bishops subject to that see; that they all communicated with him, and such of them as had been ordained in his absence, received from him, upon his return, the ring and the crosier. From thence the king concludes Wulfade and the other clerks to have been lawfully ordained, because ordained by a metropolitan, who was acknowledged as such by all his suffragans. In the close of his letter, the king excuses his having caused Wulfade to be consecrated archbishop of Bourges before he received his holiness' answer, and demands the pall for him.

As the pope had reproached Hincmar, in one of his letters to him, as well as in that to the bishops of the council of Soissons, with pride, with unfair dealing, and want of

¹ Nicol. ep. 58. Concil. t. 8. p. 830. 833.

Innocent's letter to the pope. Nicholas dies. His character. His charity, munificence, &c. His writings.

the respect and submission that was due to the apostolic see, he wrote, by Actard, a long letter to clear himself from those reproaches, and satisfy his holiness, that, in this whole affair, his conduct had been entirely agreeable to the canons and the known laws of the church. With these letters Actard set out for Rome in the beginning of November; but pope Nicholas dying in the mean time, the affair was finally determined, to the satisfaction of both parties, by his successor, as we shall see in the sequel.

Nicholas died on the 13th of November, 867, after he had governed the Roman church nine years, six months, and twenty days. He was, without all doubt, a man of very uncommon parts, and has by some been compared, nay, and equalled to Leo and to Gregory, as no less worthy of the surname of Great than either of them. His ambition, at least, did not fall short of theirs; and, treading in their footsteps, he made it his study, during the whole time of his pontificate, to engross all power to himself, to enslave, in defiance of the councils and their canons, all other sees, to his own, and exalt himself above all that is called God. He paid no greater regard to princes than to his fellow-bishops, "commanding princes," to use the words of Regino, "as if he were their king; and kings as if he were the sole monarch of the universe." Notice is likewise taken, by the Bertinian annalist, of his writing to princes, especially to the French kings, "in a haughty, imperious, and threatening style, and not with the submission, deference, and respect that his predecessors had ever shown them.¹ Of this we have seen several instances, to which I shall add one more from Gratian, quoting the following words out of one of this insolent pope's letters to king Lotharius; "we command thee by apostolic authority not to suffer any bishop to be chosen for Treves or Cologne before a report be made to our apostleship."² Nicholas, so far as we can judge from his whole conduct, had nothing so much at heart as to vilify and depreciate the authority of princes, in order to raise his own above theirs, and the church above the state; and it was, no doubt, with that view that he taught the infamous doctrine, that "subjection is not due to bad princes," and left every bishop to judge and determine whether the prince was a good or a bad one, a lawful prince or a tyrant; a doctrine that, should it ever prevail, would involve all kingdoms in endless rebellions, and fill them with blood and slaughter. But how great soever his demerit was in other respects, he certainly deserved well of the apostolic see; and his successors in that see have accordingly honored him with the greatest mark of distinction in their power, that of saintship.

Indeed, that he was received into heaven among the saints of the first class, was attested by an eye-witness, namely, by John the deacon, to whom he appeared in the company of Gregory the Great, surrounded with the same glory as that renowned pontiff.

Nicholas is commended by Anastasius for his charity to the poor, of whom he kept a list, sending a daily supply of provisions to all the blind, the lame, and the infirm, in the different quarters of the city, and giving tickets to those who could walk, to some for one day, to others for another; so that they were all, in their turn, plentifully fed by him once a week.¹ He made many rich presents to the churches of Rome, especially to that of St. Peter, of which the reader will find an inventory in the bibliothecarian. As to his public works, he repaired an aqueduct that conveyed water to the Vatican basilic, and rebuilt the city of Ostia, strengthening it with new works against any sudden attack of the Saracens, who continued to infest that coast.²

Of this pope we have near an hundred letters; but of many of them I have already given the contents in speaking of the subjects to which they related; and shall only take notice here of such of the rest as may serve to acquaint us with the doctrines, the practices, and the ecclesiastical discipline of those times. Amongst these, the most remarkable is that which Nicholas wrote in 866, in answer to the questions, doubts, or consultations of the Bulgarians, converted five years before to the Christian religion.³ It contains

¹ Anast. in Nicol.

² Idem ibid.

³ The Bulgarians, a fierce and warlike nation, came originally from the country bordering on the Palus Mæotis, were converted to the Christian religion in 861, on the following occasion: in an irruption they had made a few years before into the empire, the sister of Bogoris their king was taken, and carried, with the other captives, to Constantinople. The king, who tenderly loved her, was greatly affected with her unhappy fate: but it proved, in the end, the source of the greatest happiness that could befall him and his people: for the princess, having embraced the Christian religion during her captivity, and being soon after exchanged for one Theodore Caphara, said to have been a man of great learning, she undertook, upon her return home, to gain over the king her brother to the same faith, representing to him, on all occasions, the greatness and the power of the God of the Christians, as well as the vanity of his idols, and exhorting him to banish them, and adore one God, the maker of heaven and earth, and the only true God, in their room. The king hearkened to her; but his attachment to the religion and the gods of his ancestors was proof against all her reasons, remonstrances, and exhortations, till providence interposed in a special manner: a dreadful famine began to rage all over the land, and was soon followed by a more dreadful plague, that swept off daily many thousands. These calamities the pious princess looked upon as sent by heaven to second her endeavors; and therefore renewing her exhortations with more zeal than ever, she prevailed on the king at last to apply for relief to the God of the Christians. He soon felt the good effect of this application; the plague ceased; and the king, sensible to whom he was indebted for so quick a deliverance, dispatched ambassadors to Constantinople for proper persons to instruct and baptize him and his people; and he was accordingly instructed and baptized, with many of his subjects, by missionaries sent from thence. Such is the account Porphyrogenetus gives us of the conversion of the Bulgarians; (Porphyrt. in Vit. Mi-

¹ Bertin. Annal. ad ann. 865.

² Gratian. distinct. lxiij. c. 4.

The pope's answer to the consultations of the Bulgarians. Decisions relating to several points.

no fewer than 105 articles; for so many were the questions proposed by the Bulgarians, or rather by their king; and it deserves the name of a work rather than a letter. The chief questions, and the answers to them, are as follows: such of the Bul-

chael) and his account has been copied by Zonaras, Curopalates, and Cedrenus. But Symeon Logotheta, taking no notice of the king's sister, tells us, that the emperor Michael having made great preparations by sea and land to fall upon the Bulgarians, Gibores, their king (for so he calls him) alarmed thereat, as he was not in a condition to withstand so great a force, a dreadful famine raging at that time in his kingdom, sent ambassadors to the emperor, to let him know, that he and his people were desirous to embrace the Christian religion, and become subjects of the Roman empire; that Michael, transported with joy at so unexpected a message, invited the king to Constantinople; and that he was there baptized, taking at his baptism the name of the emperor.—(Sym. Logoth. ad ann. 4 Mich.) Bogoris, or, as I shall henceforth call him, Michael was, it seems, baptized by Photius, for he possessed at that time the see of Constantinople; and in a letter he wrote to the king upon the duty of a prince, the completest piece of the kind that is extant, he sometimes styles him his beloved son, and sometimes his spiritual son.—(Phot. ep. 1.)

The Bulgarians, highly provoked at their king's forsaking the religion of his ancestors, rose up in arms, with a design to drive him from the throne. But he, taking the cross for his standard, or wearing it, as Logotheta says, on his breast, marched out against them, and having, with a small number of men, entirely defeated the numerous army of the rebels, he resolved to bring the whole nation over to the religion he professed. The emperor sent Constantine, surnamed the philosopher, and known afterwards by the name of Cyrill, to instruct them; and by him great numbers were baptized. But Constantine being invited by Rasilaus, prince of Moravia, to preach the gospel to his people, the king of the Bulgarians resolved, upon his departure, to apply to the pope for proper persons to instruct the rest of the nation. For that purpose he sent, in 866, his own son to Rome, attended by a great number of the chief lords of the kingdom, with many rich presents for St. Peter, among which was the armor he wore when he defeated his rebellious subjects. The ambassadors were ordered to consult the pope about several doubts or questions relating to religious matters; and it was in answer to these consultations that he wrote the present letter. Nicholas was overjoyed at the news of the conversion of so numerous a nation, and, perhaps, more at their choosing to recur to him rather than to his rival the patriarch of Constantinople, to have their doubts solved, and missionaries sent to instruct them. He received, therefore, and treated the ambassadors with the greatest marks of kindness and distinction; answered their consultations in writing, even the most trifling, for such were many of them; and sent back with them the bishops Paul of Populonia, and Formosus of Porto, both renowned for their sanctity.—(Auct. anonym. vit. SS. Cyril. & Method. Anast. in Nicol. Annal. Bertin. ad ann. 861.) The king applied at the same time to Lewis king of Germany, with whom he lived in peace and amity, desiring that prince to send him priests, and a bishop to assist and direct them. Lewis, in compliance with his request, appointed Ermenric bishop, with several priests and deacons, for that mission; but left his brother Charles of France to supply them with sacred vessels, books, vestments, &c., and by him they were supplied with them accordingly, but at the expence of the bishops of his kingdom, upon whom he levied a considerable sum for that purpose.—(Annal. Bertin. Fuldens. Anast. in Nichol.) Ermenric arrived in Bulgaria, with his troop of missionaries; but finding there the two above mentioned bishops, and other missionaries come with them from Rome, he thought it advisable to return home, lest he should give umbrage to them, and to the pope who had sent them. The Bertinian annalist adds, that the emperor Lewis, hearing of the armor and other rich offerings made by the king of the Bulgarians to St. Peter, sent to the pope, commanding him, jubemus, to transmit them to him; that the pope thereupon sent him part of the said offerings by Arsenius, and begged him to excuse his not sending the rest.—(Annal. Bertin. ad Ann. 866.)

garians as had not embraced Christianity, provoked at the king's introducing a new religion among them, rose in rebellion against him, with a design to put him to death, and place another on the throne in his room. But the king having gained a complete victory over them, and put to death all the grandees, as well as their innocent children, but pardoned all the rest, he wanted to know, whether he had been therein guilty of any sin. The pope answered, that he had undoubtedly sinned in putting the children to death, who had no share in the guilt of their fathers; and that he should have spared all who fell not in the battle; but, as he had committed those murders out of ignorance, or zeal for religion, he might obtain pardon by performing penance. To murder the innocent out of zeal for religion, was, it seems, in the opinion of pope Nicholas, an alleviation of that crime; and we shall see, in the course of this history, the slaying of thousands and ten thousands, the extirpating of whole nations commended, nay, and commanded, by his successors, as highly meritorious. Nicholas himself approved and applauded one of the most bloody massacres we read of in history: for what encomiums does he not bestow in one of his letters upon the empress Theodora, mother to the emperor Michael?¹ He extols her as one of the most pious, most religious, and truly catholic princesses that ever swayed a scepter. What Theodora had done to deserve such high commendations, Porphyrogennetus informs us in the following words: "Theodora," says he, "resolved to bring the Paulicians (a sect of heretics) to the true faith, or cut them all off root and branch." A resolution worthy of a truly catholic princess! "Pursuant to that resolution, she sent some noblemen and magistrates," not preachers or missionaries, "into the different provinces of the empire; and by them some of those unhappy wretches were crucified, some put to the sword, and some thrown into the sea, and drowned. Thus were they slaughtered to the number of one hundred thousand, and their goods and estates confiscated."² And to this bloody massacre the pope alluded in commending Theodora for the "manly vigor she exerted, the Lord cooperating," domino cooperante, as he blasphemously adds, "against obstinate and incorrigible heretics." Nicholas adds in the same letter, that the heretics, experiencing in her all the resolution and vigor of a man, could scarce believe her to be a woman. Indeed zeal for religion had changed in her, as it did in our queen Mary, the tender and compassionate heart of a woman into that of a merciless and blood-thirsty tyrant. And here I cannot help observing, that, from the pope's own words, it appears, that the apostolic see had its share in the glorious

¹ Nicol. ep. 14.

² Porphyr. in vit. Mich.

The pope's doctrine concerning the administration of baptism. How apostates to be dealt with. Of suicides, &c. His letter to the archbishop of Bourges concerning the chorepiscopi.

exploit spoken of above; for the pope, after telling her, that the heretics dreaded, and at the same time admired, her resolution and steadiness in maintaining the purity of the catholic faith, adds, "and why so, but because you followed the documents of the apostolic see?"

A Greek, pretending to be a priest, had administered to many the sacrament of baptism; and the Bulgarians, discovering the imposition, had condemned the impostor to have his nose and ears cut off, to be publicly whipped, and had banished him the country. This piece of cruelty the pope did not approve, and therefore told the Bulgarians, consulting him about it, that their zeal was not according to knowledge; that banishment was a sufficient punishment; that the validity of baptism did not depend upon the virtue of the minister; and consequently that they, whom the Greek had baptized, must not be re-baptized, provided he had administered that sacrament in the name of the Trinity.¹

As some of the Bulgarians, after embracing the Christian religion, had relapsed into idolatry, they wanted to know how such apostates should be dealt with. To that question the pope answered, that they should first be admonished by their godfathers; that, if they did not hear them, it should be told to the church; and, if they neglected to hear the church, they should be looked upon as heathens, and, besides, be punished by the secular power. However, he was against their using any violence or compulsion with such as never had embraced the Christian faith; a principle which, had it been adopted by his successors, would have saved the lives, I might perhaps say, of millions.

As self-murder was not, it seems, an uncommon thing amongst the Bulgarians, the Pope allowed them to inter such as were guilty of that crime, lest the uninterred bodies should produce an infection; but for-

¹ Pope Nicholas required no more. But the council of Trent makes the intention of the priest necessary—(Concil. Trid. sess. 7. can. 11.)—in the administration of sacraments; so that, unless the priest intends to baptize, the child is not baptized, nor is any other sacred office performed, as I have observed elsewhere. And who can answer for the intention of a man, whose thoughts may easily wander from the business he is engaged in? The pope returned the same answer to the Bulgarians, consulting him, whether they should be re-baptized whom a Jew had baptized, namely, that they should not, if he had baptized in the name of the Trinity; and he could not suppose the Jew to have had the intention required by the council of Trent, that of administering a sacrament.—The doctrine here defined by pope Nicholas, namely, that baptism administered by a Jew, and consequently by a pagan or an infidel, is valid, and ought not to be reiterated, has been, ever since his time, the received doctrine of the church of Rome.—(Ordo Roman. p. 15. Eugen. decret. ad Armenos. Concil. l. xiii. p. 535.) But, among the Latins, Jerom looked upon it as a strange paradox, that a man should be made a Christian by one, who was himself no Christian; (Hieron. dial. adv. Luciferianos, c. 5.) and so did Nicephorus among the Greeks, declaring, that no man can baptize others, who is not first baptized himself.—(Niceph. Hist. l. xi. c. 11.)

bid any prayers to be said, or any oblations to be made for the redemption of their souls. It is observable, that the council of Braga ordered those who suffered for their crimes, to be treated in the same manner, as being accessory to their own death,¹ and in that sense suicides. The rest of the pope's letter relates to the feasts and fasts of the church, and the manner of observing them; to the ceremonies of marriage; to several superstitious practices and indifferent customs that obtained among them. He forbids them to eat the flesh of animals killed or hunted by the pagans, or to make any treaties with them, unless it be to gain them over to the true faith; to swear upon their swords, or in the name of any creature; to take from the churches such criminals as have fled thither for refuge; to wear their turbans in the church; to have any commerce with their wives during lent, or on Sundays, or while they suckle, &c. The pope closes his letter with exhorting the Bulgarians and their king to have recourse, in all their doubts, to the Roman church, the head of all churches, that has never deviated from the true faith, and is ever ready to instruct all who apply to her for instruction.

In a letter he wrote to Rodulph, archbishop of Bourges, he declares the chorepiscopi² to have the power of performing episcopal functions, as they were created in

¹ Concil. Bracar. l. c. 34.

² As bishops were allowed, when disabled by age or infirmities, to ordain themselves coadjutors, so were they permitted, in extensive and populous dioceses, to ordain chorepiscopi, that is, as the Greek word imports, country-bishops, to assist them in the country. The chorepiscopi were, according to the most probable opinion, real bishops; and it was their province to preside over the country-clergy, to inspect their conduct, and acquaint the city bishop therewith. As they were true bishops, they were vested with all episcopal power; but limited as to the exercise of that power. Thus, though they might confer the inferior orders without the consent, or even the knowledge of the city bishop, they were not authorized to ordain, without his leave, either priests or deacons. Pope Nicholas, in a letter to Harduic archbishop of Besançon, tells him, that the chorepiscopi are not only forbidden to ordain priests or deacons, but to consecrate churches, and even to administer confirmation to children.—(Dacheri Spicileg. t. 12.) However they were allowed to sit and vote in councils; and the decrees of the first council of Nice were signed by no fewer than fifteen of that order. As the chorepiscopi were ordained by one bishop only, the bishop of the city to whose jurisdiction they belonged, the validity of their ordination began in after-ages to be questioned; and, by a council held at Ratisbon in 803, three decrees were issued relating to them, under the name of village bishops, villanos episcopos. By the first it was enacted, that they should thenceforth perform no episcopal functions; by the second, that no chorepiscopi should be ordained in time to come; and by the third their acts were all declared null, and they placed among the presbyters. These decrees were confirmed by pope Leo III.; (Lall. t. 7. Concil. p. 1152.) but nevertheless that order was not yet entirely suppressed in the time of pope Nicholas, as appears from the letter of that pope now before us. To Haronius and Bellarmine I shall leave the task of reconciling the decrees of Ratisbon, placing the chorepiscopi among the presbyters, and declaring all their acts to be null, which decrees Leo confirmed, with the decretal of pope Nicholas, defining the same chorepiscopi to be vested with episcopal power, and the ordination even of priests and deacons by them to be valid.

Penance enjoined by Nicholas on a father, who had murdered his three children.

imitation of the seventy disciples, who were vested with that power; and consequently the ordination of priests and deacons made by them to be valid. He adds, that they are forbidden by the canons to perform such functions; and commands those canons to be observed in time to come. In the same letter, he will have those who kill their wives, if they are not taken in adultery, to undergo the penance imposed by the church on murderers.

In a letter to a bishop named Ronolard, he acquaints him with the penance he had imposed upon a father, who, having murdered his three children, came to Rome to be absolved by his apostleship from so heinous a crime. The penance he enjoined was, that, for the first three years (for his penance was to last twelve) he should not be admitted into the church, but pray at the door; that, during the next four, he should remain amongst the hearers; should in these seven years be excluded from the eucharist, should drink no wine, except on Sundays and holidays, and abstain from flesh so long as he lived; that in the three last years of his penance, he should drink no wine three days in the week, should go bare-footed, and never bear arms, except against the pagans. However, the pope allowed him to eat cheese, to keep his estate, and to cohabit with his wife, lest, says the pope, he should fall into the sin of adultery, and thus, while he atones for one crime, run headlong into a greater! So that the murder of three children by their own father was, in the opinion of pope Nicholas, a less heinous crime than adultery. Indeed, the civil law makes adultery a capital crime as well as murder; and as such it was punished under the pagan emperors as well as the Christian; nay, Constans, the son of Constantine, appointed the same punishment to be inflicted upon adulterers as upon parricides; and these were either burnt alive, or drowned in a sack, with a snake, an ape, a cock, and a dog, tied up with them.

I shall add here the account we read in Anastasius of the quarrel between this pope and John, archbishop of Ravenna, as we know not precisely in what year it happened: John acting, according to the bibliotherarian, more like a lawless tyrant than a bishop, had excommunicated several persons without just cause, and seized on their estates; had possessed himself of lands belonging to the Roman see, and annexed them to his own; had arbitrarily, and without any regard to the canons, deposed, imprisoned, and confined in dungeons, presbyters and deacons, not only of his own diocese, but of the province of Æmilia, under the immediate jurisdiction of the apostolic see; and, what was still worse, diverted devout

people from taking pilgrimages to the tombs of the holy apostles; nay, and pretended, that the pope had no power to summon him to Rome. This Nicholas could not bear; and therefore, after citing him three times to a council, which he had appointed to meet at Rome, he pronounced in that council, upon his not appearing, the sentence of excommunication against him. But the archbishop, not intimidated in the least at that sentence, resolved to maintain, even at Rome, the independency of his see; and he set out accordingly for that city, in company of several persons of distinction, whom the emperor Lewis had appointed to attend him in the character of his envoys, and countenance him on his arrival there. But the pope having gained over the envoys, and at the same time sent an order to the archbishop to appear on the first of November before the council that had excommunicated him, and there give an account of his conduct, he left Rome, paying no kind of regard to that order, and returned to his see. His return alarmed the inhabitants of Ravenna; and persons of the first distinction in that city, as well as in the province of Æmilia, flew to Rome, attended by crowds of people, to lay their grievances before the pope: they even entreated him to visit that unhappy city and diocese in person, in order to satisfy himself that the calamities they complained of were not exaggerated, and at the same time to redeem them, with his presence, from the insufferable oppression they groaned under. The pope, touched with compassion, complied with their request; and being informed upon the spot of the tyranny and rapines of the archbishop and his brother Gregory, he restored to every man his own, and issued a decree confirming what he had done. The archbishop did not wait the arrival of the pope; but, hearing of his approach, fled in great haste to Pavia, to implore the protection of the emperor, who resided there; but, to his great mortification, Luithard, bishop of that city, and the inhabitants, hearing that he was excommunicated, would not admit him into their houses, would not allow any thing to be sold to him or his attendants, nor would they so much as speak to him, or to them; nay, they pointed at them in the public streets, as men whom they were to avoid on pain of being excommunicated, and shunned by all as well as they. The treatment the archbishop met with from the emperor was not less mortifying; for Lewis, refusing to admit him to his presence, sent him the following message; "Let him go and humble himself before so great a pope, to whom we and the whole church submit; for he can no otherwise obtain what he desires," meaning, I suppose, his favor and protection. How the emperor "submitted to so great a pope" when he disapproved of his conduct, or when the

¹ Apud Iron. par. 10. c. 33.

The see of Ravenna entirely subjected to that of Rome. Hadrian II., chosen ;—[Year of Christ, 867.]

pope did not comply with his demands, we have seen above.¹ The archbishop, finding himself thus abandoned to the mercy of the pope, resolved in the end to satisfy him, in compliance with the desire of the emperor; and with that view he set out for Rome, the emperor having, at his earnest request, appointed envoys to attend him thither. The envoys were kindly received by the pope; but, upon their recommending the archbishop to him in their master's name, he told them, that if his beloved son the emperor were well informed of his whole conduct, far from recommending or screening him, he would himself have sent him to the apostolic see for correction. The pope paid more regard to the tears and prayers of the archbishop than to the intercession of the envoys; for John submitted in the end, finding himself forsaken by all, expressed great contrition for his past offences; and appearing before a council assembled by the pope on that occasion, he there wrote the act of submission, which the popes exacted from the archbishops of Ravenna at the time of their ordination; but both he and his predecessor Felix had falsified, read it in the hearing of the whole assembly, and swore, upon the cross and the Gospel, to conform to it in time to come. The next day John appeared again before the council, and having cleared himself from the crime of heresy, for that crime too was laid to his charge, the pope absolved him from the excommunica-

tion, gave him leave to say mass, and the third day allowed him to take his seat in the council. But a petition being presented to the council by the bishops of Æmilia, and the inhabitants of Ravenna, complaining of John's extortions and tyranny, a decree was drawn up by the council, in the pope's name, to restrain him from thus abusing his authority, and addressed to him in the following words: "We command you, archbishop John, to come once a year to Rome, if you are not prevented by sickness, or excused from it by the apostolic see. You shall consecrate no bishops in the province of Æmilia till they have been elected by the duke, the clergy, and the people, and you have obtained leave to consecrate them from him who shall preside in the holy see; nor shall you hinder them from coming, as often as they shall think fit, to Rome. You shall exact nothing from them contrary to the authorized custom, to the canons, or to the privileges of bishops. You shall not appropriate to yourself what another man possesses, till it has been legally adjudged to you at Ravenna, in our presence, or in the presence of our deputies and yours."² And thus was at last the see of Ravenna entirely subjected to that of Rome.²

Of the dispute that arose in the time of pope Nicholas about the presence of Christ in the sacrament, and the manner of his being present there, I shall speak, when the popes begin to take part in that controversy.

HADRIAN II., THE HUNDRED AND FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIIUS, *Emperor of the East.*—LEWIS II. *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ 867.] Nicholas being dead, Hadrian, the second of that name, by birth a Roman, the son of Talarus, of the family of Stephen III. and Sergius II. and presbyter of the church of St. Mark, was chosen to succeed him, with the greatest unanimity that had ever yet been seen in the election of a pope; all, who did not themselves aspire at that dignity, wishing it might be conferred upon Hadrian. He had been chosen no less unanimously upon the death of Leo IV. and Benedict III. the two immediate predecessors of Nicholas. But though he then prevailed upon the people to acquiesce in the reasons he alledged against his promotion, he could not persuade them to hearken to them now, though in the seventy-fifth year of his age; and the nobility, the clergy, and the people being all of one mind, they carried him by force from the church of St. Mary the Greater, where they found him at his prayers, to the Lateran

palace, and there placed him on the pontifical throne amidst the loud acclamations of

¹ Anast. in Nicol.

² Of this quarrel between John of Ravenna and pope Nicholas we read a very different account in an anonymous author, who is supposed to have lived in or near those times; for he tells us, that the pope, jealous of the archbishop's intimacy with the emperor Lewis, summoned him to Rome, to give an account of his conduct, which some had impeached; that the pope having excommunicated him upon his not obeying the summons, the emperor, who had espoused his cause, highly resented it, seized on the patrimony of the Roman church in Romagna and the neighboring provinces, and even went in person with the archbishop to Rome, where great disorders were committed by his followers, &c., and that the pope was in the end obliged to yield. But as no notice is taken by the other contemporary writers of any disagreement on this occasion between the pope and the emperor, nor of the emperor's journey to Rome, &c., nay, as the supposed contemporary author contradicts, in many particulars, the historians, who undoubtedly flourished in those times, we may well conclude the piece ascribed to a contemporary writer to be of a much later date, and in all likelihood supposititious.

The history of the popes by Anastasius the bibliothecarian ends at the death of this pope. The life of his successor Hadrian II., was written by Gullielmus likewise bibliothecarian, and that too of Stephen V., or, as others will have it, VI.

Hadrian consecrated. Rome plundered by the duke of Spoleti. The king of Lorraine writes to the new pope; [Year of Christ, 868.] Hadrian grants him leave to come to Rome.

all ranks of men. The envoys of the emperor Lewis, who were then in Rome, hearing of the election of Hadrian, were no less pleased with it than the Romans themselves, but complained of their not being invited to it though they were on the spot. But the Romans pleading the eagerness of the people, which they could not restrain, and at the same time ingenuously owning, that, as it was not customary for the emperor's envoys to assist at the election of the new pontiff, they had not invited them to it, lest it should be alledged as a precedent to introduce such a custom, the envoys acquiesced and went with the rest to pay their obeisance to the elect.¹ The decree of the election being sent to the emperor, and confirmed by him (for though the pope might be chosen he was not to be ordained without his consent) Hadrian was solemnly consecrated in the church of St. Peter on the 13th of December, 867. That ceremony was usually performed by the bishops of Ostia, of Porto, and Albano; but the bishop of Albano being dead, and Formosus, of Porto having been sent by pope Nicholas to preach to the Bulgarians, Hadrian was consecrated by Donatus of Ostia, by Peter of Cava, then an episcopal see under the archbishop of Salerno, and by Leo of the White Forest, called formerly the Black Forest, a city of Tuscany, on the Aurelian Way.²

The joy of the Roman people was not a little damped by the sudden and unexpected arrival at Rome of Lambert, duke of Spoleti; who, entering the city in a hostile manner, while the ceremony of the pope's consecration was performing in the Vatican, gave it up to be plundered by his followers; and no houses, no churches, no monasteries were spared; men were forced to ransom themselves and their families with large sums, and women of the first rank and distinction were either most barbarously used, or carried away. Of this insult Hadrian complained to the emperor, who thereupon deprived Lambert of his dukedom, while the pope, on his side, thundered out the sentence of excommunication against all concerned in it, till they restored what they had taken away. Being returned to the Lateran, he ordered all the presents, that, according to custom, were sent to the new pope, to be sold, such only excepted as were destined for divine service, and the price to be distributed among the poor, saying, "let us give freely what we have received freely, according to the precept of our Lord; they are given to us for the sake of the poor, and let the poor share them with us."³

The death of pope Nicholas was no unwelcome news to the king of Lorraine. He flattered himself that the new pope would

be more complaisant, or at least not quite so inflexible as his predecessor, with respect to the affair of his divorce; and he therefore no sooner heard of the election of Hadrian than he wrote to him the following letter: "I have received the disagreeable news of the death of pope Nicholas, of happy memory, who, I doubt not, is crowned in heaven with the saints. The whole Christian world, the clergy in particular, and, above all, the holy apostolic church, mother of all churches, have reason to mourn for so great a loss. I am myself sensibly affected with it; I appealed to his justice and equity against the calumnies of my enemies, submitted to him or rather to St. Peter, far beyond what any of my predecessors ever had done, complied with his paternal admonitions, and hearkened to the exhortations of his legates, even to the disparagement of my royal dignity, and the power that I hold of God alone. But he, suffering himself to be prejudiced against me by the sowers of strife and sedition, would never allow me to appear before him with my accusers, agreeably to the laws both human and divine, nor to visit that church, of which my ancestors were the protectors. It gives me great joy to hear that the Bulgarians and other barbarians are invited to the tombs of the apostles, and no less concern to find that I am not allowed to approach them. But waiving that, since it has pleased the Almighty to raise you to the pontifical dignity, you will not, I hope, oppose my earnest desire of paying my obedience to your holiness in person, and informing you, on that occasion, by word of mouth, of all that passed between your predecessor and me. This I shall look upon as a particular mark of your paternal goodness to one who professes himself a most obedient son and most faithful protector of your holy see."¹

In answer to this letter the pope assured the king that he should always find in the successors of St. Peter all the justice that was enjoined or required by the human laws or by the divine; that if he was innocent of what was laid to his charge, he might come to Rome without fear; and even if he was guilty, provided he was ready to acknowledge his fault, and atone for it by an edifying and salutary penance.² This condescension in the pope is supposed to have been owing to the interposition of the emperor Lewis in favor of his brother Lotharius, a perfect harmony subsisting between the two brothers, as they were both alike jealous of their two uncles, Lewis of Germany and Charles of France, ready to seize on the dominions of Lotharius the moment the pope pronounced the sentence of excommunication against him. On the other hand the pope could refuse nothing to the empe-

¹ Guil. Bibliothecarius in Hadrian II.

² Idem ibid.

³ Idem ibid.

¹ Regin. ad ann. 868.

² Idem ibid.

The pope absolves Waldrada, excommunicated by his predecessor. Theutberga goes to Rome and applies in vain to the pope for a divorce. The pope writes in her favor to the king; and to Hincmar of Reims. Lotharius goes to Italy. Has an interview with the pope at Monte Cassino.

peror, who was then employed in driving the Saracens out of Italy, who had made themselves masters of several cities and strong holds in the southern parts of that country. At his request he even absolved Waldrada from the excommunication that his predecessor had thundered out against her, wrote to her himself to acquaint her therewith, and at the same time to the bishops of Germany, to let them know, that being assured by his son, the emperor, that Waldrada sincerely repented of her past wickedness, and renouncing all commerce with Lotharius, was determined to lead thenceforth the life of a sincere penitent, he had thereupon absolved her; and they might therefore permit her to enter the church, might speak to her, and treat her in every respect as one restored to the communion of the faithful.¹ Lotharius had, it seems, informed the pope, that the kings of France and Germany had formed a design of attacking his dominions, should he undertake a journey to Rome. For upon the receipt of his letter Hadrian wrote to both those princes, exhorting them to live in peace with their nephew, and not to raise disturbances in his dominions or invade them while he was absent on his journey to Rome, since the emperor looked upon his cause as his own, and would revenge it accordingly. He added, that he was determined, if occasion required, to employ the powerful arms that God had put into his hands, with those of the emperor.²

This complaisance in the new pope encouraged Lotharius to hope, that if queen Theutberga herself owned her marriage to be null, and applied to the pope for a divorce, his holiness might be prevailed upon by the emperor to grant it without further examination; for he dreaded, even under Hadrian, the issue of a formal trial. At his request, therefore, and with the pope's permission, Theutberga set out for Rome, and being there received by his holiness with extraordinary marks of kindness, she pretended her marriage to have been unlawfully contracted, and to be null on that consideration as well as on account of some bodily infirmities; earnestly entreated him to dissolve it; and begged he would allow her to consecrate herself to a religious life, and to spend the remainder of her days in peace and retirement. The pope heard her with attention; but instead of complying with her request, he told her, that the affair was too momentous to be decided at once; that he would examine it more maturely with his brethren in a council, and in the meantime advised her to return to France, promising to write to the king in her favor. He did so, exhorting the king to receive and treat her as part of himself till the affair was

finally determined by the council which he intended to summon for that purpose, and to let her enjoy undisturbed, till the meeting of the council, the revenues of the abbies, which he had allotted her for her support and the support of her dignity. The pope closes his letter to Lotharius with the following words: "Whoever opposes this shall be anathematized, and you yourself shall be excommunicated, if it is done by your command, or with your approbation or consent."¹ Hadrian wrote at the same time to Hincmar of Reims, bestowing upon him the highest commendations, and empowering him, as his vicar, to see the decrees of the apostolic see, relating to the affair of Lotharius, put in execution, and to keep his sovereignty, Charles of France, steady in the resolution of protecting the persecuted queen.²

Lotharius, having settled the affairs of his kingdom in the best manner he could, set out for Rome soon after the return of the queen, whom he ordered to undertake that journey again and follow him thither. He proposed in the first place to have an interview with his brother, the emperor Lewis, flattering himself, that if he could get him to undertake his cause, the pope might, by that means, be prevailed upon to annul his marriage with Theutberga, and consent to his marrying Waldrada. Being therefore advanced as far as Ravenna, he despatched some of his chief lords to acquaint the emperor with his arrival in his dominions, and to beg an interview with him before he applied to the pope. As Lewis was then in the field, carrying on the war with great success against the Saracens, he sent deputies to the king advising him not to proceed, but rather to return, for the present, to his kingdom, and defer their interview to a more proper season. But Lotharius, impatient to have an end put at last to so tedious an affair, instead of hearkening to his advice, pursued his journey to Benevento, where he met his brother; and it was agreed, that the emperor should order the pope to repair to the Benedictine monastery on Monte Cassino; and that Lotharius, attended by the empress Ingelberga, whom he had gained with many rich presents, should meet his holiness there.

The pope readily complied with the emperor's order, and received Lotharius, introduced by the empress, and warmly recommended to him by the emperor, with all possible marks of respect and esteem, but neither by entreaties nor presents could he be prevailed upon to give his consent to the wished-for divorce, which, he said, he referred to the decision of a council to be held in his presence, wherein the whole affair should be examined anew. All the empress could

¹ Annal. Bertin. ad ann. 868.

² Hadr. ep. 10. tom. 3. Concil. Gall.

¹ Hadr. ep. 12. tom. 8. Concil. Gall.

² Hadr. ep. 4. tom. 3. Concil. Gall.

Lotharius is admitted to mass celebrated by the pope; and receives the eucharist. Gunthier of Cologne absolved by the pope. The paper read on that occasion. Lotharius follows the pope to Rome. Meets with a cold reception from the Romans, but is well received by the pope. The pope's presents to him.

obtain in favor of Lotharius was, that the pope, to show that he did not look upon the king as an excommunicated person, should say solemn mass, should permit him to assist at it, and even administer the sacrament to him, and to all in his retinue. To this Hadrian agreed upon condition the king publicly declared before he received the sacrament, that he had had no commerce whatever with Waldrada, not even verbal, since the time of her being excommunicated by his predecessor pope Nicholas. The unhappy prince had gone too far to recede, and therefore readily agreed to make the declaration that his holiness required, though conscious to himself of having not only conversed, but carried on the same criminal commerce with Waldrada after she was excommunicated as he had done before. However the pope was satisfied, and the next day, when mass was over, which he said with great pomp and solemnity in the presence of the empress, of the king, and their numerous retinue, taking the sacrament in his hand, he addressed the king in the following words: "If you know yourself, O king, not to be guilty of the sin of adultery, which Nicholas, my predecessor, forbade you to commit, and are fully determined to abstain from it in time to come, approach without fear, and receive the sacrament of eternal life for the remission of your sins. But if you are conscious to yourself of having committed that sin, or are not determined to avoid it so long as you live, presume not to receive it, lest what has been by divine Providence prepared for a remedy should prove your condemnation."

The king, unawed by these words, received the sacrament; and so did his followers, some few excepted, who withdrew upon the pope's saying to them as he administered it, "If you have been no-ways accessory, nor have consented to the sin of your lord and master Lotharius with Waldrada; if you have not communicated with any excommunicated by the apostolic see, may the body of our Lord Jesus Christ procure you life everlasting."¹

Among those who attended Lotharius on the present occasion, was Gunthier, the famous archbishop of Cologne, who had encouraged the king, above all the rest, to dismiss Theutberga and marry Waldrada in her room, and had been, on that account, excommunicated by Nicholas, as has been said in the life of that pope.² Hadrian, however, at the desire of the emperor, not only absolved him from the excommunication, but admitted him, with the other followers of Lotharius, to lay communion; and that, upon his reading aloud, before he received it, the following paper: "I, Gun-

thier, declare, before God and his saints, to you my lord Hadrian, sovereign pontiff and universal pope, to all the venerable bishops subject to you, and to the whole assembly, that I do not complain of the sentence of deposition pronounced canonically against me by my lord pope Nicholas, but humbly bear it; that I shall not presume to perform any functions of the sacred ministry, unless you out of pity reinstate me in my ancient dignity; and that I will never give any cause of offence to the holy Roman church, or to the pontiff, who presides in it, but shall ever live attached and obedient to both. I, Gunthier, have signed this declaration on the first of July, second indiction, in the church of St. Savior of the monastery of St. Benedict on Monte Cassino."¹ This declaration Gunthier read so as to be heard by all who were present, and the pope thereupon administered the sacrament to him among the laity, saying, "And I grant you lay communion, upon condition that you observe the promise you have made so long as you live."²

Engelberga returned after this ceremony to the emperor, and Hadrian to Rome, whither he was soon followed by Lotharius. But the king met not there with the reception he expected. No one came out to receive him; none of the clergy appeared upon his repairing to the church of St. Peter to visit the tomb of the apostle, and he went attended only by those of his own retinue to the lodging that was appointed for him near that church, but had not been so much as swept. He sent immediately to acquaint the pope with his arrival, and to beg that his holiness would say high mass the next day, being Sunday, and allow him publicly to assist at it with all his followers. This the pope would not agree to, lest he should disoblige the Romans, who were no friends to Lotharius, and held the memory of Nicholas, who would not communicate with him, in the greatest veneration. However, the king entered Rome on the Monday following, was well received by the pope, whom he presented with several gold and silver vessels, and was even entertained by his holiness at dinner in the Lateran palace. Among the presents that the pope made in his turn to the king, were a royal mantle, the branch of a palm-tree, and a ferula or pastoral staff, such as the bishops used in those days. These presents from the pope were looked upon by the king and those about him as mysterious or emblematical.

¹ Regin. Annal. Meten. et Bertin.

² This declaration, made by Gunthier, when the king and his followers were admitted by the pope to the communion of the church, plainly shows, that they were admitted to it in the church of the above-mentioned monastery, as we read in the Bertinian Annalist, and not at Rome, as is supposed by Regino and the Annalist of Metz.

Death of Lotharius. Envoys from Basilius, emperor of the East, to the pope. They deliver to him the acts of the council held by Photius against pope Nicholas; which are condemned in a council at Rome, and burnt.

By the mantle they understood Waldrada (and they might as well have understood any body else, or any thing) who, they said, would be restored to the king; the branch of the palm-tree they interpreted as denoting victory, namely, that the king would carry his point in spite of all opposition; and by the ferula was meant, as they understood it, authority over the bishops, whom the king would oblige in the end to submit to his will, and agree to his marrying Waldrada.

Lotharius left Rome pleased with these thoughts; but those of the pope were very different from his. For no sooner did the king set out on his return to Lorraine, than the pope dispatched Formosus and another bishop, with the character of his legates, to examine anew, jointly with the bishops of Germany, France, and Lorraine, the affair of the divorce on the spot. They were to decide nothing, but only to inquire into all the circumstances of that affair, and make their report to his holiness, who appointed a council to meet on the first of March of the following year 870; and the decisive sentence was to be pronounced by that council. But the pope and the bishops were delivered from that trouble in a manner, that was little expected either by them or the king. For Lotharius, arriving at Lucca on his way home, was there seized with a malignant fever; and he died of it at Placentia, whither he had caused himself to be carried. His death happened on the eighth of August, 869, and very few of his numerous retinue outlived him, being almost all carried off by the same distemper, some at Lucca and the rest at Placentia.¹ Thus ended an affair, that had engaged the attention of pope Nicholas ever since the year 862, and would, in all likelihood, if it had not thus ended, have given a great deal of trouble to Hadrian.

I have observed in page 261, that the emperor Basilius having driven Photius from the patriarchal see of Constantinople, and restored Ignatius, dispatched Basilius the protospatharius to acquaint pope Nicholas therewith, but that Nicholas dying before his arrival at Rome, the letters, which he was charged with, were delivered to his successor. The protospatharius and John metropolitan of Sylæum, sent by Ignatius, arrived at Rome soon after the election of Hadrian, and were received not only by him, but by the whole Roman people, with extraordinary marks of distinction. At their first audience they delivered to the pope, as the supreme head of the church, the acts of the council held by Photius at Constantinople against pope Nicholas,² desiring his holiness to cause those acts to be examined, and to condemn what should be found in them repugnant to the dignity of the holy Roman church, or what he thought inconsistent

with the true catholic doctrine. We are told, that the metropolitan of Sylæum threw the book containing the acts of that council on the ground when he presented it to the pope, saying, "thou hast been cursed at Constantinople, be cursed again at Rome: Photius, minister of the devil, and a new Simon compiled thee: Nicholas, minister of Christ, a new Peter and lover of truth condemned thee." The spatharius stamping upon it, and striking it with his sword is said to have added; "I believe that the devil dwells in this work, and says by the mouth of Photius his accomplice what he cannot say himself." He assured the pope at the same time that Photius had indeed got the emperor Michael to sign those acts one night when he was drunk, but that the signature of the emperor Basil was forged, as were the signatures of many bishops, whose names were seen there, though they had never so much as heard of that council.¹ The pope caused the book to be carefully examined by persons well skilled in the Latin and Greek tongues, and upon their delivering their opinion concerning it, he assembled a council in the church of St. Peter, consisting of twenty-nine bishops, nine presbyters of the Roman church, and five deacons. By that assembly the following decrees were issued in the presence of the eastern envoys. I. That the acts of the council held at Constantinople by Photius and the emperor Michael his protector, against the authority of the Roman church, should be publicly consigned to the flames, and likewise the writings that either had published against pope Nicholas, or the patriarch Ignatius. By the second decree Photius was again condemned and anathematized; but to that decree was added, that if he submitted by word of mouth and in writing to the decrees of pope Nicholas, and to that enacted by the present council, he should be admitted to lay communion. The third decree granted the communion of the church to all, who, adhering to Photius, had approved or signed his anathematized council, provided they burnt the copies they had of that council, conformed to the ordinances of the apostolic see, and communicated with Ignatius as lawful patriarch of the imperial city. By the fourth they were excommunicated, who did not communicate with Ignatius, but still continued to countenance the usurper of his see in his unjust usurpation. Lastly, all who, instead of delivering up or burning the acts of Photius' council, should thenceforth conceal or defend them, were excommunicated if laymen, and degraded if clerks. By this council, and all the bishops who composed it, the emperor Basilius was cleared from having been any ways concerned in the deposition of Ignatius, his signature was

¹ Annal. Bertin. Metens. et Regino. ² See p. 258.

³ Guil. Bibliothec. in Hadrian.

Anastasius, cardinal presbyter, excommunicated by Hadrian in a council at Rome. Hadrian sends legates into the east for the assembling of a general council;—[Year of Christ, 569.] They are well received by the emperor.

pronounced a forgery, and he declared worthy of a place among the orthodox emperors. The council being ended, the above mentioned book was laid on the steps at the church door, was trodden under foot by the bishops, and then, in their presence, thrown, with many anathemas and curses, into a great fire and consumed. Anastasius adds, that a violent shower happened at the time, but that instead of extinguishing, it served to kindle the fire, and make it burn with more violence, as if it had not rained water but oil.¹

In the same year 868 Hadrian assembled another council at Rome against Anastasius cardinal presbyter of St. Mark. Anastasius had been excommunicated by Leo IV. as has been related in the foregoing volume,² and had upon his death not only usurped the pontifical dignity, but treated Benedict, who was lawfully chosen, with the utmost barbarity.³ However pope Nicholas restored him to his dignity, and Hadrian even appointed him librarian of the Roman church. But he, abusing the confidence the pope reposed in him, pillaged the patriarchal palace, and privately conveyed away the acts of the council that had condemned him in the pontificate of Leo. Besides he was suspected of having been accessory to the murder of Hadrian's wife and his daughter. For Hadrian was married to one Stephanina, no doubt before his ordination, and had a daughter by her, whom Eleutherius, brother to Anastasius carried away by force, and married, though betrothed to another. This the pope highly resented, and applying to the emperor, in whom alone the civil power was still lodged, he prevailed upon him to appoint commissioners to try the delinquent according to the Roman laws.⁴ Hereupon Eleutherius, to be revenged on the pope, murdered both his own wife, the pope's daughter, and her mother. These murders, for which he was tried by the imperial commissioners and sentenced to death, he was said to have committed at the instigation of his brother Anastasius, whom the pope therefore excluded from the communion of the church till he cleared himself, in a council, from that as well as from the crimes mentioned above. At the same time sentence of excommunication was pronounced against all who should in the mean while communicate with him, or so much as speak to him, and he was threatened with a perpetual anathema if he stirred from Rome

till his cause was determined.¹ What was the issue of this affair history does not inform us.²

Hadrian not satisfied with excommunicating Photius and condemning the acts of his council at Rome, as has been related above, wrote to the emperor, as soon as he had despatched the affair of Anastasius, desiring him to assemble a general council at Constantinople, as the most effectual means of restoring to that church the wished-for peace and tranquillity. With this letter, and another to the patriarch Ignatius, were sent into the east Donatus bishop of Ostia, Stephen of Nepi, and the deacon Marinus; and they were to assist as the pope's legates at the general council. They set out from Rome with the envoys, whom the emperor and Ignatius had sent thither the preceding year, and arriving at Thessalonica were received there by Eustatius, spatharius, sent by the emperor to meet them, and attended by him to Sellambria. At Sellambria they were met by Sidinius protospatharius, and furnished with forty horses out of the emperor's own stables, with plate for their table, and proper persons to wait on them. Thus attended they arrived at the Round-castle, and the next day, being Sunday, they made their public entry into Constantinople, being received at the gate by all the great officers of the crown as well as the clergy in their copes, and conducted by them in great pomp to the palace of Irene. There they were received by John the imperial secretary and Strategius the spatharius sent by the emperor to excuse him from granting them audience the next day, it being his birth-day. The day following they were attended to the imperial palace by all the chief lords of the court, and admitted to the presence of the emperor, who rose up as soon as they appeared, received the pope's letter with his own hand, kissed it, and having inquired after the state of the Roman church and Hadrian's health, kissed the legates, and sent them to deliver the pope's letter to Ignatius. In that letter Hadrian congratulated the patriarch upon his restoration, declared that he adhered in all things to the decrees of his predecessor, to those especially against Photius and Gregory of Syracuse; recommended to Ignatius those bishops, who had suffered persecution on his account; and as to those, who had been ordained by his predecessor or by him, but

¹ Anast. in prefat. ad Concil. viii. Guil. Bibliothec. in Hadrian.

² See p. 219.

³ Ibid. p. 227, 228.

⁴ By one of Constantine's laws, they, who ravished virgins, or stole them, even with their consent, against the will of their parents, were burnt alive.—(Cod. Theodos. l. 9. tit. 24. leg. 1.) The severity of this law was somewhat mitigated by Constantius, but he still made it a capital offence.—(Cod. Theodos. l. 9. tit. 31. leg. 2.)

¹ Annal. Berlin. tom. viii. Concil. p. 129.

² I cannot help observing here, that some writers, not aware of Anastasius having been by Hadrian appointed bibliothecarian of the Roman church, and his being styled "Anastasius the bibliothecarian," have, by an unaccountable mistake, understood of the monk Anastasius, who succeeded him in that office and wrote the lives of the popes, what is said of the other, as if the monk had been deposed and excommunicated; whereas it is certain that he held that office to the hour of his death.

A general council appointed to meet at Constantinople. First session of the council of Constantinople. Second session. Third session. Fourth session. Fifth session.

had sided with Photius, he thought they might be forgiven upon their satisfying his legates, in the manner that he had prescribed.¹

The next day they waited again on the emperor, when he approved the assembly of a general council as was proposed by the pope, told the legates, that the patriarchs of the east, the metropolitans and bishops, had waited these two years for the decision of the holy Roman church their mother, and exhorted them to spare no pains in settling the distracted state of that church, and re-establishing a perfect harmony among them. The legates answered that they were sent for that purpose, but could admit no orientals to the council till they had signed a formulary, which they had brought with them from Rome. The mention of a formulary excluding all from the council who should refuse to sign it, surprised the emperor as well as the patriarch, who was, it seems, present at this interview; but upon its being, at their request, produced by the legates, and translated into Greek, they both approved of it, and the council was thereupon appointed to meet on the 5th of October of the present year 869,² and on that day they met accordingly in the church of St. Sophia.

At the first session none were present but the pope's three legates, the patriarch Ignatius, the deputies of the patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem, twelve bishops, who had steadily adhered to Ignatius, and several patricians, at the head of whom was Bahanes, appointed by the emperor to assist at the council with the character of his commissioners. In this session was read the pope's letter to the emperor, wherein he thanked and highly commended him for driving out Photius, and restoring the lawful patriarch to his see, adding, that at his request he would show mercy to those who had sided with the usurper, but that as they ought to be treated differently, some being more and some less guilty, he wished a general council might be assembled, and his legates allowed to preside at it, in order to determine who were to be treated with more severity, and who with less. In the same letter he desired that the acts of Photius's council might be condemned to the flames, and the decrees of the councils held by himself and his predecessor against him, be signed by all the bishops who should compose the general council. In the next place was read the formulary mentioned above, importing, that no bishops, presbyters, clerks, or monks should be admitted to the council, till they had anathematized all heretics, especially the Iconoclasts, and with them Photius, till they had condemned his council, approved, signed, and received the councils held by Nicholas and Hadrian against him;

so that none but the avowed enemies of Photius were to sit in this council.

In the second session, held on the seventh of the same month of October, ten bishops, and several presbyters, deacons, and sub-deacons, who had countenanced Photius in his unjust usurpation, but had been ordained by Ignatius or his predecessor, had their ecclesiastical ornaments restored to them, and were allowed to sit in the council upon their acknowledging their fault, asking pardon for it, and signing the formulary. Upon these the following penance was imposed by the council, namely, that such of them as eat meat should abstain from it, and likewise from eggs and cheese; that they, who eat no meat, should abstain from eggs, from cheese, and even from fish, on Wednesdays and Fridays, and only feed upon legumes, that is, upon roots and greens. But they were allowed the use of oil, and a little wine; and all were to kneel down fifty times a day, to say an hundred times a day, "I have sinned, Lord have mercy upon me," to repeat daily the sixth, the thirty-seventh, and the fiftieth psalms, and forbear all ecclesiastical functions till Christmas, when they were to be restored to their respective ranks.

The bishops met again on the 11th of October, when Theodolus and Nicephorus, metropolitans of Ancyra and Nice, who had been lawfully ordained, but had sided with Photius, were summoned to sign the formulary sent from Rome, and take their place in the council. But with that summons they refused to comply, declaring that they would sign nothing besides the confession of faith, which they had signed at their ordination, and were ready to sign anew if required. This answer did not satisfy the legates; and the two metropolitans were by them, pursuant to their instructions, excluded from the council. In the same session were read and approved the letters of the emperor Basiliius and the patriarch Ignatius to pope Nicholas, and with them Hadrian's letter to that patriarch.

In the fourth session, on the 13th of October, two bishops, Theophilus and Zacharias, who still adhered to Photius, were, at their desire, introduced and heard by the council. They pretended, that pope Nicholas had acknowledged Photius, and communicated with him, as well as with those whom he had ordained. But the contrary appearing from that pope's letters to the emperor Michael, and to Photius himself, which were publicly read, the two bishops, upon their refusing to sign the formulary, or even to hear it, were driven out of the council.

The fifth session was held on the 20th of October, when Photius was summoned to appear before the council, and upon his refusing to obey the summons was brought thither by force, pursuant to an order from the emperor. But as he would answer no

¹ Anast. in Pref. ad viii. Synod.

² Guil. Biblioth. in Hadrian.

Sixth session of the council of Constantinople. Seventh session—Photius excommunicated. Eighth session. Ninth session. Last session.

questions, nor own himself guilty, the council dismissed him, after causing the letters of pope Nicholas, containing his condemnation, to be read to him, and allowing him time to return to himself and repent.

At the sixth session, on the 25th of October, the emperor assisted in person; and the bishops whom Photius had ordained being introduced to the council, the letter of the late pope to the emperor Michael, declaring their ordination to be null, was read to them, and approved by the council. But the bishops alledging several instances of episcopal ordinations rejected as null by the pope, and yet admitted by other bishops as valid and lawful, the emperor answered, that the ordination of Photius was rejected as null by the other patriarchal see, as well as by that of Rome, that he was by all looked upon as an usurper; and consequently that those, whom he had ordained, could be no bishops, as he was no bishop himself. This session was closed with a pathetic speech addressed by the emperor to the bishops, whom Photius had ordained, and read in his name by the secretary Constantine. In that speech the emperor expressed an earnest desire to see peace and unity restored to the church of Constantinople, exhorted those who still acknowledged Photius for lawful bishop, to acquiesce in the judgment of the council, and allowed them seven days to deliberate.

The council met again on the 29th of October, and the emperor being present, Photius, and Gregory of Syracuse, who had ordained him, were, by his order, brought in. As Photius appeared leaning on a staff, the deacon Marinus, one of the legates, ordered it to be taken from him, saying, "it is a mark of pastoral dignity, and he is not a pastor, but a wolf." He was then asked whether he would sign the formulary in order to his being received into the church and admitted to lay communion. But that proposal, as he was thereby to anathematize himself, he rejected with scorn, and so did the bishops, all to a man, whom he had ordained, though earnestly pressed to it by the emperor as well as the council. Hereupon the letters of Nicholas and Hadrian rejecting the ordination of Photius as repugnant to the canons, and likewise the acts of the council held lately against him under Hadrian at Rome being read, sentence of excommunication was pronounced against him, with many anathemas, and signed by all the bishops of the council. Nicetas adds, that the bishops in signing it, dipt their pens, not in ink, but in the blood of our Savior.¹ But of this no notice is taken in the acts of the council.

The eighth session was held on the 8th of November, when all the writings of Photius against pope Nicholas and the patriarch Ignatius, and with them the acts of his

council, were, by the emperor's order, burnt in the presence of the council. In the next place some Iconoclasts were heard, and sentence of excommunication was thundered out anew against all of that sect, and likewise against Photius and Gregory of Syracuse.

At the ninth session, held on the 12th of February, 870, several persons, and most of them men of the first rank and distinction, appearing before the council, owned, that at the instigation of the emperor Michael and Photius, they had borne false witness against the patriarch Ignatius, asked pardon of God and the holy council, and declared themselves ready to undergo what penance the holy synod should think fit to impose on them. The fathers, pleased with their voluntary confession, enjoined them the following penance, namely, that for the space of four years they should only be admitted to the service of the catechumens, and stand, during the first two years, at the church door, that for four years they should abstain from meat and from wine, Sundays and festivals excepted, and during the term of three years more abstain from meat and from wine, on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. However the patriarch Ignatius was empowered by the council to mitigate the rigor and shorten the time of that penance. All, who were guilty of the same crime, were excommunicated till they confessed it and received the same penance. When these were dismissed others were introduced, who owned that by the emperor Michael's order and for his diversion, they had, in the attire of the patriarch, said prayers, performed the ceremony of ordination, and exercised other sacred functions by way of derision; and upon them a three years' public penance was imposed, and sentence of excommunication pronounced against all, who should thenceforth countenance, or knowingly suffer the sacred mysteries of our holy religion to be thus exposed to ridicule and contempt. Lastly, they were heard in this session, who had personated, in the council of Photius, the deputies of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, and they publicly owned that they had done so at his instigation, and were utterly unknown to those patriarchs. At this session was present Joseph, archdeacon of the church of Alexandria, and deputy of that patriarch. He arrived a few days before, and having perused the transactions of the preceding sessions, he presented a writing to the council, declaring that he entirely approved all they had done.

In the tenth and last session, held on the last day of February, at which assisted the emperor in person, and his son Constantine, whom he had taken the year before for his partner in the empire, was read and by all approved; the definition of the council, containing the condemnation of Photius, of all

¹ Nicet. in vit. Ignat. tom. viii. Concil. p. 1231.

The writings which the bishops of the council had signed taken from the legates and restored. Conference concerning Bulgaria; which is adjudged to the see of Constantinople.

who adhered to him, and of all heresies and heretics, that had been condemned by the seven preceding councils; the ordination of Photius was declared null, and so was the ordination of those whom he had ordained. As for the bishops, who had been ordained by Ignatius or his predecessor in the patriarchal see of Constantinople, but still continued to support the usurper, they were anathematized and excluded forever, should they even repent, from their former ranks in the church. On this occasion the emperor made a long speech to the fathers of the council, exhorting them to instruct, with great care, their respective flocks, to maintain concord and unity amongst themselves and the ecclesiastics under their jurisdiction, and to conform, in all things, to the definition of the council, since they had all approved of it. His speech was received by the council with loud acclamations, and he invited by the pope's legates to sign the definition in the first place. But he declined it, and would only sign after the deputies of the five patriarchs. Thus the legates signed in the first place, Ignatius in the next, then the deputies of the other patriarchs, and after them the emperor and his two sons, Constantine and Leo, and the bishops, in all one hundred and one. At this session were admitted into the council Anastasius the bibliothecarian, count Suppo and Everard, sent by the emperor Lewis to propose a match between Lewis' daughter, and Constantine, the emperor Basil's eldest son, which however did not take place.¹ The council being ended, a circulatory letter was drawn up in the name of the bishops who composed it, to acquaint the whole world with the deposition of Photius, and restoration of Ignatius; and another was sent in their name to the pope, to return his holiness thanks for so steadily maintaining the cause of the persecuted patriarch, and restoring concord and unity to the distracted church of the imperial city. The emperor wrote to the pope, and so did the patriarch Ignatius much to the same purpose.

Before the council ended, several bishops of the patriarchate of Constantinople, apprehending that by signing the formulary sent by the pope, they had, in a manner, subjected the see of Constantinople to that of Rome, applied privately to the emperor and Ignatius to have the writings which they had signed taken from the legates before they left the imperial city. The emperor complied with their request, and by his order the writings were secretly conveyed away by those whom he had appointed to attend the legates. But Anastasius, and the two other envoys of the emperor Lewis interposing, they were in the end all restored to them; and they put them into the hands

of the envoys in order to their being conveyed to Italy with greater safety.¹

The council being ended a conference was held, at which were present the emperor, the pope's legates, the patriarch Ignatius, the deputies of the other patriarchs, and the envoys of the king of the Bulgarians, sent to inquire of the deputies of the patriarchs, what church they ought to be subject to, whether to the church of Constantinople, or to that of Rome. The pope's legates pretended, that they ought to be subject to that of Rome, since the king, their master, had subjected himself and his people to it, and received from pope Nicholas both priests and bishops. This the envoys owned to be true, but added, that they wanted to know, which of the two sees it was most reasonable they should be subject to. The legates answered, that they had no instructions relative to that affair, and therefore could determine nothing concerning it; but that, as their country was full of priests sent from Rome, they thought it ought to belong to the Roman church. Hereupon the legates of the other patriarchs asked the envoys, whom their country belonged to when they conquered it, and whether they found in it Greek or Latin priests. The country, answered the Bulgarians, belonged to the Greeks when we conquered it, and the priests we found in it were Greeks. This the deputies of the patriarchs looked upon as a plain proof of their being ordained by the patriarch of Constantinople, and the country being under the jurisdiction of that see. But the legates answering, that many natives of Greece received their ordination at Rome, and were sent from thence into different countries, the deputies of the patriarchs desired they would let them know upon what they grounded their claim. We ground it, replied here the legates, 1st. Upon the ancient jurisdiction, which the apostolic see enjoyed, as appears from the decretals of the popes, over old and new Epirus, Thessaly, and Dardania, the country that is now called Bulgaria; 2d. Upon the voluntary submission of the Bulgarians, who have applied to Rome for priests and bishops; and lastly, upon the conversion of that nation brought about chiefly by priests and bishops from Rome. And upon which of these titles, replied the deputies, do you rest your claim? But to that the legates returned no other answer than that the holy see had not chosen them, who were its inferiors, for its judges, and that they themselves were not empowered to determine anything concerning that point. However the deputies, paying no kind of regard to their remonstrances, pronounced the following sentence: It is not fit that you, who have withdrawn yourselves from the Greek empire, and entered into an

¹ Anast. in Pref. ad viii. Synod.

¹ Anast. in Not. ad Libellum.

Ignatius drives the Latins out of Bulgaria. The legates taken on their return by pirates. Charles the Bald acknowledged king of Lorraine. The pope declares that kingdom to belong to the emperor; but no regard is had to his declaration. Letters from the pope to Lewis of Germany, and to Charles, on this occasion.

alliance with the Franks, should have a right to ordain in the dominions of our prince; and we therefore declare, that the country of the Bulgarians, which was formerly subject to the Greeks, and had Greek bishops and priests, ought, upon its return to Christianity, to be restored to the church of Constantinople, from which it was separated by paganism. The legates loudly protested against that sentence, declaring it null, as given by judges whom the holy see had neither chosen nor acknowledged. At the same time they conjured the patriarch Ignatius, presenting him a letter from the pope, not to concern himself with Bulgaria, lest the Roman church should by his means be deprived of her rights after laboring long to reinstate him in his. The patriarch, being with much ado prevailed upon by the legates to read the pope's letter, declared in general terms, that as he was not young enough to be imposed upon, nor old enough to dote and do what he censured in others, he would not interfere in the present dispute. However he soon began to exert, agreeably to the judgment given by the deputies of the patriarchs, his patriarchal authority in the country of the Bulgarians, drove out the Latin missionaries, sent Greeks in their room, and ordained Theophylactus bishop of Bulgaria.

The emperor was highly provoked at the haughty behavior and obstinacy of the legates on this occasion. However, dissembling his resentment, he entertained them, before their departure, at his table, and made them rich presents, but was so careless of their safety, that they were taken by the Slavonian pirates, who stript them of all they had, and among other things of the original acts of the council, and carried them into captivity. But having in the end recovered their liberty at the pressing instances of the pope and the emperor, they arrived at Rome on the twenty-second of December of the present year, and gave the pope a minute account of what had passed in the council as well as in the conference with the deputies of the oriental patriarchs. As for the acts of the council, Anastasius the bibliothecarian had procured a copy of them, which he brought with him to Rome and presented to the pope, who ordered him to translate them into Latin, which he did accordingly.¹ It is to be observed, that this council is received and acknowledged by the Latin church, that is, by all the western bishops, for the eighth general council, but is rejected by all the eastern bishops, except the few who communicate with Rome. The rest receive only seven general councils.

While Hadrian's legates were exercising, with the connivance of the emperor, an un-

controlled authority over the bishops in the East, he was himself striving to exert the like authority over kings and princes in the West. The king of Lorraine dying at Placentia, without lawful issue, as has been related above, Charles of France no sooner heard of his death, than leaving Presles on the Seine, where he then was, he hastened into Lorraine, where he had many friends, to take possession of that kingdom. At Verdun he was received by several of the chief lords of Lorraine, and from thence attended by them to Metz, where he was, in a general assembly, consisting of the greater part of the first men of the kingdom, and of seven bishops, acknowledged for lawful heir to his deceased nephew, was anointed king of Lorraine by Hincmar of Reims, and crowned with great solemnity.¹ On the other hand, the pope, espousing with great warmth the cause of the emperor Lewis, who was then employed in driving the Saracens out of Italy, despatched, upon the first news of the death of Lotharius, two bishops, Paul and Leo, into France with letters to Charles, to the bishops of Lorraine, to those of France, to the lords of both kingdoms, and one to Hincmar of Reims in particular. In those letters Hadrian declared the kingdom of Lorraine to belong to the emperor as the deceased king's brother; exhorted those to whom they were directed, to maintain his just rights, and threatened all with excommunication who should countenance or assist any pretender or pretenders to that crown. In his letter to Hincmar he exhorted that prelate to support, with all his authority, the just claim of the emperor, and empowered him to act in this affair as his vicar. With the pope's legates an envoy, named Boderad, was sent by the emperor to claim, in his name, the dominions of the late king his brother, as devolved to him by his death. These letters were all dated the fifth of September 869, and Charles was, on the ninth of that month, acknowledged by the far greater part of the clergy and nobility of Lorraine for their lawful sovereign, and crowned, as has been said, with great solemnity; so that the pope's legates and the emperor's envoy found him in the quiet possession of that kingdom.² To these letters, therefore, no answer was returned either by the clergy or the nobility, and the king only told the legates that when matters were settled he would write to the pope, and did not doubt but he should satisfy his holiness.

The pope, being informed upon the return of his legates, that Charles had taken possession of the kingdom of Lotharius before their arrival in France, immediately despatched new legates with letters to the two kings Lewis and Charles, to the lords

¹ Anast. in Præfat. ad viii. Synod. et Guil. Bibliothec. in Hadrian.

¹ Annal. Bertin.

² Aimoin. l. v. c. 24. Annal. Bertin. ad ann. 869.

Hincmar's answer to a letter he received from the pope.

and bishops of their respective kingdoms, and a second to Hincmar in particular, all dated the twenty-seventh of June 870. In his letter to the king of Germany, he commends him for not offering to invade the kingdom of his deceased nephew, as Charles had done in defiance of all the laws of justice and equity; threatens to excommunicate that prince, if he does not restore what he has so unjustly seized, and recommends his legates, who, he tells the king, had something to communicate to him by word of mouth which he did not choose to commit to writing. They were in all likelihood charged to propose an alliance between the king and the emperor against Charles, in order to drive him from the kingdom of Lorraine. But Charles, dreading a war with the king of Germany more than all the pope's anathemas, had already yielded to him, and he actually possessed, a considerable part of that kingdom. In his letter to Charles he complains of the little regard he had shown for his former legates, and his not answering the letter he had written to him; reproaches him with a breach of the solemn promise he had made and confirmed upon oath, not to covet or usurp the dominions of his brothers, or their descendants, and puts him in mind of what he himself wrote formerly to the holy see, when his brother Lewis, king of Germany, drove him from his kingdom, namely, "Have pity upon me, and suffer not a breach of the most solemn treaties to pass unpunished." From these words the pope concludes, that as Charles was guilty of a like breach of the most solemn treaties in seizing on the kingdom of Lorraine, the apostolic see had, even according to him, a right to punish him for it, and certainly would, if he did not restore it to the lawful heir. He closes his letter with admonishing, exhorting, and even commanding the king to relinquish what he had unjustly and tyrannically usurped, and threatening to come in person into France, and do what his ministry required he should, if the king did not comply with this third admonition.¹ In his letter to the bishops and to Hincmar he complains of their want of respect for the apostolic see in not answering the letters, which he had sent them by his former legates; charges Charles with a breach of his oath, with perjury, and tyranny; and reproaches them with scandalously betraying their ministry in not dissuading and restraining him, as they ought, from invading the dominions of the emperor, while he was actually engaged in a war with the avowed enemies of the Christian name. In the close of his letter he requires Hincmar, and the other bishops, to separate themselves from the communion of Charles, if he did not hearken to their admonitions, else he would separate them from his communion. Hadrian's let-

ter to the lords of Charles's kingdom was the same, word for word, with that to the bishops.¹

As the pope had written two letters to Hincmar in particular, Charles allowed that prelate to answer them; and he answered them accordingly by a very long one, worthy of particular notice, as it shows what were the sentiments of the Gallican bishops in those days with respect to the power claimed by popes over kings and kingdoms. For in that letter, he tells the pope in the first place, that he had acquainted the king, as well as the lords and bishops of both kingdoms, namely, of France and Lorraine with the orders which he had received from the apostolic see, and had let them know that his holiness had declared the kingdom of Lorraine to belong to the emperor, and would, without distinction of persons, excommunicate any, who should presume to invade or usurp it; but that the kings of France and Germany had answered, that they were lawful heirs to the deceased prince, and had, as such, an undoubted right to divide his kingdom between them in order to avoid a civil war, which would have ended in the utter ruin of both kingdoms. That Charles in particular had a well grounded claim to the kingdom of Lorraine, as having been bequeathed to him by his father Lewis the Debonnaire, and confirmed to him by the emperor Lotharius, father to the present emperor, who signed that donation. And was I, adds Hincmar, to set up for a judge? Was I to declare, that he had no kind of right to that kingdom, and treat him as an usurper and a tyrant? You tell me, that if the king does not comply with your admonitions, I must renounce his communion, or you will renounce mine. What you write I have communicated to many ecclesiastics as well as to laymen, and they all tell me, that no such order was ever sent to any of my predecessors though in their times brothers made war upon brothers, nay, and children upon their fathers; that the conduct of your holiness in this affair is quite unprecedented; that though Lotharius lived in public adultery, your predecessor did not command any bishop to separate himself from his communion, on pain of being himself separated from that of the holy see; that neither the popes your predecessors, nor other holy bishops have avoided the company even of heretical or schismatic princes; but on the contrary have treated them with all the respect that was due to their rank, and conversed with them when occasion required; with such as Constantius the Arian, Julian the apostate, and the tyrant Maximus; that Charles was no usurper, no tyrant, names which your holiness is pleased to bestow upon him; but lawful heir to the crown of the deceased king, which had been

¹ Hadrian, ep. 23.

¹ Hadrian, ep. 24, 25, 26, 27.

Insolent behavior of the pope's legates in France. The pope takes Carloman rebelling against his father into his protection.

therefore offered him by most of the lords and bishops of the kingdom. They say in France, continues Hincmar, that the popes have of late been greatly wanting in the respect that is due to their princes; that their conduct towards them is very different from what it was in the times of Pepin and Charlemagne; that Pepin, espousing the cause of pope Stephen against Astulphus, king of the Lombards, overcame that prince, not by the pope's excommunication, but by dint of arms: that the kingdoms of this world are to be gained not by excommunications, but by victories; and that the Lord himself has declared that kings hold their kingdoms of him; when we put them in mind of the power vested in the popes, as the successors of St. Peter, and in the other bishops, they answer, exert that power then against the Normans and other enemies of the state without imploring our assistance. But if you want our help you must not put it out of our power to help you. You must tell the pope, that he cannot be both king and bishop; that his predecessors contented themselves with governing the church, without meddling with affairs of state; and that he must not think of obliging us to receive a king, who is at too great a distance to defend us against the sudden and frequent irruptions of the pagans; that his predecessors imposed no such yoke on ours; that we cannot and will not bear it, being authorized by holy writ to defend our liberties and our inheritance even at the expense of our lives. If a bishop excommunicates a Christian unlawfully, he thereby forfeits his power; and he can exclude none from life everlasting, who is not excluded from it by his sins. It does not become a bishop to deprive a man of the name of Christian, and give him up to the devil, if he is not incorrigible, for a temporal kingdom. If his holiness therefore means to procure peace, let him not concern himself with state affairs; for he never will persuade us, that we shall not attain the kingdom of heaven, unless we acknowledge the king whom he shall be pleased to give us upon earth. All are greatly shocked, continues Hincmar, at the terms of perjury and tyranny, that are to be met with in your letters, and say what it would serve no purpose to let you know. But I must inform your holiness, that the king is determined to maintain, at all events, his claim to the kingdom of Lorraine, and that no censures nor excommunications will divert him from it.¹

In the mean time new legates arrived from Rome, namely, three bishops, John, Peter, and Wibod, and a presbyter of the Roman church named John, with envoys from the emperor. The legates went straight to St. Denys, where the king then was, and en-

tering the church of the abbey while he was attending divine service there on the festival of that saint, they ordered him, in the name of the sovereign pontiff, to relinquish the kingdom of Lorraine, to which, they said, the emperor alone had an undoubted right. The king, highly provoked at their insolent behavior, ordered them immediately to withdraw, which damped their courage not a little; and laying aside the air of authority which they had assumed, they became thenceforth more tractable. The king had several conferences with them, treated them with great civility, and soon after their departure sent the abbot Arsesgilus, and a layman named Lotharius to Rome, with two crowns of gold enriched with precious stones for St. Peter.¹ What reception his ambassadors met with from the pope history does not inform us. But certain it is that Hadrian, finding that Charles was not to be intimidated with his menaces, gave up the point, and left the kings of France and Germany to possess undisturbed their respective shares of the kingdom of Lorraine. Charles kept his share; but the king of Germany was soon after prevailed upon by the empress Ingelberga to yield his to the emperor.

Charles was not more incensed against the pope for his adjudging the kingdom of Lorraine to the emperor, than he was on account of his taking his rebel son Carloman, and Hincmar the younger, bishop of Laon, into the protection of the holy see. Carloman had rebelled against his father; but being taken prisoner by the king's troops, he was kept closely confined at Senlis. The pope's legates, on their arrival in France, interposed in his favor; and he was at their pressing instances released from his confinement, and even recalled to court. But leaving his father, soon after the departure of the legates, he fled into Belgium, and being there joined by great numbers of outlaws and vagabonds, he laid waste the whole country between the Meuse and the Seine. The bishops, whose dioceses he thus plundered, thundered out excommunications against his followers and accomplices; and Hincmar of Reims, among the rest, declared all who should continue with him after the 11th of March, cut off from the communion of the church. No sentence was pronounced by Hincmar, or any of the other bishops, against Carloman himself, the king having reserved him to be tried by the bishops of the province of Sens, as he was a clerk, (for his father had obliged him to take deacon's orders) and belonged to that church. The threats of the bishops made no impression upon Carloman or his followers; and they continued their ravages till they were obliged by the king's forces to quit the country, and retire beyond mount Jura. Carloman being

¹ Hincmar Opuscul. 41. tom. ii. p. 689. et apud Baron. ad ann. 870.

¹ Aim. i. vi. c. 24.

The pope's letter to the king in Carloman's behalf, and to the lords and bishops. No regard paid to them. Hincmar of Laon incurs the displeasure of the king. His unwarrantable proceedings.

thus driven out of France, and not doubting but he should be excommunicated by the bishops of his province, resolved to recur to the pope; and he sent accordingly deputies to implore the protection of the apostolic see against the undeserved resentment of his father, by whom he was, he said, as cruelly as unjustly persecuted. Hadrian had not yet forgot the little regard that Charles had paid to his remonstrances, exhortations, and even commands, concerning the succession to the kingdom of Lorraine; and therefore, laying hold of this opportunity to vent his passion, he wrote a most abusive letter to the king, telling him, that not satisfied with usurping a kingdom, to which he had no kind of right, he surpassed in cruelty the brutes themselves, that spared their young; whereas he treated his own son with a more than brutal barbarity, not only depriving him of his favor and protection, but driving him out of his kingdom, and moreover impiously insisting upon his being excommunicated by the bishops. This the pope called a crying piece of cruelty and injustice; and therefore ordered the king, in the name of St. Peter, to receive Carloman again into favor, to reinstate him in the benefices and honors he enjoyed before, and cherish him as his son till the arrival of the legates, whom he should appoint to take cognizance of the affair, and settle it agreeably to the laws of justice. At the same time he wrote to the lords of both kingdoms, forbidding them to bear arms against Carloman on pain of excommunication and eternal damnation; and likewise to the bishops, declaring all their excommunications null till the affair was inquired into by his legates on the spot.¹ But to these letters not the least regard was paid by the king, the lords, or the bishops. For Carloman being taken some time after, he was first degraded by the bishops of the province of Sens, and then sentenced to death by the judges appointed by the king to try him. This sentence, however, was not put in execution, the king contenting himself with causing him to be deprived of his sight, in order to prevent him, by that means, from raising new disturbances in the kingdom.²

The interposition of the pope in favor of Hincmar the younger was attended with no better success than his menaces in favor of Carloman. Hincmar the younger was nephew to Hincmar of Reims, by that prelate's sister, and had been preferred in 859 by the interest his uncle had at court to the see of Laon, subject to that of Reims. He was at first greatly favored by the king, who bestowed upon him a rich abbey, and even honored him with an employment in his court; but in the year 868 he forfeited the king's favor on the following occasion: One Luido had enjoyed a benefice in the diocese

of Laon, which after his death was granted to his son upon his paying a sum of money to that church. This benefice the bishop took from him under some pretence or other, and appropriated it to himself, though the king, to whom the son of Luido applied for redress, had desired him to restore it. Hereupon the king ordered the cause to be tried in a court consisting wholly of laymen, summoned the bishop to appear before them, and upon his refusing to appear, as if laymen were not competent judges in affairs where the church was concerned, confiscated the revenues of his bishopric, deprived him of his abbey, and dismissed him from the employment he held at court. However, at the interposition of Hincmar, of Reims, matters were adjusted for the present, the king was appeased, and the bishop of Laon allowed to enjoy the revenues of his church till such time as the affair was determined by proper judges. For the archbishop too had remonstrated, in a long letter to the king, against the summoning of an ecclesiastic before lay judges only, alledging several canons to show that the bishop was not obliged to comply with the summons, but on the contrary, that he would have betrayed the rights of the church had he obeyed it.¹

But the bishop of Laon was a man of a most restless temper, and he soon after quarrelled anew with the king. For notwithstanding he was reinstated in the possession of his revenues till the affair was finally determined by unexceptionable judges, he wrote to the pope, without the knowledge either of his uncle or of any other of the bishops, complaining of the king, and representing him as an usurper of the lands and estates of the church. This step was highly resented by the king, as well as by Hincmar of Reims, and all the other bishops, apprehending that it might occasion a breach between Charles and the pope, which would involve them, and perhaps the whole kingdom in endless troubles. But they were not more provoked at his recurring to the pope than at his arbitrarily depriving, at this very time, a count named Nortman, of a benefice he enjoyed in his diocese. That benefice the king had granted to Nortman at the bishop's own request, who had recommended him to his favor as a person of great merit, and his particular friend. But soon after wanting to recover it, he ordered Nortman to give it up, and upon his not complying, but urging that it was granted him by the king, and that he held it of the crown, he wrote to the pope, complaining of Nortman, as if he had unjustly seized and refused to restore the possessions of his church. Upon the receipt of that letter Hadrian wrote one to Hincmar of Reims, ordering him to

¹ Hadrian, ep. 28, 29. ² Annal. Bertin. ad ann. 873.

¹ Hincmar, ep. 29.

The bishop of Laon is tried in France, notwithstanding his appeal to the pope. He is deposed in a council of the Gallican bishops;—[Year of Christ, 871.]

excommunicate Nortman, if he did not immediately restore to the bishop of Laon the lands he had usurped of his church. Hincmar knew that the pope was misinformed as to the fact, and therefore very wisely took no notice of the order that was sent him. But in the mean time the bishop of Laon, breaking into Nortman's house with a troop of armed men, seized or destroyed whatever he found in it, drove him out, and, with the utmost barbarity, his wife too, though brought to bed but a few days before, and took possession both of the house and the tenements.¹ At the same time quarreling with his own clergy he suspended them all, forbidding them, on pain of excommunication, to perform any ecclesiastical function whatever, to administer baptism to children though in danger of death, or the eucharist to dying persons, and even to bury the dead. Hincmar of Reims no sooner heard of this interdict than he wrote to his nephew, ordering him, as his metropolitan, to revoke it immediately. But with that order he refused to comply; which obliged Hincmar to declare the interdict null, and command the clergy of the diocese of Laon to resume their functions without any regard to the unjust and uncanonical sentence of their bishop.²

The king, highly provoked at the violent proceedings of the bishop, appointed a council, consisting of all the bishops of his kingdom, to meet at Verberie, and summoned the bishop of Laon to it in particular. The bishops, in all twenty-nine, met, pursuant to the king's order, at the place appointed, on the 24th of April, 869, and Hincmar of Laon among the rest, who finding the bishops all to a man, and even his uncle, who presided at the council, ready to condemn him, appealed to the pope, and begged leave of the king, who was present, to pursue his appeal at Rome. Charles, far from granting him his request, ordered him to be confined, but released him from his confinement soon after.³ The following year, 870, another council was held at Attigni, consisting of the bishops of ten provinces; and in that assembly the bishop of Laon was accused by the king in person of breach of his allegiance, by his uncle of disobedience to him as his metropolitan, by Nortman of the violence he had offered him and the inhuman treatment of his wife, by the clergy of his diocese of suspending them contrary to the canons, and by several bishops of excommunicating persons of their dioceses, over whom he had no kind of jurisdiction. The bishop appealed again to the pope; but no regard was had by the king, the archbishop, or the other bishops to that appeal, nor would they grant him leave to go to Rome. However the king did not insist, nor did the

archbishop, upon his being tried according to the rigor of the law and the canons. The king was satisfied with his renewing his oath of allegiance; and the archbishop with his promising to obey him, for the future, as his metropolitan. The other complaints, that especially of Nortman and his wife, were referred to the arbitration of three bishops, namely, Actard of Nantes, Raginelm of Noyon, and John of Cambrai; and all three, after examining the affair of Nortman in the presence of the king, gave sentence in his favor.

But in the mean time the bishop of Laon, distrusting his cause, withdrew by night from Attigni, though he had promised to remain there till the complaints against him were all examined, and to stand to the decision of the three bishops. The king sent him an order to return; but with that order he refused to comply, pretending, in a letter he wrote to answer it, to be ill of a fever, but at the same time begging leave to go to Rome. The king answered the messenger, who brought the letter, that to him it seemed somewhat strange the bishop should not be able, for his illness, to come to him, and yet should be able to go to Rome. He added, that he would readily grant him his request, provided he came and satisfied him that it was just and reasonable. But he could by no means be prevailed upon either to return to Attigni, or to acquiesce in the decision of the three arbitrators; nay, he declared in a letter to the archbishop, that if the king took upon himself to dispose of the goods of his church, he would not obey him, but excommunicate all, without distinction of persons, who should presume to seize or usurp them, being authorized therein by the canons. This letter the archbishop communicated to the king, who, more exasperated than ever against the bishop of Laon, for threatening him with excommunication, appointed a council to meet at Douzi in the month of August, 871, and ordered him to be summoned to it to answer the several accusations brought against him. The bishop appeared upon the third summons, when the king charged him with perjury, sedition, and rebellion; with calumniating him to the pope; with seizing by force lands that did not belong to him; with the barbarous treatment of Nortman and his wife; with disobedience to his metropolitan; with disposing of the goods of his church, especially of a golden chalice and its patten, or cover, enriched with precious stones, which the king had offered to St. Mary of Laon; with excommunicating or suspending the clergy of his diocese contrary to the canons, &c. To these complaints the bishop returned no answer, but, appealing anew to the pope, insisted upon his being judges by the apostolic see. But Hincmar of Reims making it appear from the very canons of Sardica, which

¹ Acta Synod. Duziac. par. iii. c. 15. Hadrian, ep. 11. Hinc. Rem. ep. 35.

² Hinc. Opuscul. c. 2. ³ Annal. Bertin. ad ann. 869.

Letter of the Gallican bishops to the pope. The pope orders the bishop of Laon to be sent to Rome. The king's letter in answer to the pope's. The letter of the bishops of the council to the pope.

the other quoted to support and justify his appeal, that he was not to appeal to the holy see before, but only after judgment was given by the bishops of the province, the council voted, all to a man, his deposition, "saving in all things the judgment of the apostolic see." The sentence was pronounced by Hincmar, who presided at the council, and signed by seven metropolitans, thirteen bishops, one chorepiscopus, six presbyters, and two archdeacons.¹

The bishops sent, upon the breaking up of the council, Actard, bishop of Nantes, to Rome with the acts and a synodal letter to the pope, wherein they desired his holiness to confirm them, or, if he did not approve of their proceedings, to cause the bishop, whom they had deposed, to be judged anew by the same bishops, or by those of the neighboring provinces, and to send, if he chose it, a legate to assist at the judgment in his name, as was prescribed by the canons of Sardica. They added, that if his holiness should reverse their sentence, or in the mean time reinstate the bishop in his dignity, they would avoid his communion, and give themselves no further trouble about him. In the close of their letter they begged the pope to confirm the election of Actard, whom the Britons had driven from the see of Nantes, and the people and clergy of Tours had unanimously chosen for their bishop. This letter is dated the 6th of September, 871. At the same time Hincmar wrote a private letter to the pope, to excuse his not executing the order he had sent him to excommunicate Nortman, since his holiness was grossly imposed upon with respect to that affair. This he shows in his letter, and wishes that, if his holiness should have occasion to send him any such orders for the future, he would add this clause to them, "provided the case be as it has been represented to us."² The pope, in his answer to the bishops of the council, readily agreed to the promotion of Actard to the metropolitan see of Tours. But he highly disapproved of their judging and condemning the bishop of Laon after he had appealed to the apostolic see. "However, since you have condemned him," he added, "saving the judgment of the holy see, we order you to send him to Rome with one, at least, of his accusers, and forbid you to appoint another bishop in his room till his cause has been re-examined, and judged anew in our presence."³ At the same time he wrote to the king, complaining of his taking in ill part his paternal admonitions, and exhorting him to receive his corrections with the submission that became an obedient son of the holy see. He confirms the election of Actard, but requires, and even commands, the king to send the bishop of Laon

to Rome, declaring that he never would, upon any other terms, consent to his deposition.¹ These letters are both dated the 29th of December, 871.

Charles was highly provoked at the pope's commanding him to send a bishop of his kingdom to be judged at Rome, when he had by a council of bishops been found guilty of many crimes, and among the rest, of open disobedience to the commands of his sovereign; and he returned the following answer to Hadrian's letter, penned, as is supposed, and indeed is manifest from the style, by Hincmar of Reims, "In your letter concerning Hincmar of Laon," says the king, "you write to us thus, 'we will and command, by our apostolic authority, Hincmar of Laon to be sent to us.' Did any of your predecessors ever write in the like style to any of ours? Do you not thereby banish Christian simplicity and humility from the church, and introduce wordly pride and ambition in their room? And where did he, who dictated the letter that bishop Actard has brought to us, find it written, that a king, who is by the laws, both civil and ecclesiastic, the avenger of crimes, can be commanded, by apostolic authority, to send a criminal to Rome, who has been legally convicted and condemned? I wrote to you formerly, and now write to you again, lest you should forget it, that we kings of the Franks come of royal race, are not the vicerents of bishops, but lords and masters of the world." Here the king quotes several passages from Scripture, and likewise from the letters and decrees of the popes themselves, commanding obedience and submission to kings and princes, and then continues thus. "And where is the law to be found, that subjects kings to apostolic authority, that requires them to send delinquents tried and condemned to Rome, in order to their being there tried and judged anew? This law hell itself has vomited forth from its dark subterraneous pits, to lead us astray from the path pointed out to us in holy writ. We therefore entreat you never more to write such letters to us, or to the bishops and lords of our kingdom, that we may not be obliged to treat with contempt both the letters and the bearers. We are willing to embrace what is approved by the holy see, when what the holy see approves is agreeable to Scripture, to tradition, and to the laws of the church. If it interferes with them, know that we are not to be frightened into it with menaces of excommunications and anathemas."² The bishops of the council answered the pope's letter to them much in the same style, telling him, that they had met with many things in his letter, which they should not have believed to have been written by him, had not their brother Actard

¹ Annal. Bertin. ad ann. 870. Hincmar Opuscul. Flodoard, l. iii. c. 22. Aim. l. v. c. 24.

² Hincmar Opusc. 41. p. 659. ³ Hadrian. ep. 32.

¹ Hadrian, ep. 33.

² Apud Baron. ad ann. 871.

The pope writes again to the king but in a very different style. Letters from the emperor Basilius and the patriarch Ignatius to the pope. The pope's answer to their letters. Ignatius disregarding the menaces of the pope, keeps Bulgaria. Death of Hadrian;—[Year of Christ, 872.]

informed them, that the multiplicity of his occupations had not allowed his holiness the necessary leisure to read the acts of the council throughout, or to mind what they had writ to him. As to the affair of Hincmar of Laon, they maintained, that, according to the canons of Sardica, which they said they had caused to be read to them, it ought to be judged upon the spot, if his holiness chose to have it judged anew, and not at Rome.¹ The pope found by these letters, that neither the king nor the bishops were to be intimidated with his menaces, and therefore thinking it advisable to change his style, he wrote another to Charles, wherein, after apologizing for his former letters as written by his secretary while he was indisposed, and bestowing the highest commendations upon the king, he promised to employ all his interest in his behalf, if they should both outlive the emperor, who had no male issue, and never to acknowledge any other emperor than him, should heaps of gold be offered him. With regard to the condemnation of Hincmar, the pope mentioned it with great moderation, desiring, and not commanding him to be sent to Rome, and assuring the king, that he should refer the final decision of his cause back to the bishops of his province. But the king did not, nor did the bishops, think it advisable to comply with his holiness' desire. On the other hand the pope would not consent to the election of another bishop: and thus the see of Laon remained vacant till the year 876, when the affair was finally determined, as we shall see in the sequel. The pope, apprehending that the promise he had made would give umbrage to Lewis of Germany, begged the king to keep this letter secret, or at least to communicate the contents to none but his most faithful servants.²

In the latter end of the present year 871, the abbot Theognostus arrived at Rome with letters from the emperor Basilius and the patriarch Ignatius to the pope, entreating him to allow Paul, keeper of the charters of the church of Constantinople, whom Photius had preferred to the episcopal dignity, to keep his rank, and restore Theodore metropolitan of Curia to his, as he had been ordained by Ignatius, and had suffered much in his cause before he could be brought to side with the usurper of his see. In answer to these letters the pope told the emperor and the patriarch, that it was not customary for the Roman pontiffs to act contrary to the decrees and ordinances of their predecessors, or to those of general councils, and he could not therefore grant them their request. In

his letter to the emperor he reproached him with having entirely neglected the safety of the apostolic legates, who, returning by sea without a convoy, had been taken by the pirates, had been stript of everything they had, and used with the utmost barbarity, which, he says, had never happened before to any legates of the holy see. In the same letter he complained of Basilius for suffering the patriarch Ignatius to ordain a bishop for Bulgaria, threatening the patriarch himself, as well as the bishop whom he had ordained, with the censures of the apostolic see, if they should dare to concern themselves with that country.¹ Hadrian's answer to Ignatius has not reached our times; but in the fragment of another letter in the Greek copy of the eighth council, he censures the conduct of the patriarch in very sharp terms, charges him with acting, in many instances, contrary to the canons, especially in promoting laymen, at once, to deacon's orders in defiance of the decrees of the late council, and bids him remember, that this was the first step to the downfall of Photius. However, as the deputies of the eastern patriarch had declared, that Bulgaria ought to be subject to the see of Constantinople,² Ignatius sent, notwithstanding the pope's menaces, the bishop whom he had ordained, and many Greek priests and monks with him, to preach the gospel to the Bulgarians. Upon their arrival the Latin missionaries all withdrew, and leaving Bulgaria to the Greeks returned to Rome with bishop Grimoald, who had acquired immense riches by his apostolic labors, during his stay in that country.³

Hadrian was greatly dissatisfied with the conduct of Grimoald, but death prevented him from enquiring into it. He died, according to the most probable opinion, on the twenty-sixth day of November 872, after he had held the see four years, eleven months, and twelve days, and was buried in the Vatican. He is chiefly commended by the writer of his life for his hospitality, beneficence, and generosity to the poor, which, if we believe that author, was miraculously approved by heaven multiplying, in his hands, the money that he used to distribute among them.⁴ He equalled in ambition, perhaps in parts too, his predecessor Nicholas the Great, exercising, through the meanness of the patriarch Ignatius and by the connivance of the emperor, a kind of jurisdiction over the rival see of Constantinople; but he failed, as we have seen, in the attempt of disposing of kingdoms, and subjecting the royal to the apostolic authority.

¹ Tom. viii. Concil. Gall. p. 1529.

² Hadrian, ep. 29.

³ Apud Baron. ad ann. 871.

⁴ See p. 276.

⁵ Porphyrt. in Basil. et Anast. in Hadrian.

⁶ Guil. Bibliothec. in Hadrian.

Election of John VIII. The emperor besieged in a tower, by the duke of Benevento;—[Year of Christ, 873.] The emperor capitulates, but is absolved by the pope from the oath he took on that occasion. Council of Ravenna;—[Year of Christ, 874.]

JOHN VIII., THE HUNDRED AND SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIUS, *Emperor of the East.*—LEWIS II., CHARLES THE BALD, *Emperors of the West.*]

[Year of Christ 872.] In the room of Hadrian was chosen, John, the eighth of that name, by birth a Roman, the son of one Gundo, and at that time archdeacon of the Roman church. As the emperor was then in Campania, and approved of the election, his deputies, who were, according to custom, to assist at the consecration of the new pope, arrived in a very short time at Rome; and in their presence John was consecrated on the 14th of December, which in 872 fell on a Sunday, after a vacancy of eighteen days.¹

The emperor came to Rome soon after the consecration of the pope, and held there an assembly of the states of Italy subject to the empire. In that assembly Lewis applied to the pope, who assisted at it in person, in order to be absolved by him from an oath he had taken on the following occasion. Adalgisus, duke of Benevento, provoked at the ravages committed by the imperial troops in his territories, and much more at the haughty behavior of the French lords, who attended the court, resolved to be revenged on the emperor; and he accordingly surrounded and attacked in the night-time the palace, where the emperor lodged with the empress, with his daughter and a small number of attendants, during his stay at Benevento. The emperor, awaked at the noise, flew to the gate, but not having sufficient force with him to defend it, he retired with his family and his few attendants to one of the towers of the place, where he defended himself with great bravery three whole days. Adalgisus, finding that he was determined to hold out to the last extremity, and at the same time apprehending that the French troops, quartered in the neighboring cities, might hear of his danger and hasten to his rescue, resolved to set fire to the place, and the materials were all got ready for that purpose. But in the mean while the emperor, alarmed at the danger to which he saw himself and his family inevitably exposed, thought it advisable to capitulate; and the following capitulation was by him agreed and solemnly sworn to, upon reliques brought from the cathedral to the palace.

1. That the emperor should thenceforth never set foot in the dukedom of Benevento. 2. That he should, upon no color or pretence whatever, send, for the future, any troops into that dukedom. 3. That he should take no vengeance on the duke or the Beneventans for what had passed on the present occasion, but bury the whole in eternal ob-

livion.¹ From this oath the emperor desired to be absolved, that he might, with a safe conscience, revenge the affront offered by the duke to the imperial dignity. The pope declared at once, that an oath, extorted by force, was not binding; that the present oath was, besides, contrary to the welfare of the empire, and he therefore absolved the emperor from it in the name of God, and, as if that were not enough, in the name of St. Peter. At the same time the Roman senate declared the duke of Benevento a public enemy, and war was proclaimed against him. However the emperor, more tender-conscienced than the pope, and not acquiescing in his holiness's absolution, would not head his army in person, but gave the command of it to the empress Ingelberga, flattering himself (an evasion only worthy of a jesuit) that he thus religiously observed the oath he had taken. The empress led the army against the city of Benevento, but not being able to reduce it, and powerful succors arriving in the mean time from the emperor Basilius, with whom duke Adalgisus had entered into an offensive and defensive alliance, Lewis was glad to conclude a peace with the Beneventans; and a peace was accordingly concluded by the interposition of the pope.²

The following year the pope, leaving Rome, repaired to Ravenna, to assist at a council, which he had appointed to meet in that city, in order to make up a difference between Ursus, duke of Venice, and the patriarch of Grado. Senator, bishop of Torcellum, dying, the clergy and people chose Dominic, abbot of the monastery of Alena, for his successor. But the patriarch refusing to ordain him, because he had made himself an eunuch, the duke, espousing the cause of the elect, intimidated the patriarch with his menaces to such a degree, that not thinking himself safe at Grado, he privately withdrew to Rome, and referred the decision of the affair to his holiness. Hereupon the pope summoned all the bishops of that province, to meet at Ravenna, went thither himself with the patriarch of Grado, and Hendelmar, patriarch of Aquileia, and it was determined by the council, consisting of seventy-four bishops, that Dominic should be ordained by the patriarch.³

¹ Annal. Bertin. et Metens. Regino. Leo Ostiens. Herembertus, &c.

² Idem Ibid. et Regino ad ann. 873.

³ Rubens, Hist. Ravenn. l. v.

This determination was contrary to the received canons of the church, forbidding any one to be ordained, who had made himself an eunuch or had dismem-

Death of the emperor Lewis;—[Year of Christ, 875.] Charles the Bald crowned emperor at Rome. Charles did not, on this occasion, yield to the pope the dukedom of Benevento, &c. He is crowned king of Italy at Pavia;—[Year of Christ, 876.] Council of Pontion. The archbishop of Sens appointed by the pope primate of all France.

The following year died at Milan, on the 13th, or, as others will have it, on the 14th of August, the emperor Lewis, the second of that name; and upon his death, as he left no issue male behind him, his two uncles, Lewis of Germany and Charles of France, laid claim to the empire and kingdom of Italy. But Charles, entering Italy at the head of a powerful army as soon as he heard of the emperor's death, and proceeding straight to Rome, whither he was invited by the pope, who had declared in his favor, he entered that city amidst the loud acclamations of the people, and was crowned emperor by the pope with great solemnity in the church of St. Peter on Christmas-day, the day on which Charlemagne had received the imperial crown in the same church.¹ The coronation was a mere ceremony, and had been hitherto looked upon in no other light. But the present pope, in a speech he made to the Italian lords and bishops at Pavia, speaks of it as if it gave an undoubted right to the imperial crown, and as if he had, by crowning Charles, made him emperor. For in that speech, after extolling and commending Charles as much as his predecessor Hadrian had abused and reviled him, he told the assembly, that he had elected him, pursuant to the will of God revealed to pope Nicholas, and had, with all solemnity, advanced him to the scepter of the empire;² insinuating thereby the scepter of the empire to be a free gift of his; and from this time forward the popes have pretended to have a right to elect, or at least to confirm the election of the emperors, reckoning the years of their empire, not from the day of their accession to the imperial crown, but from that of their coronation or consecration by the pope.

Eutropius, surnamed the Lombard, tells us, that Charles, in return for the favors which he received on this occasion from the pope, made many very rich and valuable presents to St. Peter, and besides yielded to the pope the dukedoms of Benevento and Spoleti, as well as the sovereignty of Rome, and renounced the right, which his predecessors had enjoyed to that time, of confirming the election of the popes, and sending deputies to assist, in his name, at their consecration. But several of this pope's letters have reached our times, wherein he com-

bered himself in health, as it was worded by the fathers of Nice in their first canon, nay, and commanding the person to be deposed, who should commit such a fact after his ordination. These canons were made to discountenance the mistaken notion of some, who, misunderstanding the words of our Savior, "There are some that make themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake," fulfilled them literally after the example of Origen. The Vaesian heretics thought none but eunuchs fit to serve God, and therefore made themselves eunuchs, as St. Austin informs us, (Aug. de Hæres. c. 37.) and all who came over to them.

¹ Annal. Bertin. ad ann. 876.

² Sigon. de Reg. Italiæ, l. vi.

plaints to Charles of some who raised disturbances in Rome, and entreats him to punish with banishment or otherwise such as disturbed the public peace in that city, the head or metropolis of his empire;¹ which was plainly acknowledging him for sovereign of Rome. In the same style did Hadrian III., Stephen V. or VI., and John IX., the successors of the present pope, write to the successors of Charles in the empire. As for the dukedoms of Benevento and Spoleti, they were governed at this time, and long after the pontificate of John VIII. by their own dukes, as is manifest from history; and it is very certain that the popes had no kind of power over the city and dukedom of Benevento till the beginning of the eleventh century, or till the year 1019, as we shall see in the sequel. Neither did Charles renounce the right of confirming the election of the pope, and sending deputies to assist at his ordination, as will appear in the course of the present history.

From Rome Charles repaired, together with the pope, to Ticinum, now Pavia, and was in a diet held there acknowledged emperor by the Italian lords and bishops, and according to custom crowned king of Italy by the archbishop of Milan. In this diet the emperor declared Boso, brother to his wife Richilda, duke of Lombardy, gave him a ducal crown, and appointed him to govern, as his lieutenant or commissary, the Italian dominions appertaining to the imperial crown.² From Pavia the emperor returned to France, where his election, and the acts of the diet of Pavia were confirmed in a council held at Pontion, at which presided the pope's legates, John bishop of Tuscanella, and John of Arezzo, and were present six archbishops, and forty-three bishops. In this council was read by Odo, bishop of Beauvais, a letter, which the emperor had procured from the pope, appointing Ansegius, archbishop of Sens, primate of all France and Germany on the French side of the Rhine. The bishops, greatly surprised at the contents of the letter, desired to read it themselves, since it was addressed to them. That the emperor, who was present, would not allow, but insisted on their declaring their sentiments concerning it. The bishops then answered, that they were ready to obey so far as was consistent with the rights of the metropolitans, with the canons, and with the decrees of the apostolic see. The emperor and the legates, not satisfied with this answer, pressed the bishops, but could by no means prevail upon them to approve of Ansegius's primacy, without limitation or restriction. Fritarius alone, who had been translated from Bourdeaux to Poi-

¹ Johan. ep. 21. 23. 26. 31.

² Annal. Fuld. Metens. et Bertin.

Sentence pronounced by the pope against Formosus, bishop of Porto. Charge brought against him. Richilda introduced to the council and saluted empress. The emperor complains to the pope of the abuse of appeals to Rome. Several provinces in Italy overrun by the Saracens.

tiers, and now wanted to exchange Poitiers for Bourges, returned a satisfactory answer, acknowledging the primacy of the archbishop of Sens without any regard to the right of the metropolitans, to the canons, or to the decrees of the apostolic see. But the emperor was determined to carry his point notwithstanding the opposition of the other bishops; and therefore delivering to Ansegisus the pope's letter commissioning him to hold his place in this council, he ordered him to be seated on a chair at the left hand of John of Tuscanella, one of the legates, but above all the bishops on this side the Alps. The Gallican bishops loudly protested against this innovation; and Hincmar of Reims, published a treatise to show that it was repugnant to the canons of Nice, and inconsistent with the privileges granted by preceding popes to that see. But the pope, glad to oblige the emperor, supported the new primate in his dignity, without any regard either to the canons or to the decrees of his predecessors; so that Ansegisus enjoyed it to the hour of his death. And so great was the power attending it, that he was styled in France and Germany another pope.¹

While the council was yet sitting, Leo bishop of Gabii, the pope's nephew, and Peter bishop of Fossombrone arrived at Pontion with a copy of the sentence that had been pronounced by the pope, in a council held at Rome, against Formosus bishop of Porto, Gregory nomenclator of the Roman church, George his son-in-law, and their accomplices. They were charged with many heinous crimes, and among the rest with conspiring against the emperor as well as against the pope; and being summoned to appear and take their trials, instead of complying with the summons they had privately withdrawn from Rome. The following sentence was therefore pronounced by the pope against Formosus, and approved by the council: Formosus bishop of Porto, formerly sent into Bulgaria by pope Nicholas of blessed memory, having artfully insinuated himself into the favor of the newly baptized king, prevailed upon him to bind himself with dreadful oaths never to receive another bishop from the apostolic see so long as he lived; and he in his turn bound himself by the like oaths to return to the king as soon as he possibly could, and with that view, obtained leave of us, with letters and whatever else was necessary for his journey. He has, besides, prompted by his boundless ambition, been long caballing to raise himself from a smaller to a greater church, even to the apostolic see; has abandoned his own diocese without our leave or knowledge, and conspired with his

accomplices against the safety of the republic, and of our beloved son Charles, whom we have chosen and consecrated emperor. If he does not therefore personally appear, and satisfy us in the term of ten days, that is, by the twenty-ninth of April of the present indiction, we declare him deprived, by the authority of God and his holy apostles Peter and Paul, of all ecclesiastical communion. If he does not appear within the space of twenty days, that is, by the ninth of May; if in the mean time he raises any disturbance in the church, or cavils at this our sentence, let him be anathematized without hopes of absolution.¹ This letter was read in the sixth session of the council of Pontion, and the sentence against Formosus confirmed by all the bishops of that assembly. Of this bishop we shall have occasion to speak in the sequel, and shall even see him raised to the pontifical throne.

In the last session of the present council the empress Richilda was presented to the bishops by the two bishops, John of Tuscanella and Peter of Fossombrone, in her imperial robes, with a crown on her head, and being placed on a throne close to that of the emperor's, she was by the whole assembly with loud acclamations saluted empress.

As the abuse of appeals to Rome began now universally to prevail in the Gallican churches, not only bishops, but priests and the rest of the inferior clergy, appealing to the pope from the judgment given in the provinces, the emperor, at the request of the bishops of the present council, wrote, or rather ordered Hincmar to write in his name, to the pope, and represent to his holiness the evil consequences necessarily attending so pernicious a practice. In that letter Hincmar, after showing that such a practice, if encouraged, would entirely subvert all ecclesiastical discipline, and render the authority of bishops quite precarious, quotes the canons of Sardica, on which the popes grounded their right of receiving appeals, and proves from those very canons, that bishops are to be judged only upon the spot, and that priests are only allowed to appeal to their metropolitans, or to the bishops of the province. In the close of his letter he entreats the pope to conform to those canons, since many offenders would otherwise escape the punishment due to their offences, as few bishops would care to send to Rome deputies, witnesses, and the acts of their proceedings, to maintain the judgment they had given against every clerk whom they had condemned.

While these things passed in France, the southern provinces of Italy were over-run, and dreadfully harassed by the Saracens. The late emperor had gained several victories over them, and shut them up in Ta-

¹ Odorann. in Chronic. Natal. Alexand. sec. ix. et x. Part. i. c. v. Gerard Dubois in Hist. Paris. l. 8. c. 1.

¹ Joann. ep. 319.

The duke of Naples joins the Saracens. The bishop of Naples, his brother, treacherously seizes him, puts out his eyes, and sends him to Rome. Is highly commended on that account by the pope. The bishop takes upon him the government and joins the Saracens. The pope excommunicates him and presses the emperor to hasten to its relief. The election of Charles confirmed in a council at Rome;—[Year of Christ, 877.] The emperor marches to the assistance of the pope.

ranto. But upon his death, having nobody to oppose them, they made themselves masters of several places, spreading everywhere slaughter and destruction; which obliged the neighboring dukes, not able to make head against them with their own forces, to sue for a peace. The Saracens insisted, and would hearken to no other terms, upon their entering into an alliance with them, and marching with their united forces against the dukedom of Rome, and Rome itself. The pope, apprised of this alliance, spared no pains, no promises, nor threats, to prevail on those princes to break it off. Guai-ferius, prince of Salerno, not only quitted the Saracens through fear of the excommunication with which he was threatened, but marched, at the request of the pope, against the Neapolitans, who obstinately adhered to the alliance, which they had entered into with the common enemy, defeated them and made twenty-two of them prisoners, whom the pope ordered to be put to death.¹ Sergius, duke of Naples fared not much better, for as he continued to act in concert with the Saracens, notwithstanding the excommunication thundered out by the pope against him, and the Neapolitans in general, his brother Athanasius, bishop of that city, treacherously seized him, and having put out his eyes, sent him thus deprived of his sight to Rome.² The pope, highly pleased with the present, wrote a letter to the bishop, wherein he extols his zeal for the welfare of the church, in not sparing his own brother, agreeably to that of our Savior, "he that loveth father or mother (the pope adds, or brother) more than me, is not worthy of me;"³ compares him to Judith cutting off the head of Holofernes, and promises to send him, by way of reward for so good and so meritorious a work, the sum of fifteen hundred mancusæ, a very considerable sum in those days.⁴ The pope did not, it seems, recollect the admonition of St. Paul, that a bishop should be no striker.⁵ He wrote at the same time to the people of Naples to thank them for joining the bishop against the duke his brother, whom he styles the man of sin, an enemy to God, the tyrant of his people, and a rebel to the Roman church.⁶ The bishop, encouraged by the pope, took upon him the government of the dukedom, and thus became both duke and bishop. It was this he had in his view in removing his brother, who died in great misery at Rome, out of the way: and he accordingly no sooner found himself firmly established in his government, than, treading in the footsteps of his brother, he joined the Saracens, committed most dreadful ravages

in the neighboring provinces, made frequent inroads into the dukedom of Rome, and threw the city itself into the utmost confusion. Hereupon the pope solemnly excommunicated and anathematized him and all his followers. But as he paid no more regard to the papal thunders than he had done to the ties of blood and nature, John was obliged to recur to the emperor; and he wrote most pressing letters to Charles entreating him to hasten to the relief of his dominions in Italy, and of Rome itself, in imminent danger of falling into the hands of the sworn enemies of the Christian name. But Lewis, king of Germany, dying in the mean time at Frankfort, the emperor, more desirous of extending his dominions on the Rhine than defending those in Italy, marched, upon the first news of his brother's death, at the head of a powerful army against Lewis, the deceased king's second son, to whose lot Germany had fallen. But the young prince meeting him, when he least expected it, with an army not half so numerous as his, gave him a total overthrow, cut the far greater part of his choicest troops in pieces, and obliged him to leave all his baggage behind him and save himself by a precipitate flight.¹

The emperor, apprehending that Carloman, king of Bavaria, the eldest son of the late king, might improve this defeat to his advantage, and lay claim to the imperial crown, dispatched Adalgarius, bishop of Autun to Rome, with letters to the pope, excusing his not sending him the promised succours, and at the same time entreating him to convene a council of as many bishops as he could possibly assemble, and get his election to the empire confirmed by them. The council was assembled with all speed, and opened by the pope with a most fulsome panegyric upon Charles, as if his promotion had been revealed to pope Nicholas, and he had used no indirect means to attain the imperial dignity, but had been called to it, and freely chosen by the bishops and the Roman people. He therefore exhorted the bishops to confirm their own election, that the world might see they did not repent the choice they had made. To this they all agreed, and by the whole assembly, all who should dispute or oppose the election of Charles, were excommunicated, anathematized, and cursed, as disturbers of the public peace, as ministers of the devil, and enemies to God and his church. This council was held in July 877, and Adalgarius of Autun was dispatched with a copy of the acts to the emperor.²

As the Saracens in the mean time, pursued their ravages without check or control, burning churches, destroying cities, towns, and villages, and either putting to the sword,

¹ Erchamp. num. 39.

² Leo. Ostien.

³ Mat. 10: 37.

⁴ Johan. ep. 66.

⁵ 1 Tim. 3: 3.

⁶ Johan. ep. 67.

¹ Annal. Fuld. Metens. et Berlin. ad ann. 876, & 877.

² Tom. viii. Concil. Gall.

The pope meets the emperor at Vercelli, and crowns Richilda empress at Tortona. The emperor dies of poison administered to him by his physician. Council of Ravenna. The pope agrees to pay a yearly tribute to the Saracens. Rome plundered by the duke of Spoleti and the pope confined. The pope, upon his retreat, repairs to France;—[Year of Christ, 875.]

or carrying into captivity the helpless inhabitants, the pope dispatched messengers after messengers to the emperor, pressing him in the name of the bishops, priests, nobles, and the unhappy people, who had not yet fallen into the hands of their merciless enemies, to hasten to their relief, and rescue the church, that had raised him to the empire in preference to his brother, from impending slavery and oppression. The emperor, thus pressed by the pope's letters, and more by his two legates, Peter, bishop of Fossombrone, and Peter, bishop of Sinigaglia, sent by his holiness to represent to him, by word of mouth, the deplorable condition which his Italian dominions were reduced to, resolved at length to march with an army into Italy. He set out accordingly in the month of July of the present year, with a small number of troops, ordering his generals to follow him with the main body of the army. On his arrival at Orba on the other side mount Jura, he was met by Adalgarius, who delivered to him a copy of the acts of the council confirming his election, and at the same time informed him, that his holiness intended to meet him at Pavia. But the emperor found him at Vercelli, and from thence proceeded with him to Pavia. They had not been long there when advice was brought, that Carloman, king of Bavaria, was advancing at the head of a powerful army to ascertain the right he claimed to the imperial crown, as the eldest son of the elder brother. This intelligence alarmed the emperor, and as he had but very few troops with him, he left Pavia in great haste, and repossessing the Po retired to Tortona, where Richilda, who attended her husband, was crowned empress by the pope.

The emperor and the pope passed a few days together at Tortona, waiting for the troops, that Charles had ordered to follow him into Italy. But he waited in vain; and was soon informed, that the generals, whom he had trusted with the command of the forces, had kept them at home and conspired against him. Hereupon leaving Tortona in as great haste as he had done Pavia, he fled into Morienne, whither the empress had withdrawn with all his treasures upon the news of the approach of Carloman. It is remarkable, that while Charles was flying back to France upon the news of the approach of Carloman, Carloman was flying back to Bavaria upon a false report spread amongst his troops, that the emperor and the pope were coming at the head of a numerous army to give him battle. From Tortona the pope returned to Rome. But the emperor died on his way to France, being poisoned by his physician, a Jew named Sedecias, in whom he had ever placed an entire confidence. The physician is sup-

posed to have been bribed by the conspirators to administer the poison of which he died: we do not at least find that he was punished for it. Be that as it will, the emperor died at Brios, a small village on this side of Mount Cenis, eleven days after he had taken the poisonous potion, that is, on the sixth of October, 877, in the second year of his empire, the thirty-eighth of his reign, and the fifty-fourth of his age.¹

A great council was held this year in the city of Ravenna, at which the pope presided in person, and were present no fewer than one hundred and thirty bishops. This council is said in the acts to have been convened "by apostolic authority and the command of the emperor Charles;" whence it is plain that it was not held after, as some have writ, but before his death. The pope mentions that assembly in several of his letters;² but only nineteen canons issued by it have reached our time; and they are calculated to restore the ecclesiastical discipline, greatly decayed in the Italian provinces.³

The news of the emperor's death threw the pope and the Romans into the utmost confusion. The Saracens, now masters of a fortress upon the borders of the Roman dukedom, delivered up to them by Docibilis, duke of Gaeta, made daily inroads to the very gates of Rome. On the other hand the pope, having disobligered Carloman and the other princes by his partiality for Charles, could expect no relief from them. In this extremity he resolved to treat with the Saracens, and he accordingly agreed to pay them a yearly tribute of twenty-five thousand mancuse, upon condition they committed no hostilities in the Roman dukedom, nor made any attempt upon the city of Rome.⁴ The Saracens faithfully observed the articles of the treaty. But Lambert, duke of Spoleti, and Adalbert, marquis of Tuscany, who had both been excommunicated by the pope for usurping some lands that belonged to the Roman church, entering Rome in a hostile manner, seized on the pope and confined him, plundered the city, and obliged the Romans to take an oath of allegiance to Carloman as king of Italy.⁵ Upon their retreat from Rome they set the pope at liberty, who after thundering out dreadful curses against them, left Rome, and embarking at Ostia fled by sea to France, not doubting but he should be well received there by Lewis, surnamed the Stammerer, who had succeeded the emperor Charles, his father, in that kingdom. He landed at Arles on Whitsunday, which in 878 fell on the 11th of May, and was from thence attended by duke Boso, and his wife Hermengarda to

¹ Annal. Bertin.

² Epist. 53, 5, 56, 57, 59, 60.

³ Tom. ix. Concil. p. 300.

⁴ Johan. ep. 89.

⁵ Johan. ep. 84, 85.

Council of Troies. The duke of Spoleti anathematized in that council, and with him Formosus of Porto. Hincmar of Laon kindly treated by the pope and bishops of the council. Some canons of this council. Lewis crowned king by the pope.

Lions. From Lions he dispatched legates to Tours to acquaint the king, who lay indisposed in that city, with his arrival in his dominions, and his intention of assembling a council there, as he could not safely convene one in Italy. The king appointed some bishops to wait on his holiness in his name, to conduct him to Troies, the most proper place for the council to meet at, and to defray his expenses on the road. Baronius writes, that the pope, during his stay at Lions, granted the pall to Rostagnus Archbishop of that city, and besides declared him, at the request of Boso, vicar of the apostolic see in France. It is indeed said in the letters quoted by Baronius as pope John's, namely, in the 93d, 94th, and 95th, that he appointed the archbishop of Lions his vicar and representative in Gaul. But Natalis Alexander has proved, beyond contradiction, those letters to be forged.¹

The pope had invited to his council all the bishops of France and Lombardy, and likewise Lewis of France, as well as the three sons of the late king of Germany, Carloman, Lewis, and Charles. But thirty bishops only complied with the invitation, and not one of the princes but Lewis of France, in whose kingdom the council was assembled. The bishops met, for the first time, on the thirteenth of August, when a speech was read in the pope's name, laying before them the outrages committed in Rome by Lambert, duke of Spoleti, and the unworthy treatment he had met with at his hands. The pope informed them, that he had excommunicated the duke and his accomplices in the church of St. Peter, and desired they would not only confirm his sentence, but add their Anathemas to his, and cause them to be published by their suffragans in all the churches. To this the bishops readily agreed, and Lambert was again and again anathematized by the whole assembly. At the same time the sentence against Formosus of Porto was confirmed, and he with his accomplices the third time excommunicated, degraded, and anathematized, the bishops declaring all with one voice, that they condemned those, whom the holy see condemned, and received those, whom the holy see received.

Hincmar of Laon, of whom I have spoken above, appearing unexpectedly at this council, presented a memorial to the pope, complaining of the hard treatment he had met with, especially from his uncle Hincmar of Reims, notwithstanding his appeal to Rome. He had been condemned, excommunicated, and degraded, by the council of Douzi, in the Pontificate of Hadrian, as has been related above; and the emperor Charles, while he was at Rome, had prevailed upon the present pope to confirm the judgment of

that council, and suffer another bishop to be chosen in the room of Hincmar. The unhappy bishop, as he was a man of a most restless temper, had been kept closely confined after his condemnation; and the king, to prevent his being ever reinstated in his see, had after two years confinement ordered his eyes to be put out. In this condition he appeared before the pope and the council, begging they would judge his cause anew according to the canons and the decrees of the apostolic see. The pope had confirmed the sentence of the council of Douzi, had approved the election of Hedenuulfus in the room of Hincmar, and could not, therefore, allow the cause to be re-examined. However, touched with compassion, he took off the excommunication, granted the deposed bishop leave to sing mass, and, with the consent and approbation of the king, allotted part of the revenues of the bishopric of Laon for his maintenance. Hereupon the bishops, among whom were some metropolitans who befriended blind Hincmar, restoring to him his sacerdotal habit, presented him in that attire to the pope, and afterwards made him give the sacerdotal benediction to the people.¹

Several canons were issued by the present council, and this, among the rest, worthy of particular notice, that the higher power should pay that respect to bishops which was due to their dignity and the rank they held in the church, and that no man should presume to sit in the presence of a bishop unless he commanded it. The pope and the bishops, at the request of the king, excommunicated Bernard marquis of Languedoc, Hugh the son of Lotharius, late king of Lorraine by Waldrada, and some others, as disturbers of the public peace, and enemies to the state.

Lewis had been crowned, upon the death of his father, by Hincmar of Reims; but he nevertheless desired to be crowned anew by the pope; and his holiness accordingly performed the ceremony with great solemnity while the council was yet sitting, that is on the 7th of September, of the present year, 878. Some writers, and Baronius among the rest, will have Lewis to have been, on this occasion, crowned emperor. But that opinion is now universally exploded, the contrary being manifest from several letters written by the pope after that ceremony, especially from the eighty-second to Lewis and Carloman, the sons of king Lewis, wherein he styles Charles emperor of blessed memory, and gives no other title to his son Lewis than that of king.² But this point is cleared up, beyond all doubt, by a charter, that was granted by Lewis to the church of Nevers, three days after the ceremony of

¹ Natal. Alex. sect. 9 et 10. c. i. art. 11.

² Concil. Gall. tom. iii. p. 421, 422. Annal. Bertin.
³ Johan. VIII. 71, 82, &c.

The pope could not be prevailed upon to crown the queen. His speech at the close of the council. He sends legates into the east for the recovering of Bulgaria. Death of the patriarch Ignatius. Photius restored and acknowledged by the pope's legates. Writes to the pope. The emperor Basilius recommends him to the pope;—[Year of Christ, 879.]

the coronation, and is still extant. For in that charter he only styles himself "Lewis by the grace of God, king."¹ The pope refused to crown Adalaida the queen for reasons unknown to us, nor could he by any means be prevailed upon to perform that ceremony. As Lewis had been obliged by his father to put away his first wife Ansgarda, by whom he had Lewis and Carloman, and marry Adalaida in her room, some are of opinion that the pope looked upon that marriage as unlawful, and therefore would not crown the queen. But that is mere conjecture, no notice being taken by any of the contemporary writers, which is somewhat surprising, of the motives that restrained the pope from complying with the earnest and repeated entreaties of the king, whom he was so willing to oblige on every other occasion.

The pope closed the council on the tenth of September 878, with a speech addressed to the king and the bishops. He exhorted the king to employ his arms, as his predecessors had done, against the enemies of God and his church, and the bishops to arm their vassals with all possible speed and send them with him into Italy to protect the holy Roman church against the Saracens, and the Christians, more wicked than them, who had joined them. He begged the king, and likewise the bishops, to return, without delay, a positive answer to this his request; but from history it does not appear that either did; and the pope was attended into Italy only by duke Bosso and his wife Hermengarda, with whose obliging behavior he was so well pleased, that on his arrival at Pavia he adopted the duke for his son.²

The deplorable state to which Italy was reduced at this time, and Rome itself, did not divert the pope from attending to the affairs of the east. As the patriarch Ignatius continued, notwithstanding the menaces of the late pope, to keep possession of Bulgaria, and to send Greek bishops and other missionaries to preach the gospel there, John despatched, this year, into the east, Paul, bishop of Ancona, and Eugene, bishop of Ostia, with letters to Ignatius, to the Greek bishops and clergy in Bulgaria, and to Michael, king of that country. In his letter to the patriarch he commands him to recal, in a month's time, all the Greek bishops, priests, and missionaries, and to renounce all jurisdiction over the kingdom of Bulgaria, on pain of being excluded from the participation of the body and blood of our Lord, and being deprived of the patriarchal dignity, if he did not obey that command of the apostolic see within the term of two months. In his letter to the Greek bishops and clergy he

declares them excommunicated, and suspended from all ecclesiastical functions if they quit not the country within a month. He exhorts the king, in his letters to him, to drive out the Greeks, lest he should be infected with the heresies that frequently prevail among them.¹ The legates were charged to represent to the emperor, by word of mouth, the dreadful ravages committed by the Saracens in Italy, and implore his assistance.

Ignatius died before the legates arrived at Constantinople, and, to their great surprise, they found Photius placed anew in the patriarchal chair. As he was a man of most uncommon parts and great address, he had regained the favor of the emperor in the lifetime of the deceased patriarch, and was therefore suffered to seize on the patriarchal see the moment it became vacant. The two legates refused at first to acknowledge him; but they were soon persuaded by the emperor to own him for lawful patriarch, and Photius, who well knew how to deal with the Roman legates, prevailed upon them with rich presents publicly to declare, that the pope, hearing of his promotion, had sent them to approve and confirm it. Thus did he impose upon most of the metropolitans and other bishops, who had hitherto sided with the two preceding popes against him; and in order to impose upon the pope himself, he assured him in a letter, which he wrote on this occasion, that he had long withstood the prayers of the bishops, and even the commands of the emperor, but had, in the end, been forced to yield, and resume, which he did with the utmost reluctance, the patriarchal dignity. He got the bishops to sign this letter, pretending that it was the deed of a purchase, which was to be kept secret; and when they had all signed it, his secretary, named Peter, stole their seals away, and set them to it, and for this piece of knavery Photius preferred him soon after to the metropolitan see of Sardis. With this letter, thus signed and sealed, Photius despatched to Rome one Theodore, who had been ordained by him, during his exile, metropolitan of Pathmi, a city that never existed; and he was therefore styled by way of derision, bishop of Aphantopolis, that is, of the invisible city.

At the same time the emperor Basilius sent a solemn embassy to the pope, recommending Photius to his favor in the strongest terms, and representing his restoration as the only possible means of restoring peace and tranquillity to the church and state. The ambassadors arrived at Rome in the beginning of April, 879, were received by the pope with extraordinary marks of respect and esteem, and, what greatly sur-

¹ Sirmond. in not. ad Concil. Trecent.

² Johan. VIII. ep. 119.

The pope absolves Photius from the excommunication and receives him as his colleague, upon condition of his renouncing all claim to Bulgaria. The pope's letter in answer to that of Photius. The pope's legates restore to Photius in a full council the ensigns of the patriarchal dignity, and condemn the eighth general council.

prised the whole church, obtained at once his consent to the restoration of Photius so often excommunicated, and anathematized by his two immediate predecessors Nicholas and Hadrian. This appears from the letter he wrote and sent by the ambassadors on their return to Constantinople, in answer to that which he had received from the emperor. For in that letter he tells Basilius, that, Ignatius being dead, he, at his request, allows Photius to exercise the episcopal functions, though he had reassumed them without the consent or knowledge of the apostolic see, that had suspended him from them; that he receives him as a bishop, as a brother, as a colleague; and that, relying on the extensive and unlimited power granted to him in the person of St. Peter, he absolves him from all ecclesiastical censure, as well as all bishops, priests, clerks, and laymen, who had incurred any on his account. However the pope insisted on the following terms or conditions, namely, that Photius should, in a full council, ask pardon for his past conduct; that in time to come no layman should be preferred to the patriarchal see; and, what was the most important article of all, that the patriarch of Constantinople should renounce all kind of jurisdiction over the kingdom of Bulgaria. The pope closed his letter with declaring all excommunicated, who, after the third admonition, should refuse to communicate with the holy patriarch Photius, should give ear to any calumnies against him, or look upon him in any other light than that of their spiritual guide, and mediator between God and them.¹

The pope, in his answer to Photius' letter, acknowledges him for lawful successor to the deceased patriarch of blessed memory; exhorts him to forget past injuries, to gain over by gentle means such as may still oppose his restoration; and earnestly entreats him to get those who have been banished, recalled from exile, and reinstated in their respective dignities. The pope wrote likewise to the bishops under the immediate jurisdiction of the see of Constantinople, and to those subject to the other three patriarchal sees, to acquaint them with the restoration of Photius, which, he says, he had agreed to at their request, Photius having forged letters to that purpose in their names. It is to be observed, that, in the time of the preceding pope, the whole body of the Roman clergy, and John among the rest, he being then archdeacon of that church, bound themselves by a solemn oath never to consent to the restoration of Photius, but ever to look upon his ordination as void and null. But John was, on the one hand, under dreadful apprehensions from the neighborhood of the Saracens, who had seized on

some strong holds adjoining to the Roman dukedom: on the other none of the Christian princes, beside the emperor of the east, were at this time in a condition to afford him any assistance or relief; and therefore, sacrificing all other views to his own safety, he did not scruple, in order to gain his favor at so critical a juncture, not only to reverse the decrees of his predecessors, as well as those of a general council, but to break the solemn oath he had taken.¹

The imperial ambassadors left Rome in the month of August of the present year; and with them the pope despatched into the east Peter, cardinal presbyter of the Roman church, adding him to the two legates, Paul and Eugene, who he had sent thither the preceding year. He brought with him a letter from the pope to the two legates directing them how to proceed in the affair of Photius. They were ordered in the first place to wait upon the emperor with their new colleague, and let him know, that his holiness had sent them, at his request, to reinstate the holy patriarch Photius in his former dignity. In the next place they were to visit Photius himself, and acquaint him that the pope acknowledged him for his brother and his colleague, but only upon the conditions mentioned above; Photius promised to fulfil those conditions; and a numerous council being thereupon assembled, the legates restored to him, in the presence of the bishops who composed it, the ensigns of the patriarchal dignity, declared him lawful patriarch of the imperial city, and besides, of their own authority pronounced all deposed, excommunicated, and anathematized, who should thenceforth refuse to acknowledge him, or should receive any of the councils that had condemned him. The present council consisted of no fewer than three hundred and eighty bishops; the emperor was present in person, with his two sons, Constantine and Leo; and the three legates, gained over with rich presents by Photius, allowed him to preside at it with them. The first session was held in November 879, and the last in March 880. The Greeks condemn and reject to this day the council held under Hadrian, and receive this, that condemned it, for the eighth general council.

The three legates upon their return to Rome took care to conceal from the pope

¹ Baronius thinks that John, on account of the cowardice and pusillanimity which he betrayed on this occasion, was universally looked upon not as a man, but a woman, that by some he might have been called so, and that from thence the fable of pope Joan probably took its rise. But the annalist did not, it seems, recollect that this fable was not heard of till long after the time of John VIII., that is, till the latter end of the thirteenth century, and that she pope was placed by the inventor of it between Leo IV. and Benedict III., about the middle of the ninth century.

The legates are deposed for condemning the eighth general council, by the pope, on their return home;— [Year of Christ, 880.] Photius excommunicated anew. Marianus sent into the East annuls the acts of the council of Constantinople;— [Year of Christ, 881.] Charles the Gross is crowned emperor, but lends the pope no assistance against the Saracens. The bishop of Naples excommunicated in a council at Rome;— [Year of Christ, 882.]

their having condemned the eighth general council, and with it all the councils that had condemned Photius. They only told him, that, pursuant to their instructions, they had replaced Photius on the patriarchal throne; that his restoration was approved by a very numerous council assembled for that purpose; that an end was, by that means, put to all disturbances in the eastern churches; that the patriarch had ordered all the Greek priests to be recalled from Bulgaria; and lastly, that the emperor would soon send a fleet to protect the coasts of Italy, especially of the Roman dukedom against the Saracens. But the pope was soon informed of the prevarication of his three legates, and having thereupon deposed them, he declared all they had done void and null, excommunicated all, who should receive the late council held at Constantinople, or communicate with the usurper Photius, and despatched, without delay, Marinus, deacon of the Roman church, to Constantinople, with orders to protest against the proceedings of the council lately convened there, and declare them null. This commission Marinus executed with the greatest firmness and intrepidity, which so provoked the emperor Basilius, that he ordered him to be imprisoned, and kept closely confined. But finding that he was neither to be gained with promises, nor terrified with menaces, he set him at liberty after thirty days confinement, and sent him back to Rome.¹ The pope informed by him of the proceedings of the council under Photius, confirmed, with great solemnity, the acts of the councils, that his two predecessors Nicholas and Hadrian had convened against him, and condemned him anew in a council he assembled for that purpose.²

As to the state of affairs at this time in the west, Carloman king of Bavaria, the eldest son of Lewis, late king of Germany, entering Italy at the head of a numerous army upon the first news of the death of his uncle Charles the Bald, was there received and acknowledged by the Italian lords and bishops king of Lombardy. But he held not long his new kingdom, being driven out of Italy by his younger brother Charles surnamed the Gross. Carloman died soon after; and as he left no issue, the states of Bavaria chose his second brother Lewis for their king, who, to prevent Charles from disturbing him in the possession of that kingdom, renounced in his favor all claim to the kingdom of Lombardy and the title of emperor. The pope had not yet declared for either of these princes; but he no sooner heard of this agreement between them, than he wrote to Charles, offering him the imperial crown,

and pressing him to come to Rome and receive it. He even went as far as Ravenna to meet him. But the state of his affairs in France obliged that prince to repossess the Alps, and put off his journey to Rome, till the latter end of the year 880, when he was crowned with great solemnity by the pope in the church of St. Peter on Christmas-day.¹ But the new emperor showed no inclination to employ his troops against the Saracens, nor did the pope, so long as he lived, receive from him the least assistance, though he frequently pressed him, and likewise the empress Richilda, to rescue the capital of his empire from imminent slavery and utter ruin.

As the emperor, diverted at this time by other wars, was not in a condition, had he been ever so willing, to redeem his Italian dominions from the ravages of the Saracens, the pope spared no pains, no promises, no anathemas to gain over such of the Italian princes as had joined them, and prevail upon them to enter into an offensive and defensive alliance against them. He even went in person to Naples to try whether he could, by any means, persuade Athanasius, duke and bishop of that city, of whom I have spoken above,² to renew his alliance with the sworn enemies of the Christian name. Athanasius promised not only to break off the treaty he had made with them, but to turn his arms against them; and he was for that purpose supplied by the pope with a large sum of money. That money the faithless bishop employed in levying new forces to assist the Saracens more effectually, and oblige the neighboring princes to join them. The pope therefore excommunicated him with great solemnity in a council at Rome, declaring him anathematized, and suspended from all the functions of his office as a bishop, till such time as he recalled all the troops to a man, that he had sent to the assistance of the Saracens.³ This sentence made some impression upon the bishop, and he sent one of his deacons, but not till a twelvemonth after, to assure the pope that, provided he absolved him from it, he would order all his troops home, and thenceforth never lend the Saracens the least assistance. But the pope, not satisfied with his barely affording them no assistance, despatched Marinus, bishop and treasurer of the holy see, and another person of distinction named Sico, to let Athanasius know, that in order to obtain the wished for absolution, he must convince him of the sincerity of his repent-

¹ Regino, *Annal. Metens.* &c.

Baronius supposes this ceremony to have been performed in 881, not aware that Regino, Sigebert, Hermannus Contractus, and the annalist of Metz, whom he follows therein, reckon Christmas-day the first day of the year.

² See p. 286.

³ Johan. ep. 270.

¹ Epist. Steph. V. apud Bar. ad ann. 885.

² Epist. Formos. in Actis Synod. viii.

Instance of this pope's cruelty. His death. His writings. The letter condemning the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and Son probably forged. Allows the Moravians to say the canonical hours in their native language. Marinus elected.

ance, and that he could by no other means convince him of it but by apprehending and sending to Rome some of the chief men among the Saracens, of whose names Marinus would deliver him a list, and cutting the throats of the rest in the presence of his legates, "jugulatis aliis."¹ Such was the spirit of this blood thirsty church, even in those early times.

The pope had resolved to undertake a second journey into France, in order to mediate a peace between the French princes at war with one another, and had even wrote to count Suppo to meet him at mount Cenis.² But he died in the mean time, according to the most probable opinion, on the 15th or 16th of December, 882, having held the see ten years and two days. The continuator of the annals of Fulda writes, that the emperor received the news of the death of pope John, and was at the same time informed, that he had been knocked on the head with a hammer by some who coveted his wealth and aspired at his dignity. But of this no notice is taken by any other writer. Of this pope we have three hundred and twenty letters, the fragments of some others, and a constitution concerning the cardinals commonly ascribed to him, but thought by the best critics to be of a much later date. Platina supposes the life of pope Gregory the Great, comprised in four books, to have been written by this pope while he was yet deacon of the Roman church. But that mistake is confuted by Panvinius.³ The life of Gregory was written during the pontificate of pope John, and at his request, by a deacon of the Roman church named John, which probably led Platina into that mistake.

As for the letter to Photius, wherein the pope condemns as blasphemous the addition of the words "and from the Son" to the symbol, it is by some looked upon as genuine, by others as spurious. The style certainly bears a very near resemblance to

that of this pope's other letters. But, on the other hand, as we have a long letter from Photius to the patriarch of Aquileia upon this subject, written after the death of the present pope,¹ wherein he mentions several of his predecessors who had disapproved of that addition, but, speaking of him, only says, that his legates at the council of Constantinople had signed the symbol without it, we may, I think, conclude from thence the letter in question to be forged. For is it not altogether incredible that, if Photius had received such a letter from pope John, he would not have mentioned it, and named him among the popes who had condemned the said addition?

John confirmed, at the request of Sfteno Pulcher, prince of Moravia, the licence, that had been granted by pope Nicholas to the inhabitants of that country, of saying the canonical hours and celebrating mass in their native language, "the Slavonian language we justly commend," says the pope in his letter to the prince I have just mentioned, "and order the praise and the works of Christ our Lord to be celebrated in that tongue, being directed by divine authority to praise the Lord not in three only, but in all languages, agreeably to what we find in Holy Writ, 'praise the Lord all ye nations, and bless him all ye people.' The apostles announced the wonderful works of God in all languages, &c. and he who made the three chief languages, the Hebrew, the Greek, and the Latin, created all the rest for his praise and glory."² The same privilege was granted by the Greek church to the Russians, who speak the Slavonian language; and they perform to this day, as well as the Moravians, divine service in their native tongue. The pope however ordered the Gospel to be first read in the Latin, and afterwards, for the sake of those who understood not that language, in the Slavonian.

MARINUS, THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIUS, LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, *Emperors of the East*.—CHARLES THE GROSS, *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ 882.] In the room of John, and a few days after his death, was unanimously chosen by the Roman people, Marinus, called by some Martin II., a native of Gallesium in Tuscany, and the son of a presbyter named Palumbus.⁴ He had been sent to Constantinople with the character of

legate by pope Nicholas to excommunicate Photius, by Hadrian II., to preside at the eighth general council, and by John his immediate predecessor, to annul the acts of the council held under Photius, and excommunicate him anew, as has been related above. Some will have him to have been a bishop at the time of his election, though of no particular see. But in the annals of

¹ Johan. ep. 294.

² Idem. ep. 307.

³ In Notis ad Platin.

⁴ Panvin. in Not. ad Platin. et Annal. Fuld.

¹ Apud Bar. ad ann. 883.

² Johan. ep. 247.

Marianus excommunicates Photius. Restores Formosus. His death;—[Year of Christ, 884.] Hadrian chosen. Two decrees issued by him. The emperor Basilius strives in vain to reconcile him with Photius.

Fulda, continued by an anonymous writer, and published by Freherius, he is said to have been raised from the dignity of archdeacon of the Roman church to that of sovereign pontiff. He was scarce warm in the chair when he declared the acts of the late council of Constantinople void and null, excommunicated Photius, and anathematized all who should communicate with him, or acknowledge him for lawful patriarch;¹ which so provoked the emperor Basilius, that he never owned him for lawful pope, alledging that he had been translated, contrary to the canons, from one see to another, and therefore was not canonically elected.

The next thing we find recorded of Marinus is, that he restored Formosus, bishop of Porto to his see, though he had been often excommunicated by his predecessor, and had even been obliged to swear, that he never would return to Rome nor resume the episcopal dignity, but content himself, so long as he lived, with lay communion. From all these oaths Marinus absolved him, and declaring him innocent of the crimes laid to his charge, replaced him on his see.² About the same time Marinus sent the pall to Fulco preferred to the archiepiscopal see of Reims in the room of the famous Hinc-

mar, who died on the seventeenth of December, 882. He is likewise said to have sent many valuable presents to Alfred, king of England, and among the rest some of the wood of the true cross, and to have exempted, at that king's request, the English school at Rome from all taxes.¹ This is all we know of Marinus. He died, according to the best historians, in the second year of his pontificate, having presided in the apostolic see one year and five months.² He is said by Platina to have raised himself by wicked practices.³ But of such practices no notice is taken by any of the more ancient writers; nay, in the Saxon chronicle printed at Oxford, he is styled a renowned pope.⁴ If he was chosen and ordained a few days after the death of pope John in December, 882, as we are told he was, and held the see one year and five months, his death must have happened in May 884. Of this pope no writings have reached our times, besides a charter, which he granted to a Benedictine monastery in the diocese of Limoges, empowering the monks to choose their own abbot, according to the rules of the order, and anathematizing all, who should be any ways concerned in obliging them to receive one, whom they themselves had not freely chosen.⁵

HADRIAN III., THE HUNDRED AND EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIUS, LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, *Emperors of the East*.—CHARLES THE GROSS, *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 844.] Marinus was succeeded by Hadrian the third of that name, by birth a Roman, and the son of one Benedict. He was chosen and ordained, so far as we can conjecture from the duration of his pontificate, in the latter end of May or the beginning of June 884.

As the Saracens still continued their ravages in Italy, and burned in the month of September of the present year the rich monastery of Monte Cassino, murdered the abbot Bertarius at the altar, and committed many other barbarous murders without check or control, the emperor Charles being obliged to employ his forces in the defence of his French dominions against the Normans, the Italians began to think of choosing an emperor of their own nation, who, not being diverted by foreign wars, nor having other kingdoms to defend, might solely attend to the defence of Italy. This measure the Italian princes represented to the pope as the only means of preserving Italy from being brought in the end under the yoke of

the Saracens; and Hadrian is said to have issued, at their desire and request, a decree ordaining, that, if Charles should die without issue male, the kingdom of Italy and the title of emperor should be bestowed upon none but natives of Italy.⁶ Hadrian at the same time decreed, that the new pope should be thenceforth consecrated without waiting for the imperial envoys to assist at his consecration.⁷

The emperor Basilius, hearing of the promotion of Hadrian, left nothing unattempted to reconcile him with Photius, even offering to send a powerful fleet to assist him against the Saracens, provided he communicated with him, and acknowledged him for lawful patriarch. But finding him no less inflexible than his immediate predecessor, he wrote him a very sharp letter, charging him, as well as Marinus, whom he had succeeded, with pride, arrogance, and presumption, as

¹ Math. Westmon. et Sim. Dunel. ad ann. 884.

² Marian. Luitprand. Martin. Polon. &c.

³ Platin. in Martin. II. ⁴ Chron. Saxon. ad ann. 883.

⁵ Sirmond. Concl. Gall.

⁶ Sigon. de reg. Italie, l. v. ad ann. 884.

⁷ Platin. et Ciacon. in Hadrian III.

¹ Breviar. Græc. Synod. Constantinop. viii.

² Auxil. de Ordinationibus Formos. l. ii. c. 20.

Death of Hadrian;—[Year of Christ, 885.] Stephen unanimously chosen. Is ordained without the emperor's knowledge. Miracle wrought by him after his consecration. His liberality. His answer to a letter from the emperor Basilius to his predecessor.

if they sacrificed the peace and tranquillity of the church to their own private views and the exaltation of their see. Hadrian did not live to receive this letter, but died on his way to Worms, being invited by the emperor to assist at a diet there. In that diet the emperor proposed to depose some bishops, very unjustly, says the annalist of Fulda, and wanted for that purpose the authority

of the pope. But his design, adds the annalist, was defeated by the death of the pope, who died in the neighborhood of Modena, and was buried in the monastery of Nonantula, about five miles from that place.¹ If Hadrian held the see one year and four months, as we read in most of the catalogues of the popes, his death must have happened about the month of September 885.

STEPHEN V. OR VI., HUNDRED AND NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIUS, LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, *Emperors of the East*.—CHARLES THE GROSS, WIDO, *Emperors of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 885.] The news of Hadrian's death no sooner reached Rome, than the people, the clergy, and the nobility, assembled to choose him a successor; and they unanimously chose Stephen, by birth a Roman, and presbyter of that church, all crying out with one voice, "we will have Stephen, and no other, for our bishop." They went accordingly all in a body from the place of election to his house, and carried him by force (for he was the only person that opposed his election) to the Lateran palace, and there placed him upon the patriarchal throne. The very next day, being Sunday, he was attended by the whole Roman clergy to the basilic of the prince of the apostles, and ordained or consecrated there with the usual solemnity.¹

As the emperor heard at the same time of his election and consecration, he highly resented their having performed that ceremony without consulting him, or waiting for the arrival of his envoys to assist at it in his name; and he immediately despatched Lintard, bishop of Vercelli, and some other bishops, with orders to depose him. But the pope having sent to him, by a solemn legation, the decree of his election, signed by thirty bishops, and by all the leading men of the clergy, the nobility, and the people, he was appeased, revoked the order he had given, and acknowledged Stephen for lawful pope.²

Stephen was come of a noble and wealthy family, was greatly beloved by pope Hadrian II. and likewise by Marinus, who ordained him priest, and was held in the greatest veneration by all ranks of men for the purity and sanctity of his life. They had long had a great drought at Rome, and the neighboring country was at the same time infested with prodigious swarms of locusts that every where devoured the fruits of the earth, which the Saracens were not able to carry

off. Thus a dreadful famine began to rage in Rome. But the very day Stephen was chosen, and even before he got to the Lateran palace, a plentiful shower fell; and as to the locusts, in order to encourage the people to destroy them, he publicly promised a reward of six denarii a bushel. But finding that they multiplied as fast as they were destroyed, and consequently that to extirpate them he must put himself to the expense of a miracle, he blessed a great quantity of water, and distributed it among the people, ordering them to sprinkle their corn and vines with it. They did so, and the ground was soon every where covered with heaps of those dead insects.² His generosity and charity to the poor do more honor to his memory than all his miracles. For finding nothing in the patriarchal palace but bare walls, the furniture, money, and every thing else being carried off upon the first news of his predecessor's death, according to the custom that began then to prevail, and obtains to this day, he was obliged to recur to his own patrimony; and he generously expended it in maintaining the poor during the famine, in relieving the orphans, many of whom he fed daily at his own table, and in privately supplying with all the necessaries of life noble but unfortunate and decayed families.³ Such is the character the bibliothecarian gives us of the present pope.

The letter that the emperor Basilius wrote to Hadrian, filled with severe reflections upon that pope, as well as upon his predecessor Marinus, for not communicating with Photius, as has been said above, was delivered to Stephen, and he answered it a few days after his consecration. The emperor's letter, said by Baronius to have been fraught with blasphemies, has not reached our times, but Stephen's answer to it has; and the pope begins it with fixing the limits of the two powers, the spiritual and the temporal, telling

¹ Guelilm. Biblioth. in Steph. VI.

² Annal. Fuld. ad ann. 885.

¹ Annal. Fuld. ad Ann. 885.

² Guel. Biblioth. in Steph. VI.

³ Idem *ibid.*

Death of the emperor Basilius; Photius deposed, and confined to a monastery;—[Year of Christ, 886.]
 Stephen, the emperor Leo's brother, substituted in his room. The emperor writes to the pope for a dispensation in behalf of his brother, ordained deacon by Photius.

the emperor, that it is his province to check tyrants with the sword, to administer justice, to make laws, and to command fleets and armies; but that the care of the flock was committed to St. Peter, and in him to his successors in the apostolic see; and that their power is as much above all temporal power, as heaven is above the earth. From thence he takes occasion to exhort the emperor not to meddle with the affairs of the church, but contenting himself with his own province, to leave the disposal of spiritual concerns to those whom the Lord has trusted with the keys of the kingdom of heaven. In the next place the pope proceeds to answer the reason the emperor had alledged for not acknowledging Marinus for lawful bishop, namely, because he had been translated, contrary to the canons, from one see to another. Stephen positively asserts that he was no bishop at the time of his election; that the emperor could not prove that he was; and that he therefore ought not, upon that account, to have looked upon his promotion to the apostolic see as inconsistent with the canons. He adds, that the canons may, on many occasions, be dispensed with, alledges several instances of translations in the eastern churches approved by men eminent for their sanctity, and concludes from thence, that the canons, forbidding translations, are not binding in all cases, and consequently that Marinus might have been translated, which, he says, was not the case, from another see to the first without any breach of the laws of the church. The pope then complains of the emperor, but in the most respectful terms, for taking into his protection one so often and so justly condemned, excommunicated, and anathematized by the apostolic see; expresses great surprise at his giving ear to the enemies of Marinus striving to prejudice him against that holy pontiff worthy of eternal memory; condoles the church of Constantinople upon its being destitute of a pastor, and only governed by a layman; declares, that if he were not restrained by his great regard for a prince, so well deserving of the church in other respects, he would treat the usurper Photius with more severity than any of his predecessors had done, and closes his letter with congratulating the emperor upon his having destined one of his sons, namely, Stephen the youngest of the three, for the priesthood, and earnestly entreating him to send a fleet to protect the coast, and a body of troops to garrison and defend the city of Rome, in imminent danger of falling into the hands of the Saracens. We may judge of the deplorable condition to which Rome was reduced at this time, from their wanting even oil, as we read in the close of the pope's letter, for the lamps of the churches.¹

This letter was written by the pope soon after his consecration, and consequently in the latter end of September 885, but it did not reach Constantinople till the year 886, after the death of the emperor Basilius, which happened upon the first of March of that year, after he had reigned one year with the emperor Michael, and nineteen alone.¹ He was succeeded by his second son Leo, surnamed the Philosopher, or the Wise, his eldest son Constantine dying before his father: and to him was delivered the pope's letter addressed to his father. As Photius was charged after the death of Basilius with having formed a design of raising a relation of his own to the imperial throne, the new emperor, upon the receipt of the pope's letter, took occasion from thence to drive him, as guilty of high treason, from the patriarchal see, and confine him, so long as he lived, to a monastery in Armenia called Bardi.

To him Leo substituted his own brother prince Stephen, who had then scarce completed the sixteenth year of his age. But as he had been ordained deacon by Photius, and all ordinations, performed by him, were declared null by the decrees of several popes, as well as by a decree of the eighth general council, and such as had received orders at his hands were rendered incapable of ever rising to a higher degree in the church, the emperor apprehended that the pope might insist on the observance of those canons, and not consent to the promotion of the new patriarch. Having therefore invited to a conference Stylianus, metropolitan of Neocesarea in Euphratesia, and with him all the bishops, presbyters, deacons, abbots, and clerks, who had suffered most for not acknowledging Photius, nor communicating with him, he addressed them thus: "I have, upon mature deliberation, driven that wicked man Photius from the patriarchal see, and happily put an end to the persecution you have suffered. I shall require none of you to communicate with him. On the contrary, I beg you will all communicate with my brother, that we may again become one flock. But he has been ordained deacon by Photius, whom the Romans have condemned, if you do not choose to acknowledge him without first consulting them, let us write jointly to the pope for his absolution in behalf of those whom Photius has ordained."²

The emperor wrote to the pope accordingly, and so did Stylianus, in the name of all the bishops, presbyters, &c. in the east, who communicated with Rome, begging his holiness to dispense with their ordaining the new patriarch contrary to the canons, and to forgive those, who, being imposed upon by the craft of the usurper Photius, had communicated with him upon the death

¹ Apud Baron. ad ann. 885.

¹ Porphyri. in Basili.

² Apud Baron. ad ann. 886.

The pope's answer to the emperor's letter. Charles the Gross dies;—[Year of Christ, 888.] Wido, duke of Spoleti, chosen emperor, and crowned at Rome;—[Year of Christ, 891.] Death of pope Stephen. His letters, and some of his actions.

of Ignatius. Stylianus in his letter (for that of the emperor has not reached our times) assures the pope that he had opposed the intrusion of Photius from the beginning; enumerates the many crimes, with which he twice opened himself a way to the patriarchal throne, reckoning among them the murder of his predecessor Ignatius; excuses those, who had communicated with him, as having been induced to it by the legates of the apostolic see, whom the emperor had, on the one hand, terrified with his menaces, and Photius, on the other, allured with his presents; declares, that to his certain knowledge not one of the many, who had communicated with Photius, had done so by choice, and closes his letter with the following words; "As we know that we are to be corrected, and reprimanded by your apostolic see, we humbly beseech you to deal mercifully with us, and receive those, who have gone astray, but repent and return to the fold; that by your means peace may be restored in our days to a church, that has been so long divided and rent into parties."

The pope, in his answer, not only approved of but expressed great satisfaction at the expulsion of Photius. However, observing no small disagreement between the emperor's letter and that of Stylianus, the emperor writing, that Photius had abdicated of his own accord to lead a solitary life, and Stylianus that he had been driven from his see, he would determine nothing with respect to the dispensation for which they applied; but desired that bishops might be sent by both parties, since he could not give sentence without hearing the one as well as the other. The emperor and the bishops, upon the receipt of the pope's letter, despatched legates to Rome, to give the pope a minute account of the expulsion of Photius and of every thing that had passed on that occasion. But as Stephen died before their arrival, we shall have occasion to speak of the success of this legation in the following pontificate.

In the mean time died in the month of January, 888, the emperor Charles the Gross, and, as he left no male issue, the Italian princes determined to choose a king of their own nation; but not being able to agree among themselves, some acknowledging Berengarius, duke of Friuli, and others Wido, duke of Spoleti, the whole country was divided into two opposite factions, and involved by that means in the utmost confu-

sion. The pope, siding at first with neither of the competitors, invited Arnulph, king of Germany, the natural son of Carloman, brother to the late emperor, into Italy, to take possession of that kingdom, and deliver the unhappy people from the calamities of a civil and destructive war. But Arnulph being then engaged in another war, the pope and the Romans declared for Wido, who, finding his party thus greatly strengthened, attacked Berengarius in the neighborhood of Placentia, and having gained a complete victory, made himself master of all Lombardy in 890, and going the following year to Rome, was there, on the 21st of February, crowned emperor by the pope with the usual solemnity.¹

The pope died, according to the most probable opinion, about the latter end of September of the same year, after a pontificate of nine years and fourteen days according to some, but only of nine days according to others. That Stephen governed the Roman church nine years, and should be called, not the VI., but the V. of that name, appears from his epitaph, which was still to be seen in the old porch of St. Peter's church in Manlius' time, as that writer informs us, and is as follows:

"Hic tumulus quinti sacrosos continet artus
Præsulis eximii pontificis Stephani;
Bis teruis annis populum qui rexit & urbem."

Several letters passed between this pope and Fulco of Reims, that are to be met with in Flodoard's history of that church. Lewis, the son of Boso, who had been chosen king of Burgundy and Provence, was indebted to pope Stephen for the kingdom which his father had possessed. For it was upon the pope's recommendation that the bishops crowned and anointed him king, though he was then only ten years of age; and we shall see him hereafter raised to the imperial throne. We have a sermon preached by this pope against the using of charms, and talking at church.² He forbade the keepers of St. Peter's church to exact, or even to accept any thing of those who said mass there; a custom which they had introduced, or rather revived in the pontificate of his predecessor. He is likewise said to have abolished several other abuses, which the preceding popes had connived at, and among the rest that of the ordeal by fire and hot water.

¹ Herman. Contract. ad ann. 890 Luitprand, l. i. Sigon. de reg. Italie, l. vi. Annal. Metens.

² Apud Baron. ad ann. 890.

Formosus raised to the pontifical chair. Is commended by several writers. Refuses the dispensation sued for by the emperor Leo in favor of his brother; who is, nevertheless, raised to the patriarchal throne. Council of Vienne;—[Year of Christ, 892.] The African bishops, divided among themselves, apply to Formosus. He espouses the cause of Charles the Simple against Odo;—Year of Christ, 893.]

FORMOSUS, THE HUNDRED AND TENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, *Emperor of the East.*—WIDO, LAMBERT, AND ARNULPHI, *Emperors of the West.*]

[Year of Christ 891.] In the room of Stephen was chosen Formosus, bishop of Porto, who had been so often excommunicated by John VIII., and even obliged to swear that he would never return to Rome, nor ever exercise any episcopal functions, but content himself with lay communion so long as he lived. But from this oath he was absolved by pope Marinus,¹ and upon the death of Stephen raised to the apostolic see from that of Porto, to which Marinus had restored him. He is the first that was translated from another see to that of Rome, the preceding popes having all been chosen from among the presbyters and deacons of that church. Formosus, though persecuted by pope John VIII. in the manner we have seen, is commended by Luitprand for the sanctity of his life and the knowledge of the Scripture,² and several other writers, who flourished at the same time, speak of him as one worthy, in every respect, of the high station to which he was raised. Luitprand supposes one Sergius, deacon of the Roman church, to have been chosen at the same time, but to have been driven from the see by the party of Formosus, the more powerful of the two.³ But that this schism happened on occasion of the election of John IX., and not of Formosus, shall be made to appear in the sequel.

The legates, sent by the emperor Leo and the eastern bishops, of whom I have spoken in the foregoing pontificate, arrived at Rome soon after the promotion of Formosus, and were received by him with all possible marks of respect and esteem. However he could not be prevailed upon to grant them their request, and allow those who had been ordained by Photius to keep their ranks in the church, or to be preferred to a higher degree, since their ordination had been declared null by the decrees of his predecessors, and those of a general council. All the envoys could obtain of him was, that such as had been ordained by Photius, and had communicated with him, should be admitted to lay communion, upon their acknowledging their fault, and asking pardon for it in writing. But the Greeks, to avoid the confusion that the deposing of all the bishops, priests, deacons, and other clerks whom Photius had ordained, would occasion in the church of Constantinople, thought it advisable to leave

them in their respective ranks, and communicate with them upon their condemning Photius, and owning they had done wrong in receiving ordination at his hands. Thus Stephen, the emperor's brother, though ordained deacon by Photius was acknowledged for lawful patriarch by all the bishops in the East, no regard being had by them to the decrees of the popes, forbidding those to be ever preferred to a higher rank, who had been admitted by him to any degree whatever in the church.¹

The following year Formosus appointed a council to meet at Vienne, in order to redress some abuses, that prevailed in the kingdom of Arles, and sent the two bishops John and Paschal to preside at it. By that council excommunications were thundered out against laymen, who should strike clerks, make them eunuchs, or any otherwise mutilate or maim them, should usurp lands belonging to the church, dispose of churches without the consent of the bishop of the diocese, or exact fees of those whom they presented to vacant benefices. By the same council ecclesiastics of all ranks were strictly enjoined to suffer no women in their houses.²

As the churches in Africa were no less divided among themselves than those in the East, the African bishops sent deputies to consult Formosus concerning the points that occasioned their division, entreating him to return them a full and speedy answer, and put an end, by that means, to the schism, that had long prevailed among them. What these points were, history does not inform us: but from a letter, written by the pope to Fulco of Reims at this very time, it appears, that, upon the arrival of the African deputies, he resolved to assemble a very numerous council at Rome, in order to advise with them what answer he should return. He appointed the council to meet in the month of May of the present year, and, in his letter to Fulco, desired him to repair to it without delay, that he might consult him at leisure.³ But the meeting of the council was afterwards put off till the first of March of the following year; and we have reason to believe, that it was not held even then, no mention being made of it by any writer of those days.

Formosus espoused with great zeal the

¹ See p. 293.

² Luitp. l. i. c. 8.

³ Luitp. l. i. c. 8.

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 428.

² Idem tom. ix. p. 434.

³ Flodoard, l. iv. c. 2.

Great revolutions in Italy ;—[Year of Christ, 894.] Arnulph, king of Germany, lays siege to Rome ;—[Year of Christ, 895.] The Romans yield and admit him into the city. He is crowned emperor by Formosus Oath taken by the Romans.

cause of Charles of France, surnamed the Simple, against Odo or Eudes, who upon the death of Lewis the Stammerer, that prince's father, had seized on the kingdom of Aquitaine and the country lying between the Seine and the Loire, and had been even anointed king of France by Walterius archbishop of Sens. We have several letters written by the pope on occasion of Odo's usurpation, some of them to Odo himself, exhorting him to restore to the lawful heir the countries which he had unjustly seized ; and some to the Gallican bishops, requiring them to interpose their good offices with the usurper, and divert him, if by any means they could, from kindling a war, whereof the issues are uncertain, in the bowels of the kingdom. But no regard was had by Odo either to the exhortations of the pope or the remonstrances of the bishops ; and Charles, though crowned king of all France by the archbishop of Reims on the 28th of January, 893, was, in 897, obliged to yield great part of that kingdom to his competitor, that is, the whole country from the Seine to the Pyrenees.¹ But Odo dying the following year, Charles was owned by all sole king of France ; and thus was that crown restored to the family of Charlemagne.

Great revolutions happened at the same time in Italy. The emperor Wido dying in 894, his son Lambert whom he had taken for his partner in the empire, was the same year crowned emperor by Formosus. But a most bloody war breaking out between him and Berengarius, who upon the death of Wido had revived his claim to the kingdom of Italy, the pope, to put an end to the calamities attending so destructive a war, invited Arnulph king of Germany to Rome, promising to crown him emperor, provided he drove out both the tyrants, and restored peace, with his victorious arms, to the harassed country. Arnulph readily complied with the invitation, and entering Italy at the head of a powerful army, made himself master of the whole country, now known by the name of Lombardy. But instead of pursuing his march to Rome, he unexpectedly turned his arms against Rudulph, who, upon the death of Lewis the Stammerer, had caused himself to be proclaimed king of Burgundy. However he re-entered Italy the following year, but found, on his arrival at Rome, the gates shut, and the city walls defended by a numerous garrison, Agiltruda, mother of the emperor Lambert, having shut herself up in the place with the flower of the imperial troops. As her party prevailed in the city, the pope could afford no assistance to the king of Germany, being himself kept, in a manner, prisoner by Agiltruda and her friends, determined to stand a siege and de-

fend the place to the last extremity. Arnulph therefore attacked first the Leonine city with his whole army, flattering himself that he should carry it by assault. But he met with a vigorous resistance, and was repulsed with no small loss. He resolved to renew the attack the next day : but in the mean time an odd accident put him in possession of the place, without any blood being shed on the one side or the other. A hare, starting up among the troops as they were preparing for the assault, and running towards the city, the soldiers pursued it with loud shouts ; and the besieged, imagining they were advancing thus undauntedly to the assault, were seized with a panic, fled from the walls in the utmost confusion, and could by no means be prevailed upon by their commanders to return to their posts. Arnulph, perceiving the walls were abandoned on all sides, laid hold of the opportunity, as favorable as unexpected, and marching that moment up to the walls, took the place by escalade without the loss of a single man. Arnulph, now master of the Leonine city, was preparing to attack the other part of the city separated from this by the Tiber. But in the mean time the senate and the nobility submitted to the conqueror, came out in a body with their standards and crosses to receive him, and implore his protection against the insults of his victorious army.

The pope, now set at liberty, received the king upon the steps of St. Peter's church, and attending him, with the whole body of the clergy, to the tomb of the apostle, he anointed and crowned him emperor that very day. The next day the new emperor having ordered the heads of the Roman people to meet in the church of St. Paul, obliged them to take the following oath of allegiance : " I swear by all these holy mysteries, that, saving my honor, my law, and the fidelity I owe to my lord pope Formosus, I am, and shall be faithful all the days of my life to the emperor Arnulph ; that I shall never join any man against him ; that I shall never assist Lambert, the son of Agiltruda, nor Agiltruda ; and that I shall never deliver, nor be any ways accessory to the delivering of the city of Rome to either of them, or to any of their party." As Agiltruda had the good luck to make her escape, and had thrown herself into the city of Spoleti, Arnulph, having appointed Euroid governor of Rome, left that city after a short stay there of fifteen days, and taking with him Constantine and Stephen, two leading men in the senate, who had distinguished themselves by their attachment to Lambert, marched to Spoleti with a design to lay siege to that city ; but, being taken ill on his march, he dropped that design, and returned to Bavaria.

Upon his retreat the war was rekindled

¹ Flodoard, l. iv. c. 2. Annal. Metens.

Lambert and Berengarius divide, by agreement, the kingdom of Italy;—[Year of Christ, 896.] Death of Formosus and his character. Letter or bull of this pope to king Edward of England a manifest forgery. Boniface, a man of a most infamous character. Dies soon after his election.

and what he writes is confirmed by Flodoard commending this pope for his chastity, his sobriety, his generosity to the poor, his zeal in propagating the Gospel, &c. His words are

Præsul hic egregius Formosus laudibus altis
Evehitur, castus, parvus sibi, largus egenis.
Bulgaricæ genti fidei qui semina sparsit,
Delubra destruxit, populum celestibus armis
Instruxit, tolerans discrimina plurima : promptus
Exemplum tribuens ut sint adversa ferenda,
Et bene viventi metuenda incommoda nulla.¹

However we shall soon see this pope's body taken out of the grave, most barbarously insulted, and thrown ignominiously into the Tiber.

In the same year 896, and on Easter-day, which fell that year on the fourth of April, died pope Formosus, after a pontificate of four years and six months.² Luitprand speaks of him as a man truly religious, and well versed in the sacred writings.³ Fulco, archbishop of Reims, a prelate no less conspicuous for his piety and learning than his high birth, being descended from Charlemagne, and first cousin to the emperor Wido, looked upon the election of Formosus as a mark of the church being under the immediate protection of heaven;⁴ Auxilius, who lived at this time, writes, that he drank no wine, that he never tasted meat, and that he died a virgin in the 80th year of his age;

As for the letter or bull said by Malmshury² to have been sent by Formosus to king Edward, the son of Alfred, excommunicating him and interdicting his kingdom till several bishoprics, that had lain vacant seven years, were filled up, it is, without all doubt, a forged piece, nothing being more certain than that Formosus died in 896, and Edward did not come to the crown till the year 900. Besides no notice is taken of this excommunication either by the author of the Saxon Chronicle, or by Asserius, who lived at this very time, and would not, we may very well suppose, have passed over in silence so remarkable an event.

BONIFACE VI., HUNDRED AND ELEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, *Emperor of the East*.—LAMBERT AND ARNULPH, *Emperors of the West*.]

[Year of Christ 896.] Formosus was succeeded by Boniface, the sixth of that name, a man, even according to Baronius, of a most infamous character.⁵ He was a Roman, the son of Hadrian, and had been deposed, for his wicked and scandalous life, first from the rank of subdeacon, and afterwards from the priesthood, as appears from the acts of a council held under Pope John IX.⁶ He is said by the continuator of the annals of Fulda, who lived at this time, to

have died of the gout at the end of fifteen days. As he held the see so short a time, and intruded himself into it by open force, Baronius and after him some other writers, have not allowed him a place among the popes. But he is reckoned among them, and placed by the abovementioned annalist, as well as by Flodoard, between Formosus and Stephen VI. or VII.

Hinc subit ad modicum vates Bonifacius alnus.
Ter quinos hic in arce dies explevit honoris, &c.

says Flodoard.³

¹ Annal. Fuld. et Metens. Herman. Contract. Luitprand. l. i. c. 8.

² Annal. Fuld. Herman. Contract.

³ Luitp. l. i. c. 8. ⁴ Flodoard, l. iv. c. 1.

⁵ Baron. ad ann. 897. ⁶ Apud Baron. ad ann. 904.

¹ Apud Mabill. *Secl. iii. Benedic. par. 2.*

² Malmsh. de Gest. Reg. Ang. l. ii.

³ Flod. in Fragment. de Pontif. Rom.

Stephen intrudes himself into the see. Condemnation and barbarous treatment of Formosus. His ordinations declared null. Stephen reverses the decree of Hadrian III. relating to the consecration of the pope.

STEPHEN VI. OR VII. THE HUNDRED AND TWELFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, *Emperor of the East*.—LAMBERT AND ARNULPH, *Emperors of the West*.]

[Year of Christ 896.] Stephen VI. or VII. a native of Rome, and a son of a presbyter named John, intruded himself, to use the expression of Baronius, into the see, in the room of the intruder Boniface. That he was in possession of the see before the 20th of August 896, is manifest from a rescript or bull issued by him in favor of Arnulph archbishop of Narbonne, and dated 20th of August, fourteenth indiction, that is, in the year 896.¹ From the same rescript it appears, that Stephen at first acknowledged Arnulph for emperor, the said bull or rescript bearing date, the first year of the empire of the great emperor Arnulph crowned by God. But from a charter which he granted to a monastery in France, we learn, that, forsaking Arnulph, he soon after sided with Lambert, that charter being dated, in the reign of our most pious emperor Lambert, fifteenth indiction, which indiction commenced at Rome, on the first of September 896.²

The barbarous and unprecedented treatment, that the dead body of his predecessor Formosus met with from this pope, reflects greater disgrace on his memory, than his having intruded himself by force and violence into the see. For actuated with an unparalleled rage against that pope, he resolved to try him after his death; and having assembled a council at Rome for that purpose, he ordered the body of the dead pontiff to be taken out of the grave, to be brought before them, and to be placed in his episcopal robes on the pontifical chair. Having then appointed him a deacon for his counsel, he addressed the dead body thus; "Why didst thou, being bishop of Porto, prompted by thy ambition usurp the universal see of Rome?" What the mock counsel answered we know not, but Stephen, with the approbation and consent of all the bishops who were present, pronounced Formosus, heretofore bishop of Porto, guilty of the charge, viz. of intruding himself, by unlawful means into the apostolic see; and he was thereupon stript of the pontifical ornaments, three of his fingers were cut off (those, probably, with which the popes used to bless people in those days, as they still do in ours) and the body was cast into the Tiber. It was at the same time declared by the pope and his council, that Formosus could confer no orders, and therefore that they, who had received them

at his hands, should be ordained anew.¹ They pretended that a bishop could, in no case whatever, forsake his first see, as a man could in no case forsake his lawful wife, and marry another in her room, wresting to that purpose the words of St. Paul, "a bishop must be the husband of one wife:" and from thence they concluded, that a bishop, by passing from one see to another, forfeited all his power, and could therefore perform no episcopal functions. But this doctrine, though defined by pope Stephen in a council, and consequently *ex cathedra*, has been long since condemned by his successors, many of them, and the present pope among the rest, having been translated, as Formosus was, from other sees to that of Rome. The implacable hatred that Stephen bore to Formosus was owing, according to Platina,² to his having traversed his wicked designs, and prevented him from being chosen at a former election. But Hermannus Contractus ascribes it to his zeal for the emperor Lambert, and aversion to Arnulph, whom Formosus had invited to Rome, and crowned emperor.³

As dreadful disorders had happened in Rome at the election of a new pope ever since the decree of Hadrian III. took place, whereby it was enacted, that the elect should be ordained or consecrated without waiting for the imperial envoys, the emperor Lambert, sensible how much it concerned him to have the pope on his side, took occasion from thence to persuade Stephen to reverse the decree of Hadrian, and confirm, by a new one, that of Eugene II. forbidding the new pope to be ordained till his election was approved by the emperor, and deputies were sent to assist in his name at the ceremony of his consecration.⁴ The decree Stephen issued is quoted by Gratian in the following words: "As the holy Roman church, in which we preside by the appointment of God, suffers great violence from many at the death of the pontiff, owing to the custom which has been introduced of consecrating the elect without waiting for the approbation of the emperor, or the arrival of his envoys to assist at his ordination, and prevent, with their presence, all tumults and disorders, we command the bishops and the clergy to meet when a new pontiff is to be chosen, and the election to be made in the

¹ Luitprand, l. i. c. 8.

² Platina, in Steph. VI.

³ Herman. Contract. ad ann. 896.

⁴ See p. 203.

¹ Comment. Languedoc. p. 773.

² Apud Dather. Spicileg. tom. 3.

Stephen is thrown into a dungeon and strangled. Romanus chosen. Said to have declared the proceedings against Formosus to be null. His death;—[Year of Christ, 898.]

presence of the senate and the people; but let the elect be consecrated in the presence of the imperial envoy.¹

Stephen held the see but a short time, according to some, one year one month and twenty-eight days; according to others, one year and three months; and according to some, one year one month and nineteen days. But all we know for certain is, that he was in possession of the see before the 20th of August 896, as has been shown above, and that Romanus, his immediate successor, held it in October 897, a letter, bull, or rescript of that pope, dated the Ides of October, first indiction, or year of Christ 897, having reached our times. Stephen

was driven from the see, was thrown into a dungeon and strangled there, as we learn from his epitaph found in the ruins of the ancient church of St. Peter, and published by Manlius in the pontificate of Alexander III.¹ Who were the authors of his death history does not inform us; but Baronius himself owns, that he richly deserved the doom that overtook him. He had entered the fold, says the annalist, like a thief; and just it was that he should die by the halter.² Flodoard mentions a letter from this pope to Fulco of Reims, inviting him to a council, which he proposed to assemble at Rome.³ But of this council no notice is taken by any other writer.

ROMANUS, THE HUNDRED AND THIRTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THE PHILOSOPHER *Emperor of the East.*—LAMBERT AND ARNULPH, *Emperors of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 897.] Stephen being driven from the see, Romanus, a native of Galliesium, and the son of Constantine, was preferred to it in his room. We have two letters of this pope, both beginning with these words, "Romanus, bishop, servant of the servants of God," and both dated in the month of October, the first indiction, which commenced in Rome on the first of September, 897.² Romanus is said by Platina, and after him by Ciaconius and Oldwinus, to have annulled the acts of his predecessor Stephen, and declared his proceedings against Formosus unjust and illegal. But of that no notice is taken by any of the more ancient writers. Romanus enjoyed his dignity, according to Martinus Polonus, and some catalogues, only three months and twenty-two days, and with them Flodoard agrees, speaking of Romanus thus:

"Post hunc luce brevi Romani regmina surgunt.
Quatuor haud plenos tractans is culmina menses
Æthere suscipitur, meritis sortitus honores."¹

If he held the see but three months and twenty-two days, he must have died about

the end of January, 898. The words "Æthere suscipitur," &c. show him to have been a man of a different character from his predecessor.

¹ The epitaph is as follows:

Hoc Stephani papæ clauduntur membra locello:

Sextus dictus erat ordine quippe patrum.

Hic primum repulit formosi spurca superbi

Crimina, qui invasit sedis apostolicæ

Concilium instituit, præsedet pastor, et ipse

Leges satis fessis jura dedit famulis.

Cumque pater multum certaret dogmate sancto,

Captus et a sede pulsus ad ima fuit

Carceris interea vinclis constrictus, et uno

Strangulatus nervo, exiit et hominem [num

Post decimumque regens sedem cum transtulit an-

Sergius huc papa, funera sacra colens.

From the last distich it appears, that pope Sergius (namely, III.) translated the body of this pope, from the place where it was interred before, to the church of St. Peter, and that this happened ten years after his death, or in 907. What is said in this epitaph agrees with what we read in Flodoard, who speaks of Stephen VI. the present pope, thus:

Tum sextus Stephanus sacra regimina culmine carpit,

Durus qui nostris, propriis at durior instat.

Sæva quidem legat vivis, truciora sepultis

Fuleonemque mircis, formosum concutit actis

Concilium gregat infæstum, cui præsidet atrox:

Prædecessorem abiciens, ponensque patronum,

Visus ab hinc meritis dignam incurrisse ruinam,

Carpus et ipse, sacraque abjectus æde, tenebris

Carceris injicitur, vinclisque innectitur atris,

Et suffocatum crudo premit ultio letho.—(In Frag. de

Pont. Ron.)

² Bar. ad ann. 900. ³ Flod. Hist. Rem. l. iv. c. 4 et 6.

¹ Gratian, Distinct. 33. c. 28.

² Baluz, in Append. ad Marcam Hispanic. n. 58, &c.

Theodore annuls the acts of Stephen against Formosus, and restores his body to its sepulchre. His death and character. John elected. Berengarius obliges the pope to crown him emperor. Council of Rome annuls the acts of that held by Stephen against Formosus. Other decrees of this council. Council of Ravenna.

THEODORE II., THE HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, *Emperor of the East*.—LAMBERT AND ARNULPH, *Emperors of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 898.] Romanus was succeeded by Theodore, the second of that name. He was a native of Rome, the son of one Photius, and held the see but twenty days. However, he reinstated, in his short pontificate, those in their ranks, whom Formosus had ordained, and Stephen had deposed, caused the body of that pope to be taken out of the Tiber, and declaring all his acts to be legal and valid, restored him with

great solemnity to his sepulchre in the Vatican.¹ Luitprand writes, that upon the dead body being carried into the church it was saluted, as many Romans informed him, by all the images of the saints there.² Theodore is commended by Flodoard for his temperance, his chastity, his liberality to the poor, and is said to have been a lover of peace, and greatly beloved by the clergy.³

JOHN IX., THE HUNDRED AND FIFTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, *Emperor of the East*.—LAMBERT AND ARNULPH, *Emperors of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 898.] In the room of Theodore was chosen Sergius, presbyter of the Roman church; but the party of John prevailing, Sergius was driven out of Rome before his consecration, and his rival preferred to the see vacant by his flight. John was a native of Tibur or Tivoli, the son of Rampoald, a deacon and monk of the Benedictine order.¹ Soon after his election Berengarius, appearing unexpectedly before Rome at the head of a numerous army, obliged the new pope to crown him emperor. But he was no sooner gone, than the pope declared in a council, which he assembled on that occasion, the coronation of Berengarius null and illegal, as having been extorted by force, and acknowledged Lambert alone for lawful emperor. By the same council the acts of that held under Stephen against Formosus were annulled: those whom Formosus had ordained were restored to their ranks in the church, as having been unjustly degraded; the acts of Stephen's council were condemned to the flames; but they were forgiven who had assisted at that sacrilegious assembly, upon their owning their fault and begging for mercy. Twelve canons were issued by this council, and the four following among the rest: 1. That though Formosus had been translated from the see of Porto to that of Rome, on account of his extraordinary merit, no man should presume, for the future, to pass from one church to another, they being excluded by the canons from lay communion, even at the point of

death, who transgress therein. 2. That they, who had violated the sepulchre of Formosus, and dragged his body to the Tiber, should not be admitted to the communion of the church till they performed the penance imposed upon them for so heinous a crime. 3. That the new pope should be consecrated in the presence of the imperial envoys. Thus was the decree issued by Stephen VI., as has been related above, confirmed by the present council; and it is here repeated word for word. 4. That none should dare, upon the death of the pope, to plunder the patriarchal palace, on pain of incurring the censures of the church, and the indignation of the emperor; and this prohibition extended to the houses of all bishops, the custom of plundering them when the bishops died prevailing at this time all over Italy.

In the same year, 898, the pope convened another council at Ravenna, at which were present seventy-four bishops, and the emperor Lambert in person. By this council the acts of that which I have just mentioned, were all confirmed; and it was, besides, decreed that the regulations of the fathers, and the capitulars of the emperors Charlemagne, Lewis I., Lotharius, and Lewis II., concerning tythes should be strictly observed, and excommunications were thundered out against all who transgressed them. When the council was ended, the pope represented to the emperor the deplorable state to which the

¹ Sigebert, in Chron. Flod. in Frag. de Rom. Pont. Auxil. l. ii. c. 2.

² Luitprand, l. i. c. 8. ³ Flod. *ibid*.

¹ Flod. *ubi supra*.

John dies. His writings. Will not allow the bishops in the east to communicate with those whom Photius had ordained. Approves an election which his predecessor had disapproved. His answer to the archbishop of Reims concerning the wickedness of the Normans who had embraced Christianity. Letter from the bishops of Germany to the pope

Roman church was reduced, not having, he said, wherewithal to relieve the poor, nor even to pay the salaries of her clerks and other ministers. He then exhorted the bishops to discharge their duty, not like hirelings, but true pastors, and to order a fast and procession, upon their return to their respective sees, for the preservation of the emperor Lambert, the exaltation of the church, and the extinguishing of all schism and discord in the state, as well as in the church.¹ Flodoard speaks of a third council assembled by this pope, and mention is likewise made of it in his epitaph.² But the acts of that assembly have not reached our times.

John IX., held the see, according to the most probable opinion, two years and fifteen days, and must consequently have died about the beginning of August, 900, it being manifest from some of his letters, that he was in possession of the see in July, 898. Of this pope we have four letters, namely, one to Stylianus, metropolitan of Cæsarea, another to the clergy and people of Langres, the third to Charles the Simple, king of France, and the fourth to Heriveus, archbishop of Reims. Stylianus, who had all along adhered to the patriarch Ignatius, and had, on that account, been driven from his see, and most cruelly persecuted by Photius, wrote to John, begging he would allow him, and the other bishops in the East, to communicate with those, whom Photius had ordained; which, he said, would restore the so long and so much wished for peace to the patriarchal church of Constantinople. The pope, in his answer, commended the metropolitan for his attachment to the holy Roman church his mother, but at the same time declared, that he inviolably adhered, and ever would, to the decrees of his predecessors, excommunicating all, who communicated with those whom the usurper Photius had preferred to any rank whatever in the church; since none could communicate with them without owning them to have been lawfully ordained, and Photius, who ordained them, to have been lawful patriarch. But Stylianus, consulting the peace of the church of Constantinople, did not acquiesce in the pope's answer, nor did the other bishops in the East. They all agreed among themselves not only to communicate with those whom Photius had ordained, but to leave them in the ranks to which he had preferred them. And thus was, at length, an end put to the schism, that had divided the eastern churches for the space of near forty years.

The pope in his letter to the clergy and people of Langres, declares Argrim to have been lawfully elected to that see, though his predecessor (Stephen V.) had disapproved of his election as illegal, and ordered another to be preferred to that see in his room. "I do not condemn the judgment given by my predecessor," says the pope in this letter, "but only alter it for the better, being authorized therein by the example of several other pontiffs." John did not, it seems, think himself bound to adhere to the decisions of his predecessors, right or wrong; and he would have found it no easy task to alledge several instances of popes acting so just a part. The pope wrote, at the same time, to Charles of France, entreating him to favor the restoration of Argrim, who had been canonically elected, and was deservedly esteemed and beloved by his people.

The pope's fourth letter is addressed to Heriveus, archbishop of Reims, who had been substituted in that see to Fulco barbarously murdered by the command of Baldwin II., count of Flanders. Heriveus had applied to the pope to know how he should treat the Normans, who, after embracing the Christian religion, continued to lead the same life as they had led before their conversion, namely, to murder Christians, and even priests, to sacrifice to idols, and eat the meats, which they had offered to their false gods. The pope, after congratulating the archbishop upon the conversion of those infidels (such a conversion as that of the savages in the Indies by the Jesuits and other popish missionaries,) answers, that if they, who are guilty of such enormities are newly converted, and not sufficiently instructed in the doctrines and principles of Christianity, he must not proceed against them according to the rigor of the canons; but if they are not novices in the Christian religion, if they are sensible of the heinousness of their crimes, and desire to atone for them, they may be made to undergo the penance prescribed by the canons.

We have two letters from the bishops of Germany to this pope, both worthy of particular notice. The emperor Arnulph dying in December, 899, his son Lewis, at that time but seven years old, was acknowledged, the following year, by the German lords for lawful heir to the crown of Germany. On this occasion Hatto, archbishop of Mentz, wrote to the pope in his own name and in that of his suffragans, to acquaint him with the death of Arnulph their king, and the election of his son Lewis, whom, he says, they had chosen with one voice, agreeably to the ancient custom, that obtained among them, of keeping the crown in the same line. He then begs the pope to excuse their having done so without his permission, as it

¹ Sigon. de reg. Italiæ, l. vi. Rubens Hist. Raven. l. v. Sigebert. in Chron. Vincen. Bellovac. in Specul. Hist.

² For we read there the following lines:

"Johannes meritis qui fulsit in ordine nous
Inter apostolicos quem vexit altitonans
Conciliis docuit ternis qui dogma salutis, &c.

Letter from the archbishop of Saltzburg, finding fault with the pope's conduct. Character of the popes of the tenth century. Benedict elected.

was impossible for them to send deputies to Rome, the roads being all infested by the barbarians, masters of the country between them and Italy. But as they had, at last, found an opportunity of conveying a letter to his holiness, they entreated him to confirm with his blessing what they had done. In the next place they lay before the pope the complaints of their brethren, the bishops of Bavaria, against the Slavonians, who, having revolted from the French, and seized on Moravia, had withdrawn themselves from the jurisdiction of the bishops of Bavaria, pretending to have a metropolitan of their own; and besides accused the Bavarians to his holiness, as if they had entered into an alliance with the pagans (the Hungarians) and acted in concert with them. Hatto assures the pope, that this charge has not the least foundation in truth, and represents to him, at the same time, the evils that will inevitably attend his allowing the Moravians to withdraw themselves from all subjection to the bishops of Bavaria; since they will be thereby encouraged to affect an independency in the state as well as in the church, and revolting anew to rekindle the war.¹

The other letter was written to pope John by Theotmar, archbishop of Saltzburg, in the name of all the bishops of Bavaria, as well as of the clergy and the people. This pope had appointed one archbishop and three bishops in the country of the Moravians, which, till his time, had no bishop, but was under the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Saltzburg. Of this Theotmar and

the other bishops of Bavaria loudly complain in their letter, charging the pope with acting therein contrary to the known laws of the church, and the decrees of his predecessors Leo and Celestine, which they quote. They even insinuate, as if his holiness had been prevailed upon by dint of money to erect those new bishoprics, and exempt the Moravians from all subjection to the see of Saltzburg, though they had been subject to it ever since their conversion to Christianity. The Moravians had prejudiced the pope against the Bavarians as joined in confederacy with the Hungarians, who broke into Germany and Italy at this time, and committed every where unheard of barbarities, murdering priests, burning churches and monasteries, and carrying all, without distinction of sex or age, into captivity, who had the misfortune to fall into their hands. In answer to this charge the Bavarian bishops assure the pope, that their country has suffered as much by the irruption of the Hungarians as any other; that they have lent those barbarians no kind of assistance whatever; but, on the contrary, would have readily made peace with the Moravians, in order to attack them, as a common enemy, with their united forces; but that the Moravians, far from hearkening to any terms of peace, had joined the Hungarians against their Christian brethren, and treated them with the same cruelty.¹ What answer the pope returned to this letter we know not, nor whether he returned any. But of these new bishoprics, no further mention occurs in history.

BENEDICT IV., THE HUNDRED AND SIXTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, *Emperor of the East.*—LEWIS III. *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 900.] We enter now upon the tenth century, which we may well call, after Baronius, "an iron age barren of all goodness, a leaden age abounding with all wickedness, and a dark age, remarkable, above all the rest, for the scarcity of writers, and men of learning."² In this century," continues the annalist, "the abomination of desolation was seen in the temple of the Lord; and in the see of St. Peter, revered by the angels, were placed the most wicked of men, not pontiffs, but monsters. And how hideous was the face of the Roman church, when filthy and impudent whores governed all at Rome, changed sees at their pleasure, disposed of bishoprics, and intruded their gallants and their bullies into the see of St.

Peter. No mention was then made of the clergy electing or consenting, the canons were trod under foot, the decrees of the popes were despised, the ancient traditions turned out of doors, and the old customs, sacred rites, and former method of choosing popes quite laid aside. The church was then without a pope, but not without a head, its spiritual head (Christ) never abandoning it." If the church subsisted so long without any other head but Christ, what necessity is there for any other head? If it had no visible head for so long a time, the so much boasted succession was evidently interrupted. Other historians speak in the same strain of the popes who were preferred to the Roman see in those unhappy times.

¹ Tom. ix. Concil. p. 498. ² Bar. ad ann. 900.

¹ Tom. ix. Concil. p. 498.

Benedict restores the bishop of Langres to his see. Lewis, the son of Boso, king of Arles, crowned emperor by Benedict, and not by his predecessor. Death of Benedict;—[Year of Christ, 903.]

However, we meet with some good men among them, and in that number we may reckon Benedict IV. the immediate successor of John IX. He was a native of Rome, the son of Mommolus, come of an illustrious family, and greatly esteemed by the Roman nobility, as well as by the people and the clergy. All we know for certain concerning the time of his election is, that he was chosen and ordained before the thirtieth of August of the present year 900, a letter, which he wrote to the bishops of France, bearing that date.

Benedict had scarce taken possession of the see when deputies arrived at Rome, sent by Argrim, of whom I have spoken in the foregoing pontificate, to inform him that the clergy and people of Langres had unanimously chosen him for their bishop, that he had been ordained by Aurelian, archbishop of Lions, and his suffragans, and had governed that church for the space of two years and upwards, but had been driven from it by a powerful faction, and was not yet restored, though his election had been approved by the late pope, and declared entirely agreeable to the canons. On this occasion the pope assembled a council in the Lateran, and the bishops, who composed it, being all to a man of opinion that Argrim had been unjustly driven from the see of Langres, the pope wrote to the Gallican bishops, and, at the same time, to the clergy and people of Langres, to acquaint them with the decision of the council, and recommend to them the execution of the decree they had issued. Argrim was accordingly reinstated in his see, and governed that church quite undisturbed till the year 911, when he resigned his dignity to embrace a monastic life. The two letters written by the pope on this occasion, are dated the 30th of August, in the first year of lord Benedict, pope, the second after the death of the emperor Laudebert or Lambert, the third indiction, that is in the year of Christ 900.¹ From the date of these letters it is manifest that the emperor Lambert died in 898. Some ascribe his death to a fall from his horse; but others suppose him to have been murdered by Hugh, the son of Magnifred, count of Milan, who had been beheaded by his order. The emperor Arnulph died the following year, 899. Berengarius was still living; but as his coronation had been declared null by the preceding pope, no notice is taken in the date of either of those letters of him or the years of his empire.

As the pope did not acknowledge Berengarius for lawful emperor, several Italian lords, and among the rest Adelbert, marquis

of Tuscany, the most powerful of them all, invited, no doubt, with the approbation of the pope, Lewis, the son of Boso, late king of Arles, into Italy to take the imperial crown, promising to assist him to the utmost of their power against Berengarius. Lewis readily complied with the invitation, but Berengarius, the more skilful commander of the two, found means to surround his army on all sides, upon his first entering Italy, so that he could neither advance or retire, and was, at the same time, cut off from all communication with the country around him. In these straits Lewis offered to withdraw his troops, to quit Italy and return to his own kingdom, provided he was allowed to retire unmolested. Berengarius insisted on his promising upon oath never thenceforth to set foot in Italy. That oath Lewis took, but soon forgot it, and returned the very next year, 899, at the head of a very numerous and powerful army. Thus was a bloody war kindled in Italy between the two competitors. But Lewis prevailing in the end, drove Berengarius quite out of Italy, and entering Rome in triumph, was crowned with the usual solemnity by the pope.¹

Some, and among the rest Baronius, will have Lewis to have been crowned emperor by the preceding pope John IX. But from the letters of the present pope, quoted above, it is manifest that he was raised to the pontifical dignity before the 30th of August, 900; and we have a diploma of the emperor Lewis, dated February, fourth indiction, or 901, in the first year of the empire of our lord Lewis, crowned by the most holy and thrice most blessed pontiff and universal pope Benedict,² Lewis therefore was crowned by Benedict after the 30th of August, 900, and before the end of February, 901. I said, after the 30th of August, for the two letters quoted above, are dated the 30th of August, the second year after the death of the emperor Lambert; a plain proof this, that Lewis was not at that time yet crowned emperor, else the year of his empire would have been marked.

Benedict died, according to the most probable opinion, about the beginning of October, 903, having presided in the Roman church three years and two months. We learn from his epitaph,³ and from Flodoard,⁴ that he was a kind father to the widows, the poor, and the orphans, cherishing them like his own children, and that he preferred the public to his private good.

¹ Luitp. l. ii. c. 10. Regino in Chronic.

² Florentinus de rebus ad Mathildem Spectantibus l. iii. p. 114. apud Pagi ad ann. 950.

³ Apud Baron. ad ann. 907.

⁴ Flod. in Frag. de Pont. Rom.

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 511.

Leo chosen, driven from his see, and thrown into prison. Christopher intrudes himself into the see. Is shut up in a dungeon by Sergius and dies. Sergius usurps the see;—[Year of Christ, 904.] His character.

LEO V., THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, *Emperor of the East*.—LEWIS III., *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 903.] To Benedict was substituted Leo, the sixth of that name; a native of Ardea. But he was soon driven out by one of his own priests named Christopher, and thrown into prison, where he died of grief, as we read in Signonius. In some Catalogues he is said to have held the see thirty days, in others forty, and in some

one month and twenty-six, or twenty-seven days. All we know for certain is, that Christopher was possessed of the pontifical dignity in the month of December of the present year, 903. Flodoard says no more of this pope than that he died before the end of two lunar months.

CHRISTOPHER, THE HUNDRED AND EIGHTEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, *Emperor of the East*.—LEWIS III., *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 903.] Christopher, the successor of Leo, was by birth a Roman, and the son of one Leo. All we know of him is, that he intruded himself into the see by open force and violence, that he treated his predecessor with great barbarity, and confirmed all the privileges, that his predecessors had granted to the famous abbey of Corbie. The diploma, confirming those privileges, is dated, the seventh of the calends of January, the seventh indiction, that is, the twenty-fifth of December, 903, in the reign of our most pious emperor Lewis.¹ Christopher, therefore, had seized on the see before the twenty-fifth of December of the

present year. But he held it, as we read in Martinus Polonus, in Flodoard, and in most of the catalogues, only six, or at most seven months, being driven from it by Sergius, who first confined him to a monastery, and afterwards shut him up in a dungeon, where he died of the hardships which he underwent.¹ Manlius supposes him to have been buried in the Vatican, and the following epitaph, that was found in the ruins of the ancient church, to be his :

Hic pia Christopheri requiescunt membra sepulti.
but one would think the epithet *pious* could scarce be bestowed upon him, or upon his bones.

SERGIUS III., THE HUNDRED AND NINETEENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, *Emperor of the East*.—LEWIS III., *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 904.] Christopher being driven from the see, Sergius, the third of that name, a native of Rome, the son of Benedict, and presbyter of the Roman church, intruded himself into it in his room. He was chosen upon the death of Theodore II., as has been related above, but obliged by the more powerful party of John IX., to quit Rome before his ordination, and lie concealed for the space of seven years, that is from the year 898 to 904, when the faction of Adelbert, Marquis of Tuscany, who had

espoused his cause, prevailing, he returned, drove out Christopher, and placed himself on the chair in his room.² "He was," says Baronius, "the slave of every vice, and the most wicked of men."³ In these unhappy times lived, and, in a manner, reigned at Rome the celebrated Theodora and her two daughters Marozia and Theodora. They were of a senatorial family, and no less famous for their beauty, their wit and address, than infamous for the scandalous lives they

¹ Ciacon. Marian. Scot. &c.

² Flodoard. ubi supra, et epitaph. apud Mantium.

³ Bar. ad ann. 908.

Some of Sergius' actions. His death;—[Year of Christ, 911.] Anastasius. Letter from the patriarch of Constantinople to the pope, concerning third and fourth marriages.

led. Marozia cohabited with Adelbert, Marquis of Tuscany, who having seized on the castle Sant Angelo, delivered it up to her, and from thence she, her mother and her sister, supported by the marquis and his party, governed Rome without control, and disposed of the holy see to whom they pleased. Adelbert had a son by Marozia named Alberic, but she nevertheless prostituted herself to the pope, and his holiness had by her a son called John, whom we shall soon see raised to the papal chair, by the interest of his mother.¹

Sergius is said to have granted the pall to the archbishop of Cologne,² and to have exempted the church of Hambourgh, or Bremen, from all subjection to that see.³ He rebuilt, decorated, and enriched with many valuable presents the Lateran church, which had stood, says John the deacon, ever since the time of Constantine the great, but fell in the pontificate of Stephen VI.⁴ The deacon speaks favorably of this pope, and, if we believe what we read in his epitaph, he was unjustly driven from the see by John IX. and resumed the pontifical dignity at the earnest desire of the Roman people. But all the writers, who lived the nearest to those times, speak of pope Sergius III. as a man abandoned to all manner of vice, and the most wicked of men. However, we read of a solemn embassy sent to him by Leo, emperor of the east, on the following occasion: The emperor had married three

wives; but as they had all proved barren, he resolved to marry a fourth, named Zoe, by whom he had, in his first wife's life-time, a son called Constantine. As third and fourth marriages were forbidden in the Greek church, Nicholas, then patriarch, not only refused to perform the marriage ceremony, but deposed the presbyter who performed it, and would not allow the emperor to enter the church. Hereupon Leo applied to the pope; and Sergius, not satisfied with approving of his marriage, there being no law in the Latin church forbidding a man to marry as many wives as he pleases, despatched legates to Constantinople solemnly to confirm the marriage which the emperor had contracted. The patriarch, however, continued to oppose it as unlawful and null, nor could he ever be prevailed upon to acknowledge Constantine for lawful heir to the imperial crown. His obstinacy, or rather his strict observance of the laws of his church, provoked the emperor to such a degree, that he sent him into exile, and raised Euthymius, his syncellus, to the patriarchal see in his room.¹

Sergius enjoyed the pontifical dignity seven years and three months, as we read in Hermannus Contractus, Martinus Polonus, and most of the catalogues. As he was therefore ordained, about the beginning of June 904, his death must have happened about the latter end of August 911.

ANASTASIUS III., THE HUNDRED AND TWENTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[LEO THE PHILOSOPHER, ALEXANDER, *Emperors of the East*.—LEWIS III., *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 911.] Sergius was succeeded by Anastasius III., by birth a Roman, and the son of one Lucian. The only thing we know of him, that deserves any notice, is, that at the request of Berengarius, king of Italy, he sent many rich ornaments to the church of Pavia, and granted to the bishop of that city the use of a canopy the privilege of riding a white horse with the cross carried before him, and of sitting in all councils at the pope's left hand.⁵ Ciaconius adds, upon whose authority I know not, that he repaired the church of St. Hadrian, that was ready to fall, and there consecrated an altar of his own erecting.

To this pope Nicholas of Constantinople

wrote a long letter to acquaint him with what had passed between him and the emperor on occasion of that prince's fourth marriage. The emperor finding, according to his account, that he could by no means prevail upon him to authorize his incontinence, ordered him to be seized at a grand entertainment, to which he had invited him, to be conveyed from thence on board a vessel and carried into exile. However, he repented, a little before his death, of what he had done, and bewailing it with floods of tears, recalled him from exile, and restored him to his see. In that letter the patriarch bitterly inveighs against third and fourth marriages, stigmatizing them with the name of an "impure conjunction," and treating those who countenance or encourage them,

¹ Luitp. l. ii. c. 13.

² Krantzius hist. Sax. l. iii. c. 1.

³ Adam. Bremens. l. i. c. 24.

⁴ Johan. Diac. de Eccles. Lateran. paragraph. 17. et Mabill. in append. Ordinis Roman.

⁵ Sigon. de reg. Ital. l. vi.

¹ Leo Grammatic. p. 473, et 483. Zonar. Symeon. Logoth. &c.

Death and character of Anastasius;—[Year of Christ, 913.] Death of the emperor Leo. Lando dies after a pontificate of six months;—[Year of Christ, 914.] John, how raised to the see.

as promoters and encouragers of concubinage. The words of St. Paul, "It is better to marry than to burn," he absurdly restrains to women only, as if it were better for men to burn than to marry, and loudly complains of the pope's legates for presuming to approve what the bishops in the East had all, with one voice, condemned as repugnant to the laws of the church and the gospel. He adds, that he did not intend that his holiness should brand the memory, either of the late emperor, or of his predecessor Sergius, for what they have done amiss in that affair, since both have been called from this world, to account for their conduct at the tribunal of the Sovereign Judge, but thinks that they, who have encouraged the emperor to transgress the known laws of the church, and are still living, ought to be punished with the same severity as if they themselves had transgressed them.¹ As Anastasius did not live long enough to answer this letter, the

patriarch wrote another to pope John X. of which I shall have occasion to speak in the sequel.

Anastasius died, according to the computation of the best chronologers, about the middle of October, 913, after a pontificate of about two years and two months, and was buried in the Vatican. He is commended in his epitaph, and likewise by Flodoard, for the mildness of his government, for his integrity, and the purity of his manners. He did nothing blame-worthy, says Platina, which, in the popes of those days, was matter of great commendation.

In the beginning of the pontificate of Anastasius, or in the latter end of his predecessor's, died Leo the philosopher, emperor of the East, and was succeeded by his brother Alexander, who took Constantine, the deceased emperor's son by Zoe, for his partner in the empire.

LANDO, HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[ALEXANDER, CONSTANTINE, *Emperors of the East.*—LEWIS III., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 914.] Lando, by birth a Sabine, and the son of Tranus, succeeded Anastasius, but held the see, as we read in Flodoard, only six months and ten days. Rubeus in his history of Ravenna informs us that mention is made of Pope Lando in the tables written by John, archbishop of

that city, on the nones of February of the second indiction, that is, on the 5th of February, 913.¹ He is supposed to have died about the 27th of April, 914. In his pontificate died, after a very short reign, the emperor Alexander, and by his death Constantine remained sole master of the empire.

JOHN X., THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE VIII., *Emperor of the East.*—LEWIS III., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 914.] John X. a Roman, and the son of John, was, upon the death of Lando raised to the papal chair by the interest of the famous prostitute Theodora. Luitprand gives us the following account of his promotion: "In those days, says that historian, Peter, archbishop of Ravenna, thought to be the first archiepiscopal see after that of Rome, used frequently to send to Rome a deacon of his church named John to pay his obeisance to his holiness. As the deacon was a very comely and personable man, Theodora falling passionately in love with him, engaged him in a criminal intrigue with her. While they lived thus together,

the bishop of Bologna died, and John had interest enough to get himself elected in his room. But the archbishop of Ravenna dying before he was consecrated, Theodora persuaded him to exchange the see of Bologna for that of Ravenna; and he was accordingly, at her request, ordained by pope Lando archbishop of that city. Lando died soon after, and upon his death Theodora, exerting all her interest, as she could not live at the distance of two hundred miles from her lover, got him preferred to the pontifical chair."²

To no pope, perhaps, did Rome owe more than to John thus elected, or rather intruded

Apud Baron. ad ann. 912.

¹ Rub. Hist. Raven. l. v. p. 253. ² Luitp. l. ii. c. 13.

John engages the Italian princes in a league against the Saracens. Crowns Berengarius emperor;—[Year of Christ 916.] He marches in person against the Saracens; who are all, to a man, cut off or taken. Council of Altheis. Sends a legate into Spain;—[Year of Christ, 917.]

into the sea. The Saracens had possessed ever since the year 876 a strong hold on the banks of the Liris, now the Garigliano, at a small distance from Rome, and from thence made daily incursions into the Roman territories, and kept the city itself in a manner blocked up, insomuch that none could come to visit the tombs of the apostles without exposing themselves to the danger of falling into the hands of those barbarians, and being either murdered by them, or carried into captivity. As John was better qualified to command an army than to govern the church, he resolved to deliver Rome from so grievous an oppression, and with that view found means, being a man of uncommon address and great abilities, to engage not only the Italian dukes, but Berengarius king of Lombardy, and even Constantine, emperor of the East, in a league against those infidels, as a common enemy. Berengarius had been crowned emperor by Stephen VII. but that coronation having been declared null by John IX. as has been related above, the present pope promised to crown him anew, and get him acknowledged by all for lawful emperor, provided he joined the rest of the Italian princes in the intended expedition against the Saracens, who plundered the Roman church of all the wealth that the kings of the Franks and the Roman emperors, his ancestors (for he was descended from Charlemagne) had so generously bestowed upon St. Peter and his successors in the apostolic see. Berengarius, allured with this offer, marched to Rome at the head of a very numerous and powerful army; was met, as he approached the city, by the nobility, the clergy, and the people, and attended by Peter, the pope's brother, amidst the loud acclamations of the multitude, to the Vatican. The pope waited for him in the porch of the church, sitting in a chair of state, from which he rose as the king approached, and advancing a few steps kissed him, and then conducted him to the tomb of the apostle, where, after a short prayer, he received his confession of faith, and repaired with him to the Lateran palace. There the pope entertained him with all the splendor and magnificence of a great prince till Easter Sunday, that is till the 24th of March of the present year, 916, when he crowned him emperor with the usual solemnity in the church of St. Peter.

In the mean time arrived the expected succours from the East, sent by the emperor Constantine, no less provoked against the Saracens than the pope himself, for the dreadful ravages they had committed, and continued to commit in his Italian dominions. Upon their arrival the pope and the emperor took the field; for the pope, who had more of the soldier than the bishop, would have his share in the victory, which, he said, he

did not doubt but they should obtain by the intercession of the prince of the apostles, whose patrimony they defended. The Greeks under the command of Nicholas Picigli, a patrician, the imperial troops commanded by the emperor in person, and those of the Italian lords, headed by their respective dukes and marquises under the pope as their generalissimo, advanced from different quarters to the Garigliano, surrounded the fortress, and began to batter it on all sides. The Saracens held out for three months against the daily attacks of three numerous armies; but in the end, their provisions being all consumed, they set fire to the fortress, which soon destroyed the wealth of the many provinces that they had plundered, and sallying out in a close body, opened themselves a way, sword in hand, to the neighboring woods and mountains. But being closely pursued, they were all, to a man, either taken or cut in pieces.¹ Thus was the fortress of Garigliano recovered from the Saracens, chiefly by means of pope John, after they had held it for the space of forty years, and been so long the terror of all Italy. His holiness returned, in triumph, from so successful an expedition to the arms of his beloved Theodora.

In the same year, 916, the pope appointed a council to meet at Altheis, a town in lower Bavaria, in order to redress several abuses that had crept into those churches, and sent Peter, bishop of Oriona, a city in Abruzzo, to preside at it with the character of his legate. By that council several canons were enacted, and the following among the rest: that no man should marry the widow, whom he had criminally conversed with in her husband's life time; that none should communicate with excommunicated persons on pain of incurring the same excommunication; that no bishop should pray with them in the church; and that they, who, unmindful of their allegiance, should revolt from, or bear arms against their lawful prince, should be excommunicated, and by all avoided.²

The following year the pope, to avert the punishment due, as he was sensible, to the scandalous and wicked life he led, sent a legate to visit, in his name, the tomb of the apostle St. James at Compostella, in the kingdom of Leon, and at the same time wrote to Sisenand, who was then bishop of that city, and looked upon as a man of great sanctity, desiring him to engage for him, with his daily prayers, the protection of the holy apostle in his life time, and at the point of death. Sisenand took occasion from thence to send a presbyter, named John, to Rome; and by him Ordonius, king of Leon, wrote a most submissive letter to the pope, with

¹ Luitprand. l. ii. c. 13.

² Buchard. l. ii. c. 68. Juv. part. xiv. c. 116.

John approves of the Mosarabic missal with some alterations. The church of Constantinople reunited to that of Rome;—[Year of Christ, 920.] The pope determines a dispute concerning the bishoprics of Tongres;—[Year of Christ, 921.] Approves the election of a child to the see of Reims;—[Year of Christ, 925.] Disturbances in Italy. Hugh, count of Provence, crowned king of Lombardy;—[Year of Christ, 926.] John is deposed and dies in prison.

many rich and valuable presents. The pope received the Spanish legate with all possible marks of distinction, and kept him a whole year at Rome, on account of some disputes between him and the Roman clergy concerning the Mosarabic missal, that was used in Spain, but differed in some points from the Roman. As the difference was, upon examination, found to be no ways material, the Spanish churches were allowed to use their own missal, altering only some words in the consecration of the host.¹

As some misunderstanding had subsisted between Rome and Constantinople ever since the time of pope Sergius III., who had approved of the emperor Leo's fourth marriage, as has been related above, the emperor Constantine, and Nicholas the patriarch, desirous of re-establishing a perfect union and concord between the two churches, sent, in 920, a solemn embassy to Rome for that purpose. The pope, in his turn, sent the two bishops Theophylactus and Charles, with the character of his legates, to Constantinople; and thus were the two churches again happily united. As Euthymius, whom the emperor Leo had appointed patriarch in the room of Nicholas sent into exile for opposing his fourth marriage, died at this time, an end was put, by his death, to the schism, which had divided that church, some acknowledging Nicholas, and some Euthymius. By the treaty of union that was agreed to and signed, on this occasion, by the patriarch and the rest of the clergy, fourth marriages were absolutely forbidden on pain of excommunication; a five years' penance was imposed upon those who should contract a third marriage after the age of forty; and they were enjoined a three years' penance, who, being thirty years of age, and having children, should marry a third wife; but this penance was to be lessened, if they had no children.²

In the year 921 the pope determined a controversy, which had lasted some time, between Hilduin, and Richerius abbot of Prom, concerning the bishopric of Tongres. Richerius, it seems, had been chosen bishop of that city by a majority of the people and the clergy, but Heriman, archbishop of Cologne, had nevertheless ordained Hilduin. Both parties applied to the pope, who summoned the two competitors and the archbishop to Rome. Hilduin and Richerius complied with the summons, but Heriman was prevented by sickness, real or pretended, from undertaking that journey. On this occasion the pope assembled a council of the neighboring bishops; and by them Richerius was declared lawfully elected, and Hilduin not

only pronounced an intruder, but excommunicated and divested of the episcopal dignity. In his room Richerius was ordained by the pope himself, who is said to have honored him with the pall, an honor that none of his predecessors ever enjoyed.¹

How little the discipline and laws of the church were regarded by this pope plainly appears from his confirming the election of Hugh, whom his father, count Herbert, one of the most powerful lords in France, had caused to be chosen archbishop of Reims, though he was, at the time of his election, scarce five years old. John, however, appointed Abbo, bishop of Soissons, to perform the episcopal functions in that diocese, and left the care of the temporalities to the count, during the minority of his son.²

Great disturbances happened in Italy during John's pontificate. The emperor Berengarius being treacherously murdered by some of his own people in 922, Rodolph II., king of Burgundy, entering Italy, seized on the kingdom of Lombardy, and was crowned, according to custom, at Pavia by the archbishop of Milan. But the Italian lords, dissatisfied with his government, drove him out in 926, and chose Hugh, count of Provence, king of Lombardy in his room. He was the son of Theutbald and Bertha, daughter of Lotharius king of Lorraine. His mother, upon the death of Theutbald, had married Adelbert, marquis of Tuscany, and had by him Wido, who succeeded his father in that marquisate, and got the Italian lords to call his half-brother Hugh to the crown of Lombardy. As Hugh went to Italy by sea, he was met at Pisa by the pope's nuncio and the deputies of the Italian princes, and attended by them to Pavia, where he was crowned with great solemnity. From Pavia the new king repaired to Mantua, whither the pope himself went to congratulate him upon his accession to the crown; and on this occasion his holiness is said to have entered into an alliance with him, but upon what terms history does not inform us.³

As the two prostitutes Theodora and Marozia exercised, at this time, an absolute power in Rome, Wido, marquis of Tuscany, in order to establish his interest there, married Marozia, though she had a son by his father Adelbert. John had been raised, as we have seen, to the chair, by their mother Theodora; but upon her death Marozia, provoked at the pope's placing greater confidence in his brother, named Peter, than in her or her husband, resolved to remove them both out of the way. This resolution she communicated to her husband, and not only prevailed upon him to approve but to

¹ Ambros. Moral. l. xv. c. 47.

² Apud Bals. et Baron. ad ann. 917.

⁴ Concil. tom. ix. p. 571. Flodoard ad ann. 920, 922.

² Flod. ad ann. 925. ³ Luitp. l. ii. c. 3. et l. iii. c. 4.

John the first pope that headed an army. Leo VI., raised to the chair;—[Year of Christ, 929.] Stephen succeeds Leo. Dies;—[Year of Christ, 931.] John intruded into the see. Grants a charter to Odo, abbot of Cluny.

execute her wicked design. For Wido, breaking into the Lateran palace with a band of ruffians, while the pope's brother was there with him, killed the brother on the spot, and seizing the pope, dragged him to prison, where he died soon after, some say, smothered with a pillow.¹ He held the see, according to Flodoard, fourteen months and somewhat more (*paulo amplius*), and consequently must have died in June or

July 928. He deserved, says Rubeus, a better end; but to one woman he owed his rise, and his downfall to another.¹ John X. is the first pope that is seen at the head of an army; and to him Italy owed more than to most of the popes, who have been honored with a place in the calendar. He is said to have espoused with great zeal the cause of Charles, surnamed the Simple, king of France, against his rebellious subjects.²

LEO VI., THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, ROMANUS, *Emperors of the East.*]

[Year of Christ, 929.] John was succeeded by Leo VI. said by Onuphrius, and after him by Baronius and Papebroch, to have been the son of the primicerius Christopher. Leo is greatly commended by Platina, and the writers who have copied him.² But all we read of him in Flodoard, who lived in those days, is, that he succeeded John X.

and governed the church seven months and five days.

From the year 922, when the emperor Berengarius was murdered, there were no emperors of the West till the year 962, when Otho king of Germany was crowned emperor by pope John XII. in the seventh year of his pontificate, as I shall relate in the sequel.

STEPHEN VII. OR VIII., THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, ROMANUS, *Emperors of the East.*]

[Year of Christ, 931.] Upon the death of Leo, Stephen VII. a native of Rome, and the son of one Theudemund, was raised to the see in his room, and held it two years one month and twelve days. Thus Flodoard,

with whom most chronologers agree. He must therefore have died about the fifteenth of March 931. Platina speaks of him as a man who was blessed with a sweet temper, and led a very religious life.³

JOHN XI. THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, ROMANUS, *Emperors of the East.*]

[Year of Christ, 931.] In the room of Stephen was intruded into the see John, the eleventh of that name. He was the son of pope Sergius III. by Marozia, and owed his promotion to Wido, marquis of Tuscany, who had married his mother, and jointly with her governed Rome. He must have been very young when raised to the see, as

Hugh, king of Italy, was so taken with his mother's beauty, as to marry her upon the death of her husband Wido.

All we find recorded of this pope from the time of his election, if we may so call it, in 931 to 933, is, that, at the request of Hugh, king of Burgundy, he granted a charter to

¹ Luitp. l. lii. c. 12.

² Platina in Leon. VI.

³ Hist. Raven. l. 5.

² Flodoard Chron.

³ Platina in Stephen. VII.

John is confined, and dies in prison;—[Year of Christ, 936.] Leo's election and character. Hugh, king of Italy, and Alberic, lord of Rome, reconciled by his means. Leo's letter concerning abuses that prevailed in the German churches. His answer to some questions.

Odo, abbot of Cluny, confirming the grant of an abbey given to that monastery,¹ and that he sent the pall to Artald, the new archbishop of Reims.² In the year 933 he was seized and kept confined to the hour of his death by his half-brother Alberic on the following occasion. Hugh, king of Italy, become master of Rome by marrying Marozia, began to treat the Romans as his slaves rather than his vassals. Alberic, the son of Marozia by Adelbert, marquis of Tuscany, met with no better treatment from him than the Romans; nay, being one day ordered by his mother to wait upon the king with water to wash his hands, and doing it very awkwardly, the haughty prince struck him in a passion, which so provoked the youth

against the king as well as against his mother, that he put himself at the head of the discontented Romans, with a design to drive them both out of Rome. As the people flocked to him from all quarters, he attacked the castle of St. Angelo before the king could assemble his forces, and made himself master of that fortress, the king having, with much ado, made his escape over the wall, during the hurry and confusion of the assault. Marozia, however, fell into his hand; and he kept her, as well as his brother, pope John, closely confined so long as they lived.¹

John died, according to Flodoard, in the third year of his confinement, after a pontificate of four years and ten months not quite complete.

LEO VII. THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, ROMANUS, *Emperors of the East.*]

[Year of Christ, 933.] Leo, the seventh of that name, a native of Rome, was chosen, with one consent, by the clergy and people to succeed the deceased pope. He was himself the only person that opposed his election, but was in the end obliged to yield, and accept the offered dignity. Flodoard, who went to Rome in his pontificate, and was there personally acquainted with him, calls him a servant of God, and speaks of him as one endowed with every virtue becoming a person in his high station. He spared no pains to restore the decayed discipline, and redress the abuses, that prevailed not in the Roman only, but in most other churches.

As the disagreement between Hugh king of Italy, and Alberic lord of Rome, occasioned great disturbances, some of the Italian princes siding with one, and some with the other, the pope undertook, in the very beginning of his pontificate, to reconcile the two opposite parties. With that view he sent for Odo, the second abbot of Cluny, who, he knew, was highly esteemed and respected by the king. Odo interposed, as directed by the pope, and not only a peace, but an alliance was concluded by his means between the two princes, Alberic marrying the king's daughter, and the king thereupon engaging not to disturb him in the possession of Rome and its dukedom.³ This holy monk was likewise employed by the pope in restoring the famous monastery of St. Paul at Rome to its former discipline; and

he succeeded therein to the great satisfaction of the whole Roman clergy, as well as of his holiness, flattering himself, that the other monasteries of Rome, encouraged by the example of those monks, would reform themselves.²

Leo sent the pall to Gerhard, bishop of Lorch, and thus restored that see to the archiepiscopal dignity, which it had formerly enjoyed.³ Gerhard went afterwards to Rome, to inform the pope of several abuses that obtained in the German churches, and beg his holiness to correct them. The pope, in compliance with his request, wrote a letter addressed to the kings, dukes, archbishops, and bishops in those parts, exhorting them to join in extirpating, with their temporal as well as their spiritual power, the many disorders which, he was informed, prevailed among them. In that letter he answered the questions that Gerhard had proposed to him, in order to their being known to all. These were, whether witches, enchanters, and wizards should be put to death; whether the Lord's prayer should be said before and after meals; and whether the children of married priests should be admitted to holy orders. In answer to these questions the pope leaves enchanters, &c. to the rigor of the laws, issued by the civil power against them, declaring, at the same time, that it is no sin to punish them with death. He will not allow the Lord's prayer to be said at meals, as being appropriated, according to him, to the sacrifice of the mass. As for the marriages of priests, he condemns them as

¹ Apud Mabill. *Secul. v. Benedict.*

² Flodoard, in *Chron. ad ann. 933.*

³ Luitprand, l. iv. c. 1. Vit. Odon.

¹ Luitprand, l. iii. c. 12.

² Vit. Odon.

³ Concil. t. ix. p. 595.

Leo's letter to the abbot of St. Martin at Tours. Dies;—[Year of Christ, 939.] Stephen succeeds Leo. Was so disfigured in the face by order of Alberic, that he was ashamed to appear in public. The pope sends the pall to Hugh, archbishop of Reims;—[Year of Christ, 942.] He zealously espouses the cause of Lewis d'Outremer. Sends again for the abbot of Cluny.

highly criminal, orders those, who have contracted them, to be deposed, but thinks, that "the son should not bear the iniquity of the father." In the same letter the pope forbids the chorepiscopi to consecrate churches, ordain priests, or administer confirmation; declares it unlawful for a man to marry his god-mother or god-daughter, and closes his letter with enjoining the bishops to obey Gerhard as their metropolitan, and vicar in those parts of the apostolic see.¹

We have another letter of this pope, addressed to Hugh, abbot of the monastery of St. Martin, in the city of Tours, wherein he finds fault with him for suffering women to enter that monastery, and excommunicates any woman who shall thenceforth set foot

within the walls. This letter is dated the ninth of January of the eleventh indiction, that is, of the year 938, in the third year of his pontificate; so that he was ordained before the ninth of January, 936, and must therefore have died about the eighteenth of July 939, if he held the see, as we read in the best chronologers, three years six months and ten days. As in one of his letters, part of which has reached our times, he calls St. Benedict his father, Mabillon from thence concludes him to have been a monk of that order; which is not at all improbable, the rather as he is styled by Flodoard "a servant of God," a title commonly given, in those days to monks.

STEPHEN VIII. OR IX., HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, ROMANUS, *Emperors of the East.*]

[Year of Christ, 939.] Stephen VIII. or IX. was raised to the see after Leo. He was by birth a German, according to Platina. But Ciaconius will have him, upon whose authority we know not, to have been a native of Rome, only brought up in Germany. As he was chosen against the will of Alberic, who continued to tyrannize at Rome, he was by some of his partisans so cut and disfigured in the face, that he was ever after ashamed to appear in public.² What some have written, namely, that Stephen was placed on the chair by Otho, king of Germany, though opposed by Alberic, by the Roman people and the clergy, has not the least foundation in truth or in history, Otho being then too much engaged in domestic wars, and at too great a distance from Rome, to concern himself with the election of the pope, or with any thing else that happened there.³

The first thing we find recorded of this pope is his acknowledging Hugh, the son of count Herbert, for archbishop of Reims, and sending him the pall. Hugh had been chosen, by the interest of his father, archbishop of that city when he was but five years old, as has been related above. But Rodulph, duke of Burgundy, having made himself master of Reims, drove Hugh from that see, and appointed Artold, monk of the monastery of St. Remigius, archbishop in his room. But Artold being, in 940, driven out by the opposite party in his turn, Hugh

was restored, and the following year consecrated in a council of bishops at Soissons, though at that time only eighteen years of age. The bishops who ordained him despatched one of their body to Rome for the pall, which Stephen readily granted, though it had been sent to Artold by John XI. but a few years before.¹

The same year, 942, the pope, zealously espousing the cause of Lewis, surnamed d'Outremer, the son of Charles the Simple, against his rebellious subjects, despatched a bishop named Damasus, into France with letters addressed to the French lords, as well as to the people of France and Burgundy. In these letters the pope exhorted them to submit to their lawful sovereign, and obey him whom God had placed over them, since they could not disobey him without disobeying God himself, who would not suffer their disobedience to pass unrevenged. The pope, in the close of his letter, commands them, by virtue of his apostolic authority, to acknowledge Lewis for their king, to lay down their arms, and send deputies to Rome to acquaint him with their having done so, threatening them with excommunication, if they did not comply with these his apostolic injunctions before the ensuing Christmas.²

As Hugh, king of Italy, and Alberic, prince of Rome, fell out anew, and their disagreement was likely to involve all Italy in a civil war, the pope sent for Odo, by whose means they had been reconciled before, in

¹ Auct. ubi supra.

² Baron. ad ann. 940.

³ Vide Papebroch. in Concil. Chronic. Historic.

¹ Flodoard Hist. l. iv. c. 28.

² Idem in Chonic.

Stephen dies;—[Year of Christ, 942.] The election and character of Marinus. A great friend to the monks. His death;—[Year of Christ, 946.] Agapetus. Council of Ingelheim.

order to his mediating a peace between them. The holy abbot, in compliance with the pope's request, repaired immediately to Rome. But being taken ill soon after his arrival there, he was obliged to return to Tours, where he died in a very short time.

The pope did not long outlive him; for the abbot's death is said to have happened in November 942,¹ and pope Stephen's about the beginning of December of the same year, after he had presided in the see three years, four months, and five days.

MARINUS II. OR MARTINUS III., THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, ROMANUS, *Emperors of the East.*]

[Year of Christ, 942.] Stephen was succeeded by Marinus II. or Marti II., this pope being by some named Marinus, and by others Martinus. Baronius tells us, upon the authority of an ancient manuscript lodged in the Vatican library, that Marinus was a native of Rome, and a great friend to the poor; that he rebuilt, repaired, and adorned several churches; that he strove, to the utmost of his power, to restore the decayed discipline, to reform the monasteries, and reconcile the Christian princes then at war.¹ What Baronius writes is confirmed by Platina in his life of this pope. He seems to have had a particular regard for the monks; and we have some rescripts or bulls of his, granting privileges and exemptions to them, and their monasteries.² He wrote a very severe letter to Scio, bishop of Capua, censuring him for his ignorance of the canons, for his intimacy with seculars, and his utter disregard for the laws of the church. What drew these harsh censures upon him was his having settled

upon one of his deacons a church with its revenues, which his predecessors had granted to the Benedictine monks in order to their building a monastery. The pope orders the bishop to restore to the monks, without delay, what he had taken from them, upon pain of excommunication and deposition, and declares the monastery that was to be built, exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishop of Capua and his successors in that see. As for the deacon, to whom the grant of that church had been made, the pope forbids the bishop to have ever thenceforth any intercourse with him, even at the altar, and threatens him with excommunication, if he paid not due obedience to his order.²

Marinus held the see, according to the most probable opinion, three years, six months, and thirteen days; and consequently must have died some time in June, 946; and his death is accordingly placed by Flooard at that year.³

AGAPETUS II., THE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, ROMANUS, *Emperors of the East.*]

[Year of Christ, 946.] Agapetus II., the successor of Marinus, by birth a Roman, was ordained before the 22d of June, 946. For we have a letter of his bearing that date of the eleventh indiction, which coincides with the year 946; so that he was, at that time, in possession of the see.³ As the disagreement between Hugh, king of Lombardy, and Alberic, lord of Rome, occasioned great disturbances in that city, especially at the electing of a new pope, Agapetus undertook, as soon as he was raised to the see,

to reconcile them. But what success attended his negotiations we know not, Hugh being this very year driven out of Italy by Berengarius, the grandson of the emperor Berengarius by his daughter.

As the see of Reims was claimed by Hugh and by Artold, and both had received the pall from Rome, a council was appointed to meet at Ingelheim, in the diocese of Cologne, in order to determine whose claim was best grounded. The pope sent Marinus, bishop of Polymartis, to preside at it in his name; and it consisted of thirty-one bishops besides

¹ Baron. ad ann. 943.

² Apud Dacher. Spicileg. tom. iii. p. 464. et Ughell. tom. i. col. 133.

³ Rubeus Hist. Ravenn. l. v.

¹ Flooard in Chron.

² Leo Ostiens. l. i. c. 60.

³ Flooard in Chron.

Council of Treves. The acts of both councils confirmed by the pope;—[Year of Christ, 949.] Agapetus divides Pannonia into two archbishoprics;—[Year of Christ, 950.] His death;—[Year of Christ, 956.] His character. John XII. intrudes himself into the sec. Makes war upon the prince of Capua and is defeated; [Year of Christ, 957.]

him, the two kings Otho of Germany, and Lewis d'Outremer, of France, being present in person. The council met on the 7th of June, 948, and the two competitors were summoned to appear; with that summons Artold readily complied; but Hugh declining, upon various pretences, to stand to the judgment of that assembly, the bishops declared, with one voice, Artold lawful bishop of Reims, and at the same time thundered out the sentence of excommunication against Hugh, as one who had, contrary to the canons, intruded himself into that see. The same sentence was at the same time pronounced against Hugh, surnamed the Great or the White, if he did not, within a limited time, quit the party of the rebels, and acknowledge Lewis for his lawful sovereign.¹ From that time Artold held undisturbed the see of Reims till his death, that is, till the year 961.

The same year 948, the legate Marinus presided at another council held at Treves, and by that council was confirmed the sentence of the council of Ingelheim against count Hugh, guilty of rebellion and treachery, of driving bishops from their sees on account of their steady attachment to their prince, and seizing on their revenues. The bishops, who had ordained Hugh archbishop of Reims, were likewise excommunicated, and suspended from all episcopal functions till they satisfied the legates, and publicly acknowledged their fault.² The acts of both these councils were confirmed the following year by the pope in a council, which he assembled at Rome, upon the return of the legate,

and count Hugh was excommunicated the third time, as he still continued at the head of the rebels.¹

The same year the pope confirmed all the privileges that had been granted by his predecessors to the see of Hamburg, and appointed Adalagus, who then held that archiepiscopal see, his vicar, with full power to ordain bishops in Denmark, lately converted to the Christian faith, as well as in the neighboring countries.²

The following year a dispute arising, or rather the ancient dispute being revived, between Harold, archbishop of Saltzburg, and Gerard, archbishop of Lorch, concerning the metropolitan dignity, Agapetus interposed, and dividing the province of Pannonia, over which each of them claimed a jurisdiction independent of the other, subjected western Pannonia to the see of Saltzburg, and the eastern part of that province with the country of the Avars, of the Moravians and the Sclavonians, to the see of Lorch, granted to both the metropolitan dignity, and distinguished both with the pall.³

Agapetus sent likewise the pall to Bruno, brother to Otho, king of Germany, upon his being preferred to the see of Cologne, and to Odo, the new archbishop of Canterbury; and this is all we read of Agapetus, though he presided in the see ten years and about three months. He is styled by the writer of the life of St. Bruno, archbishop of Cologne, "a man of wonderful sanctity,"⁴ and most other writers place him among the few good popes of this century.

JOHN XII., THE HUNDRED AND THIRTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE, *Emperor of the East.*—OTHO, *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 956.] Upon the death of Agapetus, Octavianus, the son of Alberic, who had succeeded his father in the usurped sovereignty of Rome, seized on the see, though then, at most, but eighteen years of age. Being raised to the chair, he took the name of John, that of his uncle pope John XI., and he is the first pope that changed his name.

The first thing we find recorded of this pope is, his raising troops and marching in person, at the head of a considerable army, against Pandulph, prince of Capua, but upon what provocation, history does not inform us. Pandulph, finding his dominions

thus unexpectedly invaded by the young pope, had recourse to Girulph, prince of Salerno, who readily joined him with all his forces, as he apprehended that the pope would next fall upon him. The two princes, taking the field with their joint forces, met the pope as he was advancing to Capua to lay siege to that place, and a battle thereupon ensuing, John's army was entirely defeated, and he himself narrowly escaped falling into the hands of the provoked princes.⁵

This defeat made the pope lay aside all thoughts of extending his dominions or encroaching upon the neighboring princes; and

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 623.

² Flodoard in Chron. ad ann. 948.

¹ Flodoard in Chron. ad ann. 949.

² Adam. Bremens. l. ii. c. 2.

³ Concil. tom. ix. p. 618.

⁴ Rotgerus. vit. Bru. c. 23. ⁵ Apud Bar. ad ann. 957.

John invites Otho into Italy;—[Year of Christ, 961.] Promises to crown him emperor. Otho marches into Italy;—[Year of Christ, 962.] Goes to Rome, and is there crowned emperor. Famous diploma of the emperor Otho still to be seen at Rome. The pope revolts from the emperor;—[Year of Christ, 963.]

therefore disbanding his army, he returned to Rome, and there abandoned himself to all manner of wickedness and debauchery. But in the mean time Berengarius, king of Italy, and his son Adelbert, whom he had taken for his partner in the kingdom, governing in a most tyrannical manner, and loading with most exorbitant taxes the clergy as well as the laity, the Romans themselves not excepted, the pope resolved to apply for redress to Otho, king of Germany, a prince no less renowned for his justice and virtue, than his warlike exploits, and the conquests he had made. John dispatched accordingly into Germany, John, cardinal deacon, and Azo, keeper of the records of the Roman church, to represent to the king the deplorable condition to which the two tyrants had reduced not only the Roman church, but all Italy, and entreat him to hasten to their rescue. The legates were enjoined to offer the imperial crown to the king of Germany, provided he drove out the tyrants, and delivered the mother of all churches from the miseries she groaned under, and could no longer bear. At the same time came deputies to Otho from most of the bishops and princes of Italy, all complaining of the tyrannical government of Berengarius and his son, and imploring his protection, they all assured him that the Italian princes would readily join him, and assist him to the utmost of their power, and acknowledge him, as soon as he appeared, for their king.

As Otho had no other wars at that time on his hands, he could not withstand so tempting an offer; and having therefore assembled the flower of his army, he went first to Aix-la-Chapelle, caused his son Otho to be there anointed king of Germany, though then only seven years old, and from thence pursuing his march, he entered Italy, and advanced, without opposition, to Pavia, the troops of Berengarius flying everywhere before him, and the Italians flocking from all quarters to join him. At Pavia he was met by most of the princes and bishops of Italy; and having kept his Christmas there, he resumed his march after the holidays, and arrived, the enemy not daring to appear, without the least interruption, at Rome. He was met at the gate by the clergy in a body, by the nobility, and crowds of people, and attended by them with loud acclamations to the Vatican. He was there received by the pope, and after performing his devotions at the tomb of St. Peter, was crowned and anointed emperor with the usual solemnity. On this occasion the emperor, at the request of the pope, promised upon oath to defend the Roman church against all her enemies; to maintain her in the quiet possession of all the privileges she had enjoyed to that time; to restore to the holy see the lands and possessions that belonged to St. Peter, as

soon as he recovered them; to assist the pope to the utmost of his power, when his assistance was wanted; and, lastly, to make no alteration in the government of Rome without his knowledge or approbation. At the same time the emperor confirmed all the grants of Pepin and Charlemagne;¹ but obliged, in his turn, the pope and the Romans to swear obedience to him, and promise upon oath to lend no kind of assistance to Berengarius or to his son Adelbert, from whose tyranny he was come to deliver them. The coronation of Otho happened before the 13th of February, 962; for we have a diploma of his bearing that date, wherein he styles himself emperor.²

That diploma, in letters of gold, is still to be seen in the castle of St. Angelo at Rome; and it is thereby enacted, that the election of the pope shall thenceforth be made after the manner prescribed by the canons; that none shall disturb the election on pain of banishment; that the elect shall not be ordained till his election is confirmed by the emperor, and deputies are sent by him to assist, in his name, at that ceremony; that the new pope shall promise, in the presence of the imperial envoys, to injure no man in his property; that they, who have been any ways injured, may apply either to the commissaries of the pope, or to those of the emperor residing in Rome, and have their grievances redressed, and justice done them by either. Thus was the empire transferred from the Italian to the German princes, by the free election of an oppressed people, inviting him to their relief, and putting themselves, of their own accord, under his protection.

The emperor, in his turn, made the pope swear allegiance to him, and promise upon oath to lend no assistance to Berengarius or to Adelbert his son. But no sooner was Otho gone, than, forgetting his oath though taken upon the body of St. Peter, he began privately to correspond with Adelbert, who had taken refuge among the Saracens; and he at last openly declared for him, and admitted him, with all his followers, into Rome. The emperor, upon the first intelligence he received of the pope's corresponding with his enemies, dispatched ambassadors to Rome to put him in mind of the oath he had taken, and at the same time to inquire of the Romans what could have induced him to infringe the treaty, which he had but lately concluded, and sworn to observe. The ambassadors met with a very indifferent reception from the pope; and the Romans gave them a most shocking account of the debauched life which he publicly led, to the disgrace of the apostolic see, and their holy

¹ Luitprand, l. vi. c. 6. Regino ad ann. 962. Flodoard, in Chron. Gratian. Dist. 63.

² Apud Baron. ad ann. 962.

The pope's debaucheries. Otho marches to Rome. The pope abandons the city and flies. The emperor assembles a council at Rome to try the pope. Crimes laid to his charge. Speech of the bishop of Cremona to the council, in the emperor's name.

religion itself. They told the ambassadors, that he carried on in the eyes of the whole city, a criminal commerce with one Rainera, the widow of one of his soldiers; that he had given her the government of several cities, and presented her with crosses and chalices of gold belonging to the church of St. Peter; that he publicly kept another concubine, named Stephanía, who lately died in the delivery of a child she had by him; that he had changed the Lateran palace, once the abode of saints, into a brothel, and there cohabited with his father's concubine the sister of Stephanía; that women were afraid to come from other countries to visit the tombs of the apostles at Rome; that he spared none, and had within these few days forced married women, widows, and virgins, to comply with his impure desires. They added, that the devil hated not more his Creator than pope John did the emperor, apprehending that he might as a prince of great piety, and strictly religious, call him to an account and punish him for his debaucheries, and that he therefore wanted an Adelbert to protect and defend him.¹

The emperor, informed by his ambassadors, upon their return, of the wicked and scandalous life the pope led, said no more than that he was yet a child, and might mend his manners by the example of good men and retrieve. But when he received certain intelligence of his having openly declared for Adelbert, and even admitted him into Rome, he raised the siege of Montefeltro, where Berengarius had shut himself up, and marched with his whole army against the pope and his new ally. But they no sooner heard of his march, than despairing of being able to withstand so great a force, they plundered the church of St. Peter, and fled, carrying along with them all the wealth they found there. The emperor entered Rome at the head of his army, was received by the clergy, the nobility and the people, as their deliverer, with the greatest demonstrations of joy, and, attended by them, to the castle of St. Paul, which his friends had surprised before the flight of the pope, and prepared for his reception. During his stay there, the Romans renewed, of their own accord, the oath of allegiance they had taken to him, and at the same time solemnly promised to give no kind of assistance to Berengarius, to Adelbert, or to any of his enemies, and never to elect a pope, nor suffer a pope to be ordained without his consent, or that of his son.²

The emperor, having settled the civil government of the city, assembled in the next place, by the advice of the prelates, who attended him, a council in order to examine

into the conduct of the pope, and give him an opportunity of clearing himself, if he was innocent, from the many crimes that were laid to his charge. At this council the emperor presided in person, and were present thirteen cardinal priests, three cardinal deacons, the archbishops of Hamburg and Treves, the bishops of Minden and Spire, and almost all the bishops of Italy, with many priests, deacons, and the chief nobility of Rome. The pope was summoned by the council and the emperor to appear and answer the many accusations lodged against him. But as he did not comply with the summons, the council met after waiting some time for his answer; and upon the emperor's asking the Italian bishops, why his holiness absented himself from so venerable an assembly, all answered with one voice, "we are surprised that you should not know what is well known to the Babylonians, the Iberians, and even to the Indians. So public are his crimes; and he is so lost to all shame, that he does not even attempt to conceal them." The emperor desired them to mention each crime in particular that they laid to his charge. Hereupon Peter, cardinal bishop, rising up, declared, that he had seen him say mass without communicating; John, bishop of Narni, and John, cardinal deacon, attested, that they had seen him ordain a deacon in a stable; Benedict, deacon, with other deacons and priests said, that they knew for certain that he had ordained bishops for money, and had, among the rest, ordained a child, but ten years old, bishop of Todi. They added, that they knew likewise for certain, that he carried on a scandalous intrigue with the widow of Rainierius, with Stephanía, his father's concubine, and at the same time with one named Ann and her niece; that he had turned the holy palace into a brothel; had publicly hunted; had put out the eyes of Benedict, his ghostly father, who died of the anguish; had caused John, cardinal subdeacon, to be made an eunuch, which occasioned his death; had set several houses on fire; and had been frequently seen clad in armor with a sword by his side. Many clerks as well as laymen assured the emperor and the fathers of the council, that he had, to their certain knowledge, drank wine in honour of the devil; that in playing at dice he had invoked Jupiter, Venus, and the other pagan deities; that he never said matins, nor any other canonical hours, nor ever signed himself with the sign of the cross.¹

As the emperor only spoke the Saxon language, which the Romans did not understand, he ordered Luitprand, bishop of Cremona, to address the assembly in Latin, as follows: "It too often happens, as experience teaches

¹ Luitprand, l. vi. c. 6.

² Idem ibid.

¹ Luitprand, l. vi. c. 7.

Letter to the pope from the emperor and the council. The pope's letter to the council. The council's answer. The emperor's speech to the bishops. The bishops speech to the emperor.

us, that men raised to high stations, are envied and calumniated by their inferiors, I therefore conjure you in the name of God, whom no man can deceive, of his immaculate mother, the Virgin Mary, and by the body of St. Peter, in whose church we are, not to allege any crime against our lord the pope, of which you do not know him for certain to be guilty." To this the whole synod answered with one voice, "if pope John is not guilty of the crimes laid to his charge, and of many other still more detestable enormities, may St. Peter, who opens the gates of heaven to the just, and shuts them against the unworthy, never absolve us from our sins, and let us be placed on the left hand at the last day. If you do not believe us, believe your army, who beheld him but five days ago, having a sword by his side, and armed with a shield, with a helmet, and a cuirass." They were separated from him only by the Tiber, which prevented them from taking him thus accoutred. The emperor answered, "there are as many witnesses of it as there are soldiers in my army." Though the crimes of which he was arraigned were all fully proved, yet the synod begged he might be heard before he was condemned; and that being agreed to by the emperor, the following letter was written, and sent to him in the name of the emperor, and the bishops who composed that assembly.

"Being come to Rome for the service of God, and not finding you here, we asked the Roman bishops, the cardinals, the presbyters, deacons, and people, why you had withdrawn from the city at our arrival, and would not see your defenders, and the defenders of your church. They, in answer, charged you with such obscenities as would make us blush, were they said of a stage-player. I shall mention to you a few of the crimes that are laid to your charge, for it would require a whole day to enumerate them all. Know then that you are accused, not by some few, but by all the clergy as well as the laity, of murder, perjury, sacrilege, and incest with your own relations, and two sisters; that you are said to have drunk wine in honor of the devil, and to have invoked at play Jupiter, Venus, and the other demons. We therefore earnestly entreat you to come and clear yourself from these imputations. If you are afraid of being insulted by the multitude, we promise you upon oath, that nothing shall be done but what is warranted by the canons." The direction of this letter was, "to our lord John, high pontiff and universal pope, the emperor Otho, and the archbishops of Liguria, Tuscany, Saxony, and France, greeting."

To this letter the pope returned the following laconic answer. "John, servant of the servants of God, to all bishops. We

hear that you want to make another pope. If that is your design, I excommunicate you all in the name of the Almighty, that you may not have it your power to ordain any other, or even to celebrate mass." While the bishops were reading this letter several other bishops arrived, and among the rest, Hericus, archbishop of Treves; and with their advice the council returned the following answer to the pope's letter. "If you come to the council, and clear yourself from the crimes that are laid to your charge, we shall pay all due respect to your authority. But if you do not come, and are not detained by lawful impediment, as you have no seas to cross, nor a very long journey to perform, we shall make no account of your excommunication, but retort it upon you. The traitor Judas received of our Lord the power of binding and loosening, as well as the other apostles; and with that power he was vested so long as he continued faithful to his divine master and Lord. But by betraying him he forfeited all his power and authority, and could thenceforth bind none but himself." The bishops were, it seems, all strangers to the doctrine that the pope is to judge all mankind, and be judged by none.

With this letter were sent Hadrian, presbyter cardinal, and Benedict, cardinal deacon: but arriving at the Tiber they were informed, that the pope was gone, with a quiver upon his shoulder, nobody knew whither. The letter was therefore brought back, and the council being assembled the third time, the emperor addressed the bishops thus: "We have waited for John, in order to lay our complaints against him before you in his presence. But now, as we find that he is determined not to appear, I shall briefly acquaint you with, and leave you to judge of his conduct towards me. When he was grievously oppressed by the two tyrants, Berengarius and Adelbert, he dispatched messengers to us into Saxony, beseeching us to hasten to Italy, and deliver the church of St. Peter and himself from the calamities they groaned under. I complied with his request; and I need not tell you what I have done, as you have all seen it. However, forgetting the fidelity, which he swore to me upon the body of St. Peter, he entered into an alliance with Adelbert, invited him to Rome, supported him against me, raised seditions in the city, and arming himself with a cuirass, appeared thus armed in the sight of my army. Let him be judged by the synod."

The council replied, "Such an extraordinary evil must be cured by an extraordinary remedy. Had he hurt none but himself, he might, in some degree, be borne with: but how many has his example perverted? How many, who would, in all likelihood, have led a pure and irreproachable life, have abandoned themselves to all manner of wickedness? We beg therefore, that this monster,

Leo chosen in the room of the deposed pope. John stirs up the Romans against the emperor; who defeats but forgives them;—[Year of Christ, 964.] Conspiracy against Leo; who is obliged to quit Rome. John's cruelty to Leo's friends. John assembles a council in Rome. Acts of that council.

without one single virtue to atone for his many vices, may be driven from the holy apostolic see, and another, who will set us a good example, be put in his room." "It is

our pleasure," replied the emperor, "and nothing will give us greater satisfaction, than your raising to the holy apostolic see a person of that character."

LEO VIII. THE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[NICEPHORUS PHOCAS, *Emperor of the East.*—ΟΤΤΙΟ, *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 963.] John being deposed by the emperor and the council, the clergy, nobility, and people chose, with one voice, Leo VIII. of that name, a native of Rome, and the son of John, formerly Protoscrinarius, or first keeper of the records, which office Leo exercised at the time of his election. He is supposed to have been ordained on the 6th of December, 963, and in the presence of the emperor, who was then at Rome.

As the Romans seemed all extremely well pleased with their new pope, and the city enjoyed a perfect tranquillity, the emperor, to relieve the inhabitants, dismissed the greater part of his army. Of this the deposed pope was no sooner informed, than he began, by his emissaries, to tamper with the Romans, and stir them up to rebellion, promising to reward them with the immense wealth of the church of St. Peter, which he had taken with him, if they murdered the emperor and his new pope, the usurper of the holy see. The leading men in the city hearkened to the offer; and as no men, says the historian, are more greedy of, and more easily corrupted with money than the Romans, they were soon prevailed upon to engage in so wicked an attempt; and they conducted it with such secrecy, that at the day appointed, the 2d of January 964, the whole city was in arms, without the emperor's having ever received the least intimation of their design. They marched in battle array to the emperor's quarters on the other side of the Tiber. But his advanced guards taking the alarm, the few troops he had with him, drew in an instant together, and marching, with their brave commander at their head, met the Romans as they were passing the bridge, engaged them, put them, at the first onset, to flight, and pursued them with great slaughter, till the emperor, touched with compassion, put a stop to their fury. The next day, pope Leo interposed in behalf of the rebels, and at his request the good-natured prince granted them all a free pardon, upon their taking anew an oath of allegiance, and delivering up hostages for the observance of that oath.¹

Some few days after, the emperor resolved to leave Rome, and repaired to Spoleti and Camerino, being informed that Adelbert had appeared in those dukedoms. Before he set out, the pope persuaded him to return the hostages, assuring him that by such a mark of confidence he would rivet himself in the favour of the Romans, and engage for ever their affection as well as their fidelity. He did so; but he was scarce gone when a new revolution ensued. For several women of great distinction, with whom the young debauched pope used to riot and pass the greater part of his time, no longer able to bear his absence, formed a design of murdering Leo and restoring John to the see. They communicated their design to several persons of rank, and by them the deposed pope was unexpectedly brought back, was admitted into the city, and attended, in a kind of triumph, to the Lateran palace. Leo had the good luck to make his escape to the emperor, then at Camerino. But two of his friends were seized, namely, John, cardinal deacon, and Azo, the Protoscrinarius; and John ordered immediately the right hand of the former to be cut off, and the tongue, nose, and two fingers of the latter. At the same time Otger, bishop of Spire, was whipt by his command till he was ready to expire.²

In the next place John assembled a council in the church of St. Peter, on the 2d of February, 964, at which were present sixteen bishops, some cardinals, and seven priests and deacons, John presiding in person. It was finished in three sessions; in the first, the council that deposed him was condemned as an unlawful and uncanonical meeting, Leo was deposed, and forbidden, on pain of being anathematized without hopes of absolution, ever to exercise any episcopal functions, or attempt the recovery of the see, which he had, contrary to the canons and all laws of justice, usurped; his ordinations were all declared null, and they, whom he had ordained, stript in the council of their sacerdotal ornaments, and ordered to write these words upon a paper, "my

¹ Luitprand, l. vi. c. 2.

¹ Luitprand, l. vi. c. 3.

² Idem l. vi. c. 2.

John murdered. Benedict chosen by the Romans in his room. Otho marches to Rome and obliges the inhabitants to surrender. Benedict condemned in a council, and divested of the pontifical ornaments. Whether the decree conferring on the emperor Otho and his successors the power of nominating the pope, &c. be forged or genuine.

father had nothing, and gave me nothing," which was owning that Leo had not the power of conferring orders, and therefore that they had received none. In the second session, they who had been any ways accessory to the usurpation of Leo, were anathematized, if laymen or monks, and, if ecclesiastics, degraded. In the third session, Benedict of Porto, and Gregory of Albano, who had ordained Leo, were suspended from all episcopal functions, after owning that they had acted contrary to the canons, and begging forgiveness. Sico of Ostia, the third bishop concerned in the ordination of Leo, did not appear at the council, and was therefore deposed without hopes of being ever restored. By this council a canon was issued, forbidding laymen, on pain of excommunication, to stand, during mass, within the presbytery, or near the altar.¹

John did not long survive the holding of this council. For being one night, soon after, in bed with a married woman, the devil, says the historian, but more probably the husband in the disguise of the devil, gave him so violent a blow on the temple, that he died in a week, having held the see seven years and two months before his deposition, and five months more after it. His death is supposed to have happened on the 14th of May, 964.

Upon the death of John, the Romans, persisting in their rebellion, chose one Benedict, a native of Rome, and Protoscrinarius of the Roman church, to succeed him, though they had promised to the emperor upon oath to acknowledge no other than Leo, so long as he lived, and to suffer no pope to be thenceforth ordained without his consent. Otho was then busied in reducing the dukedom of Camerino, but he was no sooner informed of the election of Benedict, than he left that dukedom, and marching at the head of his army to Rome, invested the place so closely on all sides, that the inhabitants were, in a very short time, obliged to submit for want of provisions, to open the gates, and surrender at discretion, though they had bound themselves by a solemn oath never to forsake Benedict, nor to acknowledge Leo, whom they styled the emperor's pope. Otho, now master of the city, ordered, in the first place, the bishops who attended him, and those whom he found in Rome, to assemble in council, and settle, in the first place, the affairs of the church. The bishops met in the Lateran church at the time appointed, and Benedict being brought before them in his pontifical robes, Benedict, cardinal archdeacon, addressed him thus: "By what authority or by what law hast thou assumed these ornaments in the life time of the venerable pope Leo,

whom thou madest choice of together with us in the room of John, whom we all condemned and rejected? Canst thou deny thy having promised upon oath to the emperor never to choose nor to ordain a pope without his consent, or that of his son, king Otho?" Benedict answered, "I have sinned, take pity on me;" which words so affected the good-natured emperor, that bursting into tears, he begged the fathers would deal mercifully with him, provided he acknowledged his fault in the hearing of the whole council. At these words, Benedict, throwing himself at Leo's feet and the emperor's, owned aloud, that he was an usurper, and begged the pope, the emperor, and the council to forgive him. He then took off his pall, and delivered it to the pope with his pastoral staff, which Leo immediately broke, and showed it thus broken to the people. After this Leo ordered him to sit down on the ground, and having stript him, in that posture, of all the pontifical ornaments, he pronounced the following sentence: "We divest Benedict, who has usurped the holy apostolic see, of the pontifical dignity, and the honor of priesthood; however, at the request of the emperor, who has restored us, we allow him to retain the order of deacon, but upon condition that he quits Rome, and goes into perpetual banishment."²

By this council, a constitution or decree is said to have been issued, conferring on the emperor Otho, and his successors forever, the power of nominating the pope, and granting the investiture to bishops. But whether the said constitution be forged or genuine, is not agreed among authors. Goldastus,² de Marca,³ and many others, maintain it to be genuine; and it is to be met with in Gratian⁴ and in Theodoric of Niem. However, as in this constitution mention is made of the like privilege granted, as is there supposed in 774, by pope Hadrian I. to Charlemagne, and we have reason to believe that no such privilege ever was granted by that pope, I cannot help looking upon the decree or constitution of Leo as a forgery. The reasons that incline me to think the decree of Hadrian to be forged, are, I. Florus Magister, in his Treatise of the Election of Bishops, written about the year 820, says it was established by custom, that the person elected should be approved by the prince; so that he was quite unacquainted with the pretended constitution of Hadrian; and we cannot suppose he would never have heard of it, if it had been enacted, as is said, in 774, that is but forty-six years before, in a council at Rome, consisting of

¹ Luitprand, l. vi. c. 2.

² Goldast. Constitut. Imperial. l. i.

³ Marca Concord. l. viii. c. 12, 29.

⁴ Gratian. Distinct. l. iii. c. 23.

Leo dies;—[Year of Christ, 965.] John XIII. chosen. Driven out of Rome, takes refuge in Capua. Erects that city into a metropolis;—[Year of Christ, 966.]

one hundred and fifty-three bishops. 2. Lupus Ferrariensis grounds the right of electing and instituting bishops, which he vests in the emperor and in other secular princes, upon a constitution issued by pope Zachary in 757, and takes no kind of notice of the more recent constitution of Hadrian; a plain proof that it was not yet heard of in his time. 3. From one of Hadrian's letters, written in 784, it appears, that in the kingdom of Lombardy, when a new bishop was chosen, the decree of election was sent to Rome, and the elect was thereupon ordained by the pope without the consent or even the knowledge of the emperor. We have another letter from the same pope to Charlemagne of the year 787, in answer to one he had received from that prince, desiring that the bishop of Ravenna might always be chosen in the presence of his deputies. The pope answered that this was a new thing, and that ever since the time of Pepin, the clergy and people of Ravenna had chosen their own bishop, none else interfering, and sent the decree of election to the apostolic see; which is evidently inconsistent with that pope's having, by a special decree, vested in the emperor, ever since the year 774, the power of appointing all bishops throughout his dominions. Upon the whole, the decree ascribed to Hadrian, is, evidently, forged; and consequently that of Leo, sup-

posing it genuine, and as such, confirming it, must be likewise a forgery.

In that decree, as quoted by Goldast¹ out of Theodoric of Niem, who wrote about the year 1420, Leo is made to yield to Otho all the countries and territories that had been given to the Roman church by other princes and emperors. But as Leo there gives up many places which it is very certain the Roman church never possessed, and many which she did not possess till long after the time of this emperor, that piece is now universally looked upon as spurious²

Leo enjoyed the pontifical dignity but a very short time after his restoration, for he died in the beginning of March of the following year, 965, after a pontificate of one year and three months.

As to Benedict, styled the Fifth of that name, by those who acknowledge him for lawful pope, he was banished to Hamburg, where he died in the month of July of the same year, 965. Adamus Bremensis writes, that at Hamburg he led a very edifying life; that he was a man of uncommon learning and parts, and as worthy of the high station to which the Romans had raised him, as any of his time.³ Dittmar speaks of him, in his chronicle, as a man of great sanctity, and adds, that by the command of Otho III., his remains were translated from Hamburg to Rome.⁴

JOHN XIII., THE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[NICEPHORUS PHOCAS, *Emperor of the East.*—OTHO, *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 965.] Upon the death of Leo the Romans, mindful of their oath, dispatched Azo, keeper of the records, and Marinus, bishop of Sutri, into Saxony, where the emperor then was, to desire him to appoint a successor to the deceased pope. Otho, pleased with this mark of their obedience, left them at full liberty to choose whom they pleased, but sent with them Otger, bishop of Spire, and Linzo (perhaps Luitprand) bishop of Cremona to Rome, to assist at the election in his name. Upon their arrival the Romans chose Benedict, then in exile at Hamburg, and even prevailed upon the emperor to consent to his promotion.¹ But he dying in the mean time, John bishop of Narni, a native of Rome, and the son of a bishop of the same name, was unanimously chosen and ordained on the 1st of October, which in 965 fell on a Sunday.

The new pope was scarce warm in the chair, when the Roman nobility, provoked at his haughty behavior, and the power he assumed over them, entered into a combination against him, and being assisted by the prefect and by one named Rotfred, a leading man in the city, drove him from Rome and obliged him to take refuge in Capua. He was there received with the highest respect by prince Pandulph, and entertained suitably to his rank for the space of ten months, that is, till the Romans recalled him, hearing that the emperor was marching with his army to Rome in order to restore him and punish his enemies, whom he could not but look upon as rebels. The pope, to reward the prince and people of Capua for the respect and kindness they had shown him during his stay there, erected their city into a metropolis, and before he set out on his return to

¹ Goldast. p. 36.

² See Pagi ad ann. 964.

³ Adam. Bremens. l. ii. c. 6.

⁴ Dittmar. Chron. l. ii. c. 3.

¹ Adam. Bremens. ubi supra.

Otho marches to Rome to restore the pope. Punishes the Romans as Rebels. The pope holds a council at Ravenna;—[Year of Christ, 967.] Magdeburg erected into a metropolis;—[Year of Christ, 968.] Otho sends ambassadors into the East to propose a marriage between his son Otho and the daughter of the emperor Romanus. Young Otho crowned emperor. Otho sends ambassadors into the East. Treatment they meet with there from Nicephorus.

Rome, ordained the brother of the prince the first archbishop of the place.¹

In the mean time Otho pursuing his march to Rome, seized at Placentia Sigovulfus bishop of the place, and sent him prisoner into Germany with several Italian counts, who had declared together with him for Adelbert, and stirred the people up to rebellion. From Placentia he advanced with his army to Rome, and entering the city without opposition, he ordered the chief authors of the late disturbances to be seized, sent the consuls into exile, and ordered the thirteen tribunes to be hanged. The prefect had the good luck to make his escape. But the rest were all either banished or condemned to dungeons for life; one, and he a man of the first distinction, was, by the command of the emperor, stript naked, and being set on an ass, most cruelly scourged through the chief streets of the city, and then banished the dukedom of Rome. The body of Rotfred, who had been murdered by some of the pope's partizans, was dug up, was cut in pieces, and thrown into the kennels, as unworthy of Christian burial.²

The emperor, having thus made the Romans, who, he found, were not to be gained by gentle methods, feel the effects of his justice, left Rome in the beginning of the following year, and, after visiting several cities of Tuscany, repaired together with the pope to Ravenna; where a council was held, consisting of most of the bishops of Italy, and of some from France and Germany, who attended the emperor. In that council the emperor restored to the pope the city of Ravenna with its territory, and several other places, which Pepin and Charlemagne had given to St. Peter, but Berengarius and Adelbert had seized and kept for themselves. In the same council the deposition of Herold, archbishop of Saltzburg, was confirmed, and likewise the election of Frederic, who had been appointed to succeed him. Herold revolting from the emperor, had joined the Pagans, probably the Hungarians, and had been, on that account, punished with the loss of his sight, and driven from his see. But though deprived of his sight, and suspended from all episcopal functions, he continued to celebrate mass, to wear the pall, and to act in every other respect as still vested with the archiepiscopal dignity. The sentence of deposition was therefore anew pronounced in full council against him, and all were excommunicated who should thenceforth receive any ordination whatever at his hands. This sentence or decree is dated the 25th of April, 967.

¹ Suppl. Regin. Leo Ostien. l. ii. c. 9. Sigon. l. vii. Canelius in Hist. Metropolitan. Par. 3. Dissert. li. c. 5.

² Suppl. Regin. ad ann. 967.

Upon the breaking up of the council, the pope returned to Rome, and there passed the remaining part of his pontificate without the least molestation from the Romans. The emperor remained in Lombardy, and having there settled the affairs of his Italian dominions, he assembled, before his return to Saxony, another council at Ravenna, at which were present most of the bishops, who had assisted at the former. By this council, the city of Magdeburg was, at the desire and request of the emperor, erected into an archiepiscopal see, and Adelbert, monk of the monastery of St. Maximinus at Treves, was, with the approbation of the bishops, appointed by the emperor the first archbishop of the place, and sent to Rome for the pall. The pope, desirous of obliging the emperor, not only granted the pall to the new archbishop, but declared him primate of all Germany, put him upon the level with the archbishops of Cologne and Treves, made him metropolitan of the Sclavonians, who inhabited the vast country beyond the Elbe and the Sala, and were then, or should be afterwards converted to the faith. At the same time, the pope ordered bishoprics to be founded in the following places, namely, at Zitz, at Meissen, at Merseburg, Brandenburg and Poznan, and these new bishoprics were all subjected to the metropolitan see of Magdeburg.¹

While Otho was still at Ravenna, ambassadors arrived from Nicephorus Phocas, emperor of the East, sent with rich presents to conclude a peace between him and the Latins. Otho received the Greek ambassadors with the greatest marks of esteem, sent them back loaded with presents of great value for the emperor, and dispatched with them to Constantinople, some persons of the first rank in the empire, to propose a match between his son Otho, king of Germany, and Theophania, daughter of the late emperor Romanus by Theophano, whom Nicephorus the present emperor had married. As the emperor proposed to keep his Christmas at Rome, the pope, acquainted therewith, wrote to the king of Germany, pressing him to meet his father there, and visit with him the tombs of the holy apostles, the protectors of his kingdom, as well as of the church and the empire. The king readily complied with the invitation, and being, upon his arrival at Rome, taken by the emperor for his partner in the empire, he was crowned by the pope on Christmas-day, with the usual solemnity in the church of St. Peter.²

From Rome the emperor dispatched a second embassy to Constantinople, to demand Theophania in marriage for his son Otho. But Nicephorus, instead of consenting to the proposed marriage, treated the ambassadors,

¹ Chronograph. apud Mabill. See Benedict. v. p. 833.

² Suppl. Regin. ad ann. 967.

Beneventum made a metropolis;—[Year of Christ, 969.] Marriage between the emperor's son and the daughter of Romanus, who is crowned empress at Rome;—[Year of Christ, 971.] The pope dies the following year. Poland converted in this pope's time. Prague made an episcopal see. He confirmed the acts of a council held in London. The ceremony of christening bells not introduced by him.

as well as the pope's nuncio, who attended them, with the utmost contempt. Luitprand bishop of Cremona, who was at the head of the embassy, writes, that upon their arrival at Constantinople, they were shut up in one of the imperial palaces; that they were not suffered to stir from thence, nor were any allowed to come near them; that the imperial ministers gave the emperor of the West no other title than that of king; that they expressed the greatest indignation at the pope's styling him, in his letter, emperor of the Romans; and that, with respect to the proposed marriage, the emperor declared that he would consent to it only upon condition that Rome and Ravenna were re-united to the empire, and that the pope should thenceforth be elected and ordained in the presence of his envoys, agreeably to the custom that had ever obtained since the earliest times. Nicephorus however condescended to answer Otho's letter, expressing a sincere desire of living in peace and friendship with him, but returned no answer to the pope.¹

The following year, in a council held at Rome, at which were present both the emperors, namely, Otho and his son, the pope, at their request, and with the consent of all the bishops, who composed that assembly, raised the see of Beneventum to the rank of a metropolis, granted the pall to Landulphus, then bishop of the place, and subjected to the new metropolis the sees of St. Agatha, Avellino, Arriano, Ascoli, Bovino, Volturara, Larino, Telesse, Alife, and Siponto. The decree granting this dignity, and the privileges attending it to the bishop of Beneventum and his successors for ever, is subscribed by the pope, by both emperors, and twenty three bishops, and dated the 26th of May, 969.²

In the mean time the emperor Nicephorus Phocas being murdered, and John Tzimisce raised to the empire in his room, Otho sent a third embassy into the East to propose the above-mentioned marriage to the new emperor. The ambassadors were received at Constantinople with all possible marks of esteem, were entertained with the greatest magnificence, and the match was no sooner proposed than agreed to by the emperor and all the great men of the empire. Otho was no sooner acquainted by his ambassadors with the success of their negotiation, than he dispatched some of the first men of the empire to attend the bride from Constantinople to Rome. She was met there by the two emperors; and at their request the pope first performed the marriage ceremony, and crowned her, the very next day, with

great pomp and solemnity, empress of the West.¹

The following year the pope died; and his death is supposed to have happened on the 5th or the 6th of September, after he had presided in the see six years, eleven months, and five days. The inhabitants of Poland being converted to the Christian faith in this pope's time, he sent some bishops from Rome to keep them steady in their new religion, and with the consent and concurrence of Mieceslaus, their first Christian duke or king, established several bishoprics in that populous country, then known by the name of Slavonia, as the inhabitants were by that of Slavonians.² By the same pope the city of Prague was made an episcopal see, and a monk of Saxony, named Dymar, was chosen the first bishop of the place, and ordained by the archbishop of Mentz. None of the natives were, it seems, acquainted with the Latin language, and the pope would not allow divine service to be performed in any other. At the same time Mlada, sister to Boleslaus duke of Bohemia, coming to Rome to visit the holy places there, was, at her request, allowed by the pope to found a monastery for nuns in the city of Prague, and appointed the first abbess, the pope only requiring her to exchange the name of Mlada for that of Maria.³ John XIII. is said to have confirmed in a council at Rome, the privileges, which king Edgar had granted to the monastery of Glassenbury, in a council held at London in the thirteenth year of his reign, that is 971.⁴

The custom of blessing, or, as is vulgarly called, of christening bells, is said by Baronius,⁵ to have been first introduced by this pope, who gave the name of John Baptist to the great bell of the Lateran church. But that this custom prevailed long before the time of John XIII. is manifest from the capitulars of Charlemagne in 789, that is, near two hundred years before pope John. For in those capitulars the christening of bells is forbidden, "ut clocæ non baptizentur."⁶ This custom therefore obtained so early as the year 789, at least in France and Germany. Cardinal Bona observes, that the name of some saint is given to a bell in its consecration, that the people may think themselves called to divine service by the voice of the saint, whose name the bell bears.⁷ John XIII. was buried in the church of St. Paul; and there his epitaph is still to be seen.

¹ Chronograph. Hildensheim. et Sigebert ad ann. 971.

² Chromer Hist. Polon. ad ann. 965.

³ Mabill. See Benedict V. p. 833.

⁴ Malmes. l. ii. de reg. c. 8.

⁵ Baron. ad ann. 968.

⁶ Martene de antiq. Eccles. ritib. l. ii. c. 21.

⁷ Bona rer. Liturg. l. ii. c. 22.

¹ Luitprand, apud Baron. ad ann. 968.

² Append. tom. ix. Concil. p. 1238.

Benedict VI. chosen. Extends the jurisdiction of the see of Saltzburg. Otho the Great dies ;—[Year of Christ, 973.] The pope imprisoned and strangled ;—[Year of Christ, 974.] Donus elected. His character. Dies ;—[Year of Christ, 975.]

BENEDICT VI., THE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[JOHN TZIMISCES, *Emperor of the East.*—OTHO I. OTHO II., *Emperors of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 972.] Benedict, the sixth of that name, by birth a Roman, and the son of one Hildebrand, was, upon the death of John, preferred to the pontifical chair in his room. He was ordained after the 28th of November; for we have a letter of his bearing that date, which is said to have been "written in 973, the first year of his pontificate;" so that on the 28th of November, 973 he had not completed his first year, and must, consequently, have been ordained after that day. All we find recorded of this pope besides his tragical death, is his having extended the jurisdiction of the archiepiscopal see of Saltzburg over the whole province of Noricum, and all Pannonia, whereas his predecessor Agapetus II. had confined the jurisdiction of that see to Noricum and Lower Pannonia, and subjected Upper Pannonia to the see of Lorch.¹

In the second year of Benedict's pontificate died the emperor Otho, deservedly sur-named the Great, and his son and successor being diverted by foreign wars from attending to the affairs of Italy, many of the Italian lords shook off the yoke, and, setting up for sovereigns, tyrannized uncontrolled over those who were not in a condition to oppose them. At Rome one Cincius, having formed a strong party by exclaiming against the emperor as a tyrant, by putting the Romans in mind of the late executions, and exhorting them to recover their former liberty, attacked unexpectedly the Lateran palace, and seizing on the pope, who he knew would oppose him, dragged him to prison, and after keeping him some time confined in the castle of St. Angelo, caused him to be strangled.¹ This is all we know of pope Benedict the sixth.

DONUS II., THE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JOHN TZIMISCES, *Emperor of the East.*—OTHO II., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 974.] Benedict being put to death by the tyrant Cincius, Donus II., a native of Rome, was by the Tusculan faction chosen to succeed him. Hermannus Contractus does not reckon Donus among the popes. But he is by all other writers placed in their catalogues immediately after Benedict VI. Platina writes, and after him Stella, that Donus was a man remarkable for his modesty and his integrity, and therefore met with no ill treatment, but lived unmolested, and was buried in the church of St. Peter. Upon the death of Benedict VI.

one Franco, deacon of the Roman church, was raised by the party of Cincius to the see. But the Tuscan party declaring against him, he left Rome soon after his intrusion, and carrying with him the treasure of St. Peter fled to Constantinople. It was at his instigation, and to make place for him, that Cincius ordered Benedict to be murdered. He is styled by Gerbert, "of all monsters of wickedness the most wicked." Some, however, have allowed him a place between Benedict VI. and Donus II., under the name of Boniface VII.

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 711.

¹ Hermannus Contract.

Majolus, abbot of Cluny, declines the pontifical dignity offered by the emperor. Benedict VII. chosen. Excommunicates Franco. Holds a council at Rome;—[Year of Christ, 951.] Dies. John XIV. chosen and driven from the see by Franco. Franco dies suddenly;—[Year of Christ, 955.] John elected, but not reckoned amongst the popes.

BENEDICT VII., THE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JOHN TZIMISCES, *Emperor of the East*.—OTHO II., *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 975.] The emperor no sooner heard of the death of Donus, than wishing to see one placed in the chair capable of reforming the many abuses that prevailed in the Roman church, he wrote to Majolus, abbot of Cluny, a man held by all in great esteem for the sanctity of his life, earnestly pressing him in his own name, and in the name of the empress Adalais, his mother, to accept of the papal dignity, and repair, without delay, for that purpose to Rome.¹ But the holy abbot obstinately refusing to accept what others were striving by the most wicked means to attain, the emperor, after tempting him again and again, but in vain, with the same offer, dispatched his envoys to Rome, to assist according to custom at the ordination of the new pope. The deputies were ordered to join the Tuscan party; and by that party was chosen and ordained in the presence of the imperial envoys, Benedict VII., a Roman, the son of

one David, and at the time of his election bishop of Sutri.

Benedict was no sooner ordained, than assembling a council in the Lateran church, he deposed, excommunicated, and anathematized with great solemnity Franco, who had intruded himself into the chair upon the death of Benedict VI., inhumanly murdered at his instigation.¹

Of this pope we find nothing else recorded in history, but that in 977 he restored the see of Lorch to its metropolitan dignity, and in 981 held a council at Rome against simoniacal ordinations, at which the emperor was present in person.² In Benedict's time died at Rome, in the month of December, 983, the emperor Otho II., and was buried in the porch of the Vatican church. The pope survived him but a few months; for his death is said to have happened on the 10th of July of the following year, 984, after enjoying the pontifical dignity nine years and some months.

JOHN XIV., THE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILUS, CONSTANTINE, *Emperors of the East*.—OTHO III., *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 984.] In the room of Benedict was chosen, a few days after his death, John XIV., bishop of Pavia, and archchancellor under the late emperor Otho II. His name was Peter, but he exchanged it, upon his promotion, for that of John, out of respect for the prince of the apostles. He held the see only eight months. For Franco, hearing that Otho was dead, left Constantinople, and returning to Rome soon after the election of John, was received with great joy by those of his party, and even encouraged to resume the pontifical dignity, and drive John from the see. This he readily undertook, and his party prevailing, he seized on pope John, confined him in the castle of St. Angelo, and there either starved him to death, or dispatched him with poison. He caused his body to be exposed to public view, that his friends might all know he was dead, and lay aside all thoughts of attempt-

ing his rescue, or re-instating him in his see. Franco enjoyed but a very short time the usurped dignity, being carried off by a sudden death when he had not yet held it a whole year. He behaved, after his restoration, in so tyrannical a manner to all indiscriminately, even to those of his own party, that they stabbed his dead body in an hundred places, dragged it stark naked through the kennels to the place where stood the equestrian statue of the emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, (called in the Vatican manuscript the statue of Constantine) and there left it. But it was from thence conveyed away early the next day by some of the clergy, and privately buried.³

In the room of Franco, called in most catalogues Boniface VII., though by no writer acknowledged for lawful pope, was elected John, a native of Rome, and the son of one Robert. But whether his election

¹ Syrus in Vit. Majoli, l. iii. c. 8.

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 721.

² Idem, p. 1244.

³ Apud Baron. ad ann. 985.

John leaves Rome soon after his election. Is recalled by the tyrant Crescentius. Mediates a peace between Ethelred, king of England, and Richard, duke of Normandy;—[Year of Christ, 990.] The first instance of a solemn canonization;—[Year of Christ, 993.] Quarrel between the pope and the Gallican bishops.

was not canonical, or he died before his consecration, he is not reckoned among the popes, his immediate successor, called likewise John, being counted the fifteenth pope of that name. However, as John, the son of Robert, was elected, he is styled in the

chronicle of St. Maxentius, apostolicus, that is, pope, and so is Boniface VII. For it is there said, that three apostolici died in one year at Rome, in 985, namely, John XIV., Boniface VII. and John the elect.

JOHN XV., THE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIUS, CONSTANTINE, *Emperors of the East.*—OTHO III., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 985.] To John, the son of Robert, was substituted John XV., by birth a Roman, and the son of a presbyter named Leo. He was chosen, it seems, without opposition, and ordained, as appears from some of his letters, in December, 985.¹ In the beginning of his pontificate, Crescentius, a man of great power and authority in Rome, aspiring, after the example of the Tuscan marquises, at the sovereignty of the city, seized on the castle of St. Angelo, which alarmed the pope, acquainted with his violent and tyrannical temper, to such a degree, that leaving Rome he withdrew into Tuscany, and from thence wrote to Otho, entreating him to hasten to the relief of the holy see, and the unhappy city, threatened with destruction by a new tyrant. Otho answered the pope, that as soon as his affairs were settled in Germany, he would march with his whole army to Rome, and exert the same zeal in defence of the apostolic see as his father and grandfather had done. The pope took care to acquaint Crescentius with this answer, who thereupon, remembering the late executions, dispatched some of the chief men of his party to invite his holiness back to Rome, and assure him, that he should be treated with all the respect that was due to the successor of the prince of the apostles. The pope complied with the invitation, and was thenceforth suffered to live quite unmolested by Crescentius, and those of his party.²

In the year 990 a quarrel arising between Ethelred, king of England, and Richard, duke or marquis of Normandy, the pope sent over into England Leo, chorepiscopus of Treves, with the character of his legate *a latere*, to mediate a peace between them. On that occasion John wrote a letter addressed to all the faithful, wherein he tells them that he had sent a legate to the sea coast at a great distance with exhortatory letters; that on Christmas day his legate had an audience of the king; that he persuaded him to

hearken to terms of peace, and send over with him ambassadors to treat with the duke; and that, on the first of March 991, a peace was happily concluded at Roan between the king and the duke.¹

In the life of this pope we meet with the first instance of a solemn canonization. For by him was solemnly canonized, or sainted, Ulderic, bishop of Augusta, at the request of Liutulf, his successor in that see. On that occasion the pope assembled a council in the Lateran palace; and when the bishops were all met, Liutulf rising up, begged leave of the assembly to read to them the book which he held in his hand, containing, he said, an authentic account of the life and miracles of the venerable Ulderic. They readily agreed to his request; and when he had done, the pope, after consulting the bishops, declared with their approbation, that Ulderic might thenceforth be worshipped and invoked as a saint reigning in heaven with Christ.² They did not, it seems, inquire into the truth of any thing contained in that book, but supposed the miracles, and whatever else it contained, to be true.

The only thing that occurs worthy of notice in the pontificate of John XV. is the quarrel that arose in 990, between him and the Gallican bishops, on the following occasion: Adelbert, archbishop of Reims, dying, the famous Hugh Capet, whom the French had raised to the throne in 987,³ appointed Arnold, natural brother to Charles, duke of Lorraine, with whom Hugh was then at war, to succeed him, flattering himself, that he should thus gain him over to his party. The archbishop took the usual oath of allegiance to the king; but six months after he

¹ Malmes. de Reg. i. ii. c. 10. et Concil. tom. ix.

² Mabill. in Pref. ad sec. v. Benedict, p. 99.

³ As Lewis V. left no issue behind him, the French chose Hugh Capet, descended from Childebrand, brother to Charles Martel, for his successor. Charles, duke of Lorraine, and uncle to the deceased king, had an indisputable right to the crown; but he was excluded on account of his attachment to the German party and the emperor Otho. Thus was the crown transferred from the Carlovingian, or the second race of the French kings to the third, who hold it to this day.

¹ Baluz. in Append. Marcæ Hispan. p. 234.

² Baron. ad ann. 985.

Council of Reims against Arnold. Speech of the bishop of Orleans. The pope suspends the bishops of the council. Gerbert's letter on this occasion.

betrayed the city to the duke his brother, as was proved by the testimony of the very priest, who, by his order, opened the gate to the duke. Of this treachery the king and the bishops of the province of Reims complained to the pope, informing his holiness, at the same time, that they designed to assemble a council in order to try the archbishop. The deputies, whom they sent to Rome on that occasion, were at first well received by the pope. But Herbert, count of Vermandois, having in the mean time espoused the cause of Arnold, to whom he was related, the pope, gained by his presents, would not afterwards so much as admit the envoys of the king and the bishops to his presence. However, upon their return, a council was assembled at Reims, at which presided Seguin, archbishop of Sens, and were present all the bishops of the province of Reims, and a great number of abbots from different provinces. They met on the seventeenth of June 991; and Arnold being in the first session convicted of high treason, and of a manifest breach of his oath, he was in the second, at which assisted king Hugh and his son Robert, solemnly deposed, and Gerbert, formerly preceptor to prince Robert, was, at the desire of the king, appointed archbishop of Reims in his room.

Arnold was not deposed by the council, nor was his successor named, till he owned himself guilty of the crime laid to his charge, and acknowledging himself unworthy of the episcopal dignity, delivered the ring and his crosier to the king, and publicly consented to the election of another bishop to that see. However some abbots, undertaking his defence, pretended, upon the authority of forged decretals, that his renunciation was null, and that, notwithstanding his pleading guilty, no other could be placed on that see, till his cause was re-examined at Rome, and his resignation received by the pope. But they were silenced by Arnold, bishop of Orleans, who, on that occasion, made a long speech, showing that all honor was due to the see of Rome, as having been founded by St. Peter, the prince of the apostles; that due obedience ought to be paid to its decrees, so long as they are consistent with the decrees of Nice and of other general councils; that if the pope acted agreeably to those decrees, he would not disapprove nor reverse the judgment given by a provincial synod, or a national council; that if he disapproved or reversed it, greater regard should be had to the ancient laws and canons of the church universal, than to any new decrees that the popes might be prompted to issue by motives of interest, pride, or revenge. From thence he took occasion to lament the deplorable condition to which the Roman church was reduced, being now no longer governed by the Leos, the Innocents, the Gregories, &c., but by the most worthless

wretches of the whole human race, by monsters rather than men, abandoned to all manner of wickedness, and void of all knowledge, both sacred and profane. "And are we," he added, "to consult them and acquiesce in their judgment, when we have in Belgium and Germany, provinces so near us, so many bishops, no less eminent for their learning than for their religion and exemplary lives? At Rome every thing is venal; and he will always have justice on his side, who has most gold to give to his judges." The bishop of Orleans proves, in the remaining part of his speech, that the bishops of each province are empowered, by the councils, to try, condemn, and depose, such of their fellow bishops as are arraigned and convicted of crimes, for which they deserve to be deposed; that they are directed by no canons or laws of the church to consult in such cases the pope, but are only required to acquaint him with the judgment they have given, and, if he does not approve of it, to re-examine the cause on the spot.

The pope was no sooner informed of the deposition of Arnold, and the ordination of Gerbert, than he declared the one and the other null, nay, and suspended all the bishops, and among the rest Gerbert himself, who had assisted at that council. But Gerbert, little imagining then that he should ever be raised, as he afterwards was, to the pontifical dignity, not only made no account of the sentence pronounced by the pope, continuing to perform all episcopal functions as if no such sentence ever had passed, but persuaded the other bishops to pay as little regard to it as he did himself. As Seguin, archbishop of Sens, who had presided at the council, betrayed some fear of the papal thunder, Gerbert wrote to him, that he had nothing to fear; that the judgment of the pope was not so much to be dreaded as the judgment of God; that should the pope sin against his brother, and not obey the church, after repeated admonitions, he ought to be looked upon, without any regard to his station, as a heathen and publican; that he can cut no man off, much less his fellow bishops, from the communion of the church, for not approving what they believe to be contrary to the gospel; that a sentence manifestly unjust, ought not to be looked upon, according to the great pontiff St. Leo, as coming from the see of St. Peter; that bishops and the other pastors of the church, are to regulate their conduct by the Scriptures, by the canons of the church universal, and by the decrees of the apostolic see, when agreeable to them; that they, who transgress those laws, are to be tried by them, and by them alone absolved or condemned; but that such as observe them have nothing to fear, and may live, happen what will, quite undisturbed. He closed his letter with exhorting Seguin to take the laws of the church, and not the will of one man,

Another letter of Gerbert on the proceedings of the council against Arnold. The king writes to the pope; who sends a legate into France. The council of Mouson;—[Year of Christ, 995.] Gerbert's speech in the council. Delivers it to the legate. Gerbert deposed, and Arnold restored.

misinformed or misled by passion or prejudice, for the rule of his conduct.

Gerbert wrote another letter on the same subject to Vilderod, bishop of Strasburg, wherein, after giving him an account of the proceedings of the council against Arnold, he maintains the justice of the sentence pronounced by the bishops who composed it, as entirely agreeable to the decrees of the general councils, and the practice of the church in all ages; confutes what had been urged by some abbots in the council, namely, that a bishop could be judged and deposed by none but the pope, and shows, that as the crimes which Arnold was arraigned of, deserved the punishment that the council had inflicted upon him, and were fully proved, the pope could not reverse the judgment they had given, nor suspend them for giving it.

At the same time, king Hugh wrote to the pope, giving him a succinct account of the proceedings of the council of Rheims, begging him to confirm them, as no ways derogatory to the authority of the apostolic see, and inviting him to meet the Gallican bishops at Grenoble, on the confines of France and Italy, where the affair should be examined anew, in the presence of his holiness. In answer to this letter, the pope pretended that he could not leave Rome, as the tyrant Crescentius would probably lay hold of that opportunity to usurp the sovereignty of the city. He therefore proposed the assembling of a council either at Rome or at Aix-la-Chapelle. But that proposal being rejected by the Gallican bishops, the pope dispatched into France, Leo, abbot of St. Boniface in Rome, with the character of his legate, to assemble a council at Mouson in the diocese of Reims, ordering him to insist on the expulsion of Gerbert, and restoration of Arnold, as the one had been deposed, and the other ordained, without the knowledge or the consent of the apostolic see.

The council met accordingly at the place appointed on the 2d of June, 995; and the legate having presented to the bishops a letter from the pope, declaring the deposition of Arnold uncanonical, and representing Gerbert as an usurper of his see, that prelate showed, in a speech which he made, and afterwards delivered to the legate in writing, that Arnold had been judged and condemned according to the canons; that being convicted of many enormous crimes, he had owned himself unworthy of the episcopal dignity and resigned it; that as for himself, he had never courted that nor any other dignity; that he had been named to it by the king, without any application from him, and freely chosen by the bishops of the province; that he had long declined the offered dignity, but was, in the end, forced to yield to the pressing instances of the king, of the bishops of the province, and the peo-

ple and clergy of Reims; and consequently that he did not deserve to be treated as an usurper of, or intruder into that see. He added, that as to the pope, his holiness had no just cause to complain, since they had informed him of the whole affair before they took any step in it; but as he returned no answer to their deputies, after they had waited eighteen months for directions, they thought it their duty to proceed, according to the known laws of the church, against one whose scandalous conduct reflected disgrace on the episcopal order.

This speech Gerbert delivered to the legate in writing, who promised to transmit it to his holiness, but at the same time ordered him to forbear all ecclesiastical functions till the meeting of another council; and he appointed another to meet on the 1st of July at Reims, there being present at this only four bishops, namely, the archbishop of Treves, and the bishops of Liege, of Verdun, and Munster. When the legate commanded Gerbert to abstain from the functions of his office till the meeting of the new council, he told him in plain terms, that he would not comply with that injunction, no bishop, no patriarch, nor even the pope himself, being empowered by the canons to suspend a bishop, unless he was convicted of the crime laid to his charge, or confessed it, or refused to appear at a synod, when canonically summoned; that he was not guilty, nor even arraigned, of any thing of that nature, and would not therefore condemn himself. However, at the friendly interposition of Luitolf, archbishop of Treves, he consented to abstain from celebrating mass till the meeting of the council.¹

The acts of that council have not reached our times. But from history it appears, that Leo, the pope's legate, having gained, as he was a man of great address, many of the Gallican bishops over to his party, Gerbert was deposed by that assembly, and Arnold ordered to be reinstated in his see. But notwithstanding this sentence, Arnold was kept by the king closely confined, as guilty of high treason, till three years after, when, upon the death of king Hugh, he was, at the request of pope Gregory V. the immediate successor of the present pope, released by king Robert, the son of Hugh, and suffered to return to his see.² As for Gerbert, he readily submitted to the sentence of the council, however unjust, saying the bishops are welcome to take from me what they have given me; which was tacitly declaring, that he yielded to the bishops, and not to the pope. He withdrew from France to the court of Otho III. whose preceptor he had been, and was by him first preferred to the see of Ravenna, and, upon the death of

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 743. 747.

² Aimoin. in Vit. Sancti Abbon.

Death of John XV. ;—Year of Christ, 996.] Gregory V. chosen. He crowns Otho emperor. The electoral college not instituted by Gregory. Gregory driven from Rome ;—[Year of Christ, 997.]

Gregory V. to that of Rome, as we shall see in the sequel.

The council of Reims was held in 995, and pope John XV. died the following year, the eleventh of his pontificate. He is commended by the writers of later times for his piety, his learning, and even for his skill in the military art, though we do not find, that he ever had the least opportunity of showing

or exerting that skill, and it can be no great commendation in a bishop to be a good general. He is said to have writ several books; but none of his works have reached our times. I shall leave Baronius to reconcile with this pope's sanctity, what was said by Arnold bishop of Orleans, in the council of Reims, namely, that in his time every thing was venal at Rome.

GREGORY V., THE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIUS, CONSTANTINE, *Emperors of the East.*—OTHO III., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 996.] As Otho III. was encamped with his army at Ravenna when the pope died, the clergy, the senate, and the people of Rome, immediately despatched messengers to acquaint him with the death of the pope, to express their desire of being honored with his presence in their city, and beg his directions with respect to the future election. Among the clergy of Otho's chapel was his nephew, Bruno, then only twenty-four years of age, but of a sweet disposition, of an exemplary life, well versed in most branches of learning, and by all no less esteemed for his eminent virtues than his high birth. This youth Otho recommended to the clergy and people of Rome, and he was, it seems, elected while he was still at Ravenna. For we are told by the author of the life of St. Adalbert, bishop of Prague, who flourished at this very time, that Bruno was elected, and attended to Rome by Willigisus, archbishop of Mentz, and another bishop; that he was received there with all possible marks of respect and esteem, and consecrated pope to the great satisfaction of the people and clergy.¹ As to the time of his ordination, all we know for certain is, that he was ordained before the twenty-eighth of April, 996. This we learn from a charter he granted to the monastery of St. Ambrose, dated the twenty-eighth of April, 998, in the second year of his pontificate.² If he was on the twenty-eighth of April, 998, still in his second year, he must have begun his first before that day. At his ordination he chose to be called Gregory, and he is the fifth of that name.

Otho, who had been hitherto only styled king of Germany, went soon after the ordination of his nephew to Rome, and was by him solemnly crowned emperor on Whitsunday, which in 996 fell on the thirty-first of May.³

The same year Gregory held a council at Rome, consisting chiefly of Italian bishops; and in this council the electoral college is said to have been instituted by the pope and the emperor, who was present at it in person. But the writers, who first ascribed that institution to Gregory V., all lived three years after his time; and the more ancient and contemporary historians are all, to a man, silent about it. Besides, the presbyter Nippo, in the account he gives us of the election of the emperor Conrad, surnamed the Salic, that happened twenty-six years after the death of Gregory V., tells us, as an eye-witness, that Conrad was elected emperor by the archbishops, who voted the first, and by the grandees of Italy as well as of Germany, the emperor, whoever he was, being at that time king of Lombardy. In the same manner, Lotharius, duke of Saxony, was chosen emperor in 1125, upon the death of Henry V., who died without issue, as we read in Orderic, who flourished about that time.¹ From these testimonies of contemporary writers, and many more might be produced, it is evident, that the number of electors was not, till long after this pope's time, confined to seven.

Upon the breaking up of this council, with respect to which we are left quite in the dark, the emperor, taking leave of the pope, returned with his army to Germany, having first made the Romans swear allegiance to him, and obedience to the pope. But he was no sooner gone, than the tyrant Crescentius, having formed a strong party under color of redeeming the city from the bondage it groaned under, and restoring the Romans to the liberty they enjoyed under their own princes, drove Gregory from his see, plundered the Lateran Palace, and began, as consul and prince of the republic, titles his followers bestowed on him, to act as sovereign of Rome.

Gregory being fled, the tyrant declared

¹ In Vit. Adalbert apud Mabill. See Benedict. V.

² Concil. tom. ix. p. 555.

³ Chronograph, Hildensheim. ad hunc ann.

¹ Orderic Vitalis, l. ii. p. 882.

John XVI. anti-pope. Excommunicated by Gregory. Gregory restored;—[Year of Christ, 998.] Crescentius and his accomplices punished. Council of Rome. King Robert excommunicated and his queen.

the see vacant, and raised to it one Philagathes, who took the name of John. He was a native of Calabria, of a very mean extraction, but a man of great parts and address. As Calabria was then subject to the Greek empire, and he spoke that language, he soon insinuated himself into the favor of the Greek empress, Theophania, the wife of Otho II., and was by her recommended to the emperor, who employed him in several affairs of great moment, as did likewise his son, the present emperor, Otho III. Upon the death of the bishop of Placentia, he seized on that see, and held it, till hearing that Gregory was driven from Rome, he purchased the see with the plunder of the church of Placentia.¹

From Rome Gregory withdrew to Pavia, and in a council held there excommunicated Crescentius, as well as the usurper of his see, and with them all their accomplices. The sentence pronounced by the pope against John was confirmed by all the bishops of Italy, France, and Germany, in the councils they assembled for that purpose. In the mean time the emperor, hearing of the revolt of the Romans, of the expulsion of the pope, and tyranny exercised in Rome by Crescentius, set out at the head of a small, but chosen body of troops for Italy, and finding the pope at Pavia, pursued his march with him to Rome. John betook himself to flight at their approach; but falling into the hands of some of the pope's friends, they deprived him of his sight, cut off his nose, and tore out his tongue. This they are by some said to have done without the emperor's knowledge, apprehending that he might forgive him, as he had been formerly one of his chief favorites.² But others write, that this punishment was inflicted upon him by the command of the emperor.³ As for Crescentius, he retired into the castle of St. Angelo, not having a sufficient number of men to defend the walls of the city. But the emperor ordered a general assault, and having taken the place by storm, though till that time thought impregnable, he ordered the tyrant's head to be cut off, and his body to be hung upon a gibbet before one of the gates of the city, with the bodies of twelve of his accomplices.⁴ The famous abbot St. Nilus is said by the author of his life to have exerted his utmost endeavors in favor of John, begging both of the pope and the emperor that his life might be spared, and he sent back to his monastery (for he was originally a monk) to do penance there for his sins. That writer adds, that, notwithstanding the interposition, the prayers, and entreaties of so holy a man, the pope ordered the unhappy wretch, blind and deformed

as he was, to be led through the streets in a tattered sacerdotal habit, mounted upon an ass with his face to the tail, which he held in his hand. But of this no notice is taken by the more ancient writers; and besides, Gregory is commended by the contemporary writers for the sweetness of his temper, and is even said to have diverted the emperor, when he first came to Rome, from banishing Crescentius for the disturbances which he had raised, under the other popes, in that city. The executions spoken of above struck such terror into the people, that they thenceforth carefully avoided giving Gregory the least cause of complaint.

The pope being thus restored to his see, and having nothing to fear from the Romans, convened a council in Rome, at which assisted twenty-eight bishops, and the emperor in person, with a great number of presbyters, abbots, and deacons. This council was chiefly assembled on the following occasion. Robert, king of France, had married Berta, the widow of Odo, count of Champagne, and daughter of Conrad, king of Burgundy. But as Robert had been godfather to one of her children, and godfathers were forbidden by the council of Trullo not only to marry the infant, but the mother of the infant for whom they had answered,¹ the pope assembled a council to declare the king's marriage incestuous and null. And such it was accordingly declared by the pope and all the bishops who were present, and the king was ordered, in the first canon, to dismiss Berta, whom he had married contrary to the laws of the church, and to atone by a seven years' penance for that transgression, on pain of being cut off from the communion of the faithful. The same sentence was pronounced against Berta, if she did not separate from the king. By the second canon, all the bishops who had assisted at that marriage, and Erchembaldus in particular, archbishop of Tours, who had given the nuptial benediction, were suspended from their episcopal functions and the communion, till they went to Rome, and, acknowledging their fault, obtained forgiveness of the apostolic see. No regard was at first paid, either by the king or by Berta, to the sentence of the pope and his council: but it made so deep an impression upon the minds of his subjects, that he was forsaken, if Petrus Damianus is to be credited, by all his domestics except two, who supplied him with the necessaries of life; and neither would they have any other intercourse with him, nor would they so much as touch the vessels he had used, till they had purified them in the fire.² Be that as it will, the king lived three years longer

¹ Chron. Magdeburg. ad ann. 997.

² Ibid. ad ann. 998.

³ Chronograph. Hildensheim. ad ann. 998.

⁴ Idem ibid.

¹ Justin. Cod. l. v. tit. 4. leg. 16.

² Petrus Damian. ep. 5.

But this is probably of a piece with what we read in the same author, namely, that Berta was delivered of a monster, having the neck and the head of a goose.

Other canons of the council of Rome. Gregory dies;—[Year of Christ, 999.] Silvester II., chosen. His generosity to Arnold of Reims.

with Berta, and then, dismissing her, married Constantia, surnamed Candida, the daughter of William, count of Provence. He is said to have been persuaded by Abbo, abbot of Fleury, to part with Berta and marry another in her room. Ivo of Chartres writes, that the bishops went all to Rome with the king, and with Berta, to be absolved by the pope.¹ But the writer of Abbo's life, taking no notice of the king's journey to Rome, only says, that he confessed his fault, that he publicly begged pardon for the scandal that he had given, and performed the penance that was enjoined him.

Gisilerius, bishop of Mersburg, held at this time the archbishopric of Magdeburg, and being therefore charged with holding two parishes, that is, two bishoprics, it was ordained by the third canon of the present council, that the church of Mersburg, erected by the apostolic see and the emperor Otho I. into an episcopal see, but divested of that dignity by Otho II., should be restored to its former rank; and by the fourth canon it was decreed, that if Gisilerius could make it appear, that his translating himself from the see of Mersburg to that of Magdeburg was not owing to ambition, but that he had been invited by the people, he should be continued in that see; but if he could not make that appear he should return to Mersburg. It was added in that canon, that if it could be proved, that he had been induced by motives of ambition or avarice to exchange the one

church for the other, he should keep neither. The fifth canon related to the church of Puy in Velay. Guy, bishop of that city, had, on his death-bed, appointed Stephen, his nephew, to succeed him, without consulting either the clergy or people. Stephen was accordingly ordained by the archbishop of Bourges, and the bishop of Nevers. But this ordination was declared null by the council, Stephen was deposed, and two bishops, who had ordained him, were suspended, till they satisfied the holy see. By the same canon the clergy and people of Velay were empowered to choose their bishop, who was to be ordained by the pope, and king Robert was exhorted not to support Stephen, but, on the contrary, to favor the election of the clergy and people. This judgment was complied with in France, and in the room of Stephen, Theodard was elected by the clergy and people, and ordained by Silvester II. the successor of Gregory.¹

Gregory did not long survive the holding of this council, for he died, as appears from his epitaph, which is still to be seen in the church of St. Peter, on the eighteenth of February, 999. In the same epitaph he is commended for his high birth, for his knowledge of three languages, the French, or the Teutonic, the Latin, and the language, or barbarous Latin, that was then spoken in Italy, and for his generosity to the poor.

SILVESTER II., THE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIUS, CONSTANTINE, *Emperors of the East*.—OTHO III., *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 999.] Gregory was succeeded by Gerbert, unanimously chosen by the clergy and people of Rome upon the recommendation of the emperor, who had preferred him the year before to the archiepiscopal see of Ravenna. He was a native of Auvergne, come of an obscure family, but endowed with most extraordinary parts, and had shown from his tender years great thirst after knowledge. He was highly esteemed by the emperor Otho II. who chose him for preceptor to his son Otho III. and gave him the abbey of Bobio in Italy. Upon the death of the emperor he returned to France, and settled at Reims with archbishop Adalberon. He pretended to have been named by that prelate, on his death-bed, for his successor in that see. But the king, Hugh Capet, nevertheless preferred to it Arnold, the natural

son of Lotharius, king of France, and brother to Charles, Duke of Lorraine. When Arnold was convicted of having betrayed that city to the duke, and thereupon deposed by the council of Reims, he was, with the approbation of the king, chosen by the people of Reims and the bishops of that province to succeed him. But being afterwards deposed in his turn by Leo, the legate of John XV., the emperor Otho III. got him first chosen archbishop of Ravenna, and afterwards raised to the apostolic see. He was ordained in the presence of the imperial envoys, on Palm-Sunday, which in 999 fell on the second of April; and on that occasion he took the name of Silvester II.

He was no sooner ordained, than, forgetting the quarrel between him and Arnold, archbishop of Reims, he confirmed that pre-

¹ Ivo, Part. ix. c. 8.

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 772, et seq.

St. Stephen, king of Hungary, perpetual legate ;— [Year of Christ, 1000.] The bishop of Hildesheim complains to the pope of his metropolitan ;— [Year of Christ, 1001.] Council in Germany disapproves the conduct of the metropolitan. Silvester dies ;— [Year of Christ, 1003.] Charged with the study of Magic.

late in his see, empowered him to perform all the functions of his office, to wear the pall, to consecrate the kings, to ordain his suffragans, and exercise the same jurisdiction over them, as had ever been exercised by any of his predecessors. As he could not justify him without condemning himself, he told him in the letter, which he wrote to him on that occasion, that though his conscience condemned him, he absolved him by the authority with which he was vested as the successor of the prince of the apostles.¹

The pope is said to have sent the following year to St. Stephen I. king of Hungary, the famous crown, with which his successors are crowned to this day, and to have bestowed upon him, at the same time, the title of king, and appointed him his perpetual legate, with full power to dispose of all ecclesiastical preferments at his pleasure, and to have, as legate of the apostolic see, the cross carried before him, as a reward justly due to his apostolic labours in converting his subjects to the Christian faith. "I am called the apostolic," said the pope to the king's ambassadors demanding a royal crown for their master; "but he may well be called the apostle of Christ, who has gained to him so numerous a people; and we therefore leave the churches to be disposed of by him, as our vicar."²

In the year 1001 the pope sent Frederic, cardinal of the Roman church, into Germany to determine a difference between Bernouard, bishop of Hildesheim, and his metropolitan, Willegisus, archbishop of Mentz. The archbishop had given the veil to a nun in a monastery under the immediate jurisdiction of the see of Hildesheim, and besides consecrated the church of the said monastery without the permission of the bishop. Bernouard, provoked at the arbitrary proceedings of his metropolitan, and determined to maintain the just rights of his see, went in person to Rome to complain to the pope. Silvester, who had been formerly acquainted with him, received him with the greatest marks of esteem, the rather, as he was warmly recommended to him by the emperor; but he would give no sentence till he had heard both sides, and the affair was inquired into on the spot. He therefore sent the above mentioned cardinal into Germany with orders to assemble a council, to hearken to the advice of the bishops who composed it, and to determine the dispute together with them. The council met by the appointment of the legate at Polden on the 22d of July. But the archbishop, finding his conduct was censured by almost all the bishops who were present, privately withdrew; and he was thereupon, with the approbation of the council, suspended by the legate from all

episcopal functions, till he gave the bishop of Hildesheim such satisfaction as his fellow-bishops should judge proper; and he was strictly enjoined to abstain for the future from any ways encroaching on the jurisdiction and rights of his suffragans as established by the known laws of the church. The acts of this council were brought to Rome by the cardinal legate, and confirmed by the pope in a council held in the Lateran palace, at which were present thirty bishops, and the emperor in person.

Of this pope, though highly commended by most of the writers who lived the nearest to this time, for the sanctity of his life, as well as the prudence with which he administered his short pontificate, we find nothing else recorded besides his giving the pall at Rome to St. Herebert, archbishop of Cologne, and his confirming to Leothoric, archbishop of Sens, the primacy of all Gaul, formerly granted by John VIII. to Ansegisus, his predecessor in that see. Silvester died on the 12th of May, 1003, having governed the church four years one month and nine days. The day of his death is marked on his epitaph, which was composed by pope Sergius IV. who succeeded him in 1009, and is still to be seen in the Lateran church.

Cardinal Benno, who lived in the time of Gregory VII., writes, that Silvester was a famous magician; that he learnt the black art in a book, which he stole at Seville; that he did homage to the devil; that he sold his soul to him for the popedom; that he had a brazen head in his closet, which answered all the questions he asked, and that having consulted the devil about the length of his life, he was assured he should not die till he had said mass in Jerusalem; that he thereupon promised himself a very long life, but happening in the fifth year of his pontificate to say mass in the church called the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, he was taken suddenly ill, and concluding, from a strange noise of devils, that his end was at hand, he made a full confession of his sins to the cardinals, and desired that his body might be put into a chariot drawn by two horses, and buried where they should stop; that his request being complied with, the horses stopt at the Lateran church, and that he was buried there by the cardinals. To these tales other writers have added, that for a long time after his bones were heard to rattle, and his sepulchre used to sweat great drops when a pope was to die. These fables, however absurd and ridiculous, have been adopted by Siebert, who indeed speaks doubtfully of them, and likewise by Martinus Polonus, Vincent of Beavais, Galfrid, Malmesbury, and several others, who flourished many years after his time. But he is highly commended for his piety and eminent virtues by all the contemporary writers, who speak

¹ Concil. i. ix. p. 778.

² Apud Surium. in Vit. S. Steph. ad Diem 20 Aug.

Silvester's writings. John XVII. chosen.

of him, namely, by his successor Sergius IV.; in his epitaph, by Ditmar, bishop of Mersburg,¹ by Helgald, monk of Fleuri,² and by several others, who lived in his time, or very soon after it. His rise from the lowest station in life to the highest dignity in the church, the high favour he was in with the emperor and other princes and kings of his time, and his extraordinary knowledge in every branch of literature, especially in mathematics and astronomy, probably made him be looked upon in so ignorant an age as a magician; and what was said by the ignorant multitude was gravely related by cardinal Benno as matter of fact, the cardinal being a most violent partizan of the emperor Henry, with whom Gregory VII. was then at war.

Silvester travelled very early into Italy, Spain, and Germany, in quest of knowledge, spent large sums, as soon as he had it in his power, in the purchase of books, and spared no expense to get those transcribed, which he could not purchase. He wrote himself several learned treatises of rhetoric, arithmetic, and geometry. He made a set of globes, and a clock, while he was with the emperor at Magdeburg, and afterwards an astrolabe, of which he wrote a treatise by way of dialogue between him and Leo, the pope's legate. Upon his being preferred to the archiepiscopal see of Ravenna, he wrote a very learned charge to his suffragans,

which has been published by Mabillon under the following title, "A sermon or speech of the philosopher Gerbert, pope of the city of Rome, surnamed Silvester, for the instruction of bishops."¹ In that piece he highly complains of the simony that prevailed in his time. To Silvester is ascribed by Baronius and others, the life of St. Adalbert, bishop of Prague, and martyr. But the learned Mabillon has plainly proved it to be the work of an anonymous monk.² This pope wrote a great number of letters upon different subjects, whereof one hundred and sixty were printed at Paris in 1611. But the completest collection of these letters is to be met with in Duchesne;³ and they afford us great light with respect to the affairs of those times, both ecclesiastic and civil. His thirty-eighth letter contains the first exhortation to the crusade. For he there introduces the city of Jerusalem addressing and exhorting the church universal to rescue the holy places, where our Lord was born, where he lived and suffered, out of the hands of the infidels. He was frequently consulted, before his promotion to the apostolic see, by the emperor Otho III., and we have one of that prince's letters to him with the following direction, "To Gerbert, a most learned philosopher, and eminent in the three branches of philosophy." The verse he wrote on his promotion from Reims to Ravenna, and from Ravenna to Rome, does him no great honour.⁴

JOHN XVII., THE HUNDRED AND FORTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIUS, CONSTANTINE, *Emperors of the East.*—HENRY II., *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1003.] In the room of Silvester was chosen, after a vacancy of thirty-three days, John XVII., surnamed Sicco, a native of Rome, of a mean descent according to some: of a very illustrious and ancient family according to others. As the emperor Otho III. died the year before, and Henry of Bavaria was not yet crowned emperor, the clergy and people were left to choose whom they pleased, and to their disagreement was, probably, owing the length of the vacancy. We know nothing at all of the character or actions of this pope. In-

deed, his pontificate was so short, that he scarce had time to perform any thing worthy of notice. For he was ordained on the 13th of June, 1003, and died on the 7th of December of the same year, having held the see five months, and twenty-five days. He was buried, as Joannes Diaconus the Younger informs us, in the Lateran church, and his tomb was still to be seen there in his time.⁵

¹ Mabill. Analect. tom. 2. ² Mabill. Sec. Benedict. V.

³ Duches, Scriptor. ver. Franc.

⁴ Scandit ab R. Gerbertus in R. post Papa viget R.

⁵ Joan. Diac. de Eccles. Lateran.

¹ Ditmar. l. vi.

² Helgald, in Vit. Robert Regis.

John XVIII. chosen. Bamberg made an episcopal see. He reunites the churches of Constantinople and Rome. He dies. Sergius chosen. Sends a legate to consecrate a monastery in Tours.

JOHN XVIII., THE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIIUS, CONSTANTINE, *Emperors of the East.*—HENRY II., *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1003.] John XVII. was succeeded by John XVIII., by birth a Roman, and called, before his election, Fasanus. He was ordained on the twenty-sixth of December, which in the year 1003 fell on a Sunday.

The first thing we find recorded of this pope is his sending a legate into Germany to assist at the consecration of Tagmo, who had been elected archbishop of Magdeburg in the room of Gisilerus deceased. That see was founded by Otho I., and by a particular privilege granted at his request, the new archbishop was to be ordained by none but the pope. As Tagmo, therefore, was not, at the time of his election, in a condition to undertake a journey to Rome, nor did the pope think it advisable to leave the city in the very beginning of his pontificate, he appointed a legate to assist at the ordination in his name; and the ceremony was performed by Willegisus, archbishop of Mentz, and the other bishops of the province, in the presence of the legate, and of Henry, duke of Bavaria, who had succeeded Otho III. in the kingdom of Germany.¹

In this pope's time the city of Bamberg was, with his approbation, erected by king Henry into a bishopric, and taken by the pope into the particular protection of the

apostolic see, but at the same time subjected to the metropolitan see of Mentz, as appears from the pope's letters to the bishops of Gaul and Germany.¹

Of John XVIII., we read nothing else besides his sending St. Bruno to preach the gospel to the Russians, his granting some privileges to monasteries, and receiving at Rome, with uncommon marks of distinction, Elpheg, the new archbishop of Canterbury, gone thither, in 1006, for the pall.² It is said in his epitaph, that he reunited the eastern and western churches, and happily put an end, we know not by what means, to the schism that subsisted between them. What is said there is confirmed by Peter, patriarch of Antioch, who tells Michael Cœrularius in a letter, which he wrote to him in 1050, that being forty years before at Constantinople, in the pontificate of pope Sergius, he found that the name of pope John, the predecessor of Sergius, was commemorated at mass with the names of the other patriarchs, but was omitted, he knew not why, at the time he wrote that letter.³ We shall see in the sequel what this rupture was owing to.

The pope died, according to the most probable opinion, about the end of May, 1009, having presided in the church five years and five months.

SERGIUS IV., THE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIIUS, CONSTANTINE, *Emperors of the East.*—HENRY II., *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1009.] To John XVIII. was substituted Sergius IV., a native of Rome, the son of one Martin, and at the time of his election bishop of Albano. His name was Peter, but he is said to have changed it, out of respect for the founder of his see, and to have taken that of Sergius. As to the time of his election, we only know that it happened after the seventeenth of June, 1009, a charter dated that day in 1012 being said to have been granted in the third year of his pontificate;² so that on the seven-

teenth of June, 1012, he had not entered into his fourth year, and he must therefore have been chosen after that day in 1009.

We find nothing recorded of this pope besides his sending a legate into France to consecrate a monastery founded in the diocese of Tours, which Hugh, archbishop of that city, looked upon as an encroachment upon his jurisdiction; and his determining a dispute between the archbishop of Hamburg and the bishop of Verden about a parish

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 785.

² Osborn. in Vit. Sancti Elphegi, apud Surium, tom. ii. Die 19 April.

³ Apud Baron. ad ann. 1009.

¹ Ditmar. l. v.

² Ughell. Italia sacra, tom. vii. p. 523.

Sergius' death and character ;—[Year of Christ, 1012.]
Crowns Henry II. emperor ;—[Year of Christ, 1014.]
emperors.

Benedict chosen, driven from the see, and restored—
Henry confirms all the donations of the preceding

named Ramsola, which the pope adjudged to the archbishop.¹

Sergius died in 1012, either in the latter end of the third, or in the beginning of the fourth year of his pontificate. For his successor was possessed of the see on the twenty-third of November of that year, as appears from one of his diplomas.² From his epitaph, it appears that he had governed the church of Albano five years before he was translated to that of Rome ; that he was of a mild disposition, kind to his friends,

generous to the poor, and dear to all. He has been thought worthy of a place in the Benedictine monology, though he is not honored by the church as a saint. This pope was called Os Porci, or Hog's Snout, as we read in Ditmar, a contemporary writer, and not Sergius II. as is said by Platina, who will have that pope to have been the first, who, disliking his own name, took another. But that custom did not take place, as has been shown, till long after the time of Sergius II. raised to the see in 844.

BENEDICT VIII., THE HUNDRED AND FORTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIUS, CONSTANTINE, *Emperors of the East.*—HENRY II, *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1012.] Upon the death of Sergius, John, bishop of Porto, the son of Gregory, count of Tusculum, was raised by his family to the chair, after the seventeenth of June 1012, when Sergius was still living, as we have seen, and before the twenty-third of November of the same year, when John, under the name of Benedict VIII., was in possession of the see. But he was soon driven from it by one Gregory, and obliged to fly into Saxony, and implore the protection of Henry, king of Germany. That prince received him with the greatest marks of respect and esteem, promised to re-instate him in his see, and having settled the affairs of his kingdom, he set out with that view for Italy in September, 1013, kept his Christmas at Pavia, and from thence pursued his march, at the head of a numerous army, to Rome. But the Romans, in the mean time, hearing that the king had espoused the cause of Benedict, recalled him, and drove Gregory from the chair and the city. The king, however, continued his march, and arriving at Rome in February, 1014, was met by the pope at some distance from the city, and received at the gate by the clergy, the magistrates, and the nobility, and attended by them to the church of St. Peter.

The pope, to engage the king in his defence, had, no doubt, promised to crown him emperor ; and this ceremony he performed a few days after his arrival with the greatest pomp and solemnity, crowning him emperor, and at the same time his queen Cunegunda empress. The pope, before he placed the crown on his head, asked him whether he would be the protector and defender of the church, whether he would be faithful to him and his successors, and upon

his answering, that he would ever protect and defend the church to the utmost of his power, and pay all due obedience to his holiness and his successors in the apostolic see, the pope set the crown on his head and saluted him emperor, amidst the loud acclamations of the multitude. On this occasion the pope presented the emperor with a crown of gold in the shape of a globe, enriched with precious stones of an immense value, with a cross of gold at the top, to denote, says Glaber, a contemporary writer, that he ought to reign so as to deserve the protection of the cross. That crown the emperor sent to the monastery of Cluny, in high reputation, even in that degenerate age, for the strict observance of the monastic rules, and the eminent sanctity of many of those monks. When the ceremony of the coronation was over, the pope gave a grand entertainment to the emperor and the empress in the Lateran palace.¹ This ceremony was performed on the fourteenth of February, in the year 1014, which was the thirteenth of Henry's reign as king of Germany.²

The emperor confirmed, before he left Rome, all the donations of his predecessors in favor of the apostolic see ; “we confirm,” said he in his diploma, “all the donations made to the blessed apostle Peter, by Pepin, by Charles, and by the Otho's.” However, by the same diploma he confirmed the decrees of Eugene II. and Leo IV., ordering the new pope to be ordained or consecrated in the presence of the imperial commissaries ; and this edict or diploma was still complied with in the election of Alexander II., raised to the chair in 1061, as appears from Petrus Damianus, who wrote in that pontificate.

¹ Adam. Bremens. l. iii. c. 13. et lib. ii. c. 35.

² Apud Baron. ad ann. 1012.

¹ Chron. Hildesheim. ad ann. 1014. Glaber, in fine libri I. Ditmar, in init. l. 7.

² Ditmar, in init. l. vii.

Henry causes the symbol to be sung at mass in Rome. The pope drives the Saracens out of Italy;—[Year of Christ, 1016.] Some Jews executed at Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1017.] The bishopric of Bamberg given to the pope;—[Year of Christ, 1019.] Two councils held by the pope.

The emperor, who was a most religious prince, and is now even honored as a saint, is said to have asked the Roman clergy, during his stay at Rome, why they did not sing at mass the symbol or creed after the Gospel, agreeably to the custom that obtained in all other churches. That question the Romans answered, saying, the Roman church had never been infected with heresy, but had always held the doctrine delivered to her by the apostle St. Peter; and therefore left those churches to sing the creed, that had held tenets contrary to the doctrines which it contained. This answer, reflecting on all other churches, did not satisfy the emperor, who therefore insisted on the creed being sung at Rome as it was everywhere else; and he prevailed in the end.¹

In the year 1016 the Saracens made a descent upon the coast of Italy, and having made themselves masters of the city of Luna in Tuscany, they settled there with their families, and made frequent incursions into the neighboring countries. Their neighborhood alarmed the pope, and, therefore, assembling all the bishops and defenders of the church, he ordered them to join him with all the men they could raise, in order to march jointly with him against the common enemy. Having thus assembled a competent army, and at the same time prepared a great number of armed vessels to prevent their escaping by sea, his holiness set out from Rome at the head of his army. At his approach the king of the Saracens had the good luck to get off unobserved in a small vessel; but his people, reduced to despair, held out three whole days, and with great slaughter repulsed the aggressors in their repeated attacks. But being in the end quite tired out, they abandoned the place, hoping to find shelter in the neighboring woods. But his holiness pursued them so close, that not one out of so numerous a multitude escaped the edge of the sword. We are told the number of the slain was so great, that the victors could not count the dead bodies, and that the booty was immense. The queen of the Saracens was taken, and without any regard to her sex, put to death. The ornament of gold, enriched with precious stones, which she wore on her head, was claimed by the pope, who sent to the emperor his share of the rest of the booty. The king of the Saracens, highly provoked at the loss of his queen, and so many of his subjects, sent him a sack full of chesnuts, with this message, that he would return next summer with as many men. In answer to this message the pope sent him a bag filled with millet, and bid the messenger let the king know, that if he was not satisfied with the mischief which he had already

done to the patrimony of St. Peter, he might return, but should find as many armed men to receive him.¹

The following year there happened in Rome a most violent storm of wind, by which, as it began on Good Friday after the adoration of the cross, and lasted, without intermission, till Saturday evening, many houses were blown down, and great numbers of people buried in the ruins. But they found at last what had occasioned that storm. For a Jew of the Greek synagogue informed the pope, that his brethren had treated the image of Christ with scorn and derision at the very time the Christians were worshipping it. Upon this intelligence the pope caused the Jews, belonging to that synagogue, to be strictly examined; and having found what the informer told him to be true, he ordered all, who were anyways concerned in that sacrilegious insult, to be immediately executed, and the storm ceased.² Many such stories were related, and even believed by some of the best writers of those dark ages.

In the year 1019 the pope, leaving Rome, where a perfect tranquillity reigned, went into Germany, and kept his Easter at Bamberg with the emperor, who had invited him thither to consecrate a church in that city, erected by him into a bishopric. That ceremony the pope performed with great solemnity, and the emperor entailed that bishopric upon him and his successors forever, with an annual tribute of a white horse, and an hundred marks of silver.³ This bishopric Leo IX. afterwards exchanged for that of Beneventum, only reserving the tribute of a white horse, as we shall see in the sequel.

By this pope two councils only are said to have been held, during the eleven years of his pontificate, the one at Rome, the other at Pavia. All we know of the former is his granting a charter to a monastery in Italy, containing several privileges.⁴ The acts of the latter have reached our times; and they consist of a speech pronounced by the pope, wherein he loudly complains of the incontinence of the clergy, and of seven canons, whereof the two first enforce the observance of the canons forbidding clerks to keep concubines, or to have women in their houses. By the two next, the children of clerks are declared to be slaves of the church, which their fathers belonged to, though born of a free woman; and it was enacted by the three last, that no vassal of the church, whether clerk or layman, should make any purchase in his own name, or in the name of a freeman. The decrees of this council

¹ Ditmar, l. vii.

² Fragm. Historiæ Aquitan. ad ann. 1017.

³ Chron. Hilden. ad ann. 1019. Wippo, in Vit. Conrad. Salic. Leo Ostiens. l. i. c. 47.

⁴ Ughell Ital. Sacra tom. ii. p. 996.

Benedict dies;—[Year of Christ, 1021.] His writings. John XIX. chosen. He refuses the title of universal bishop to the patriarch of Constantinople;—[Year of Christ, 1025.]

were signed by the pope, by the archbishop of Milan, and five bishops, and confirmed by the emperor, who, at the request of the pope, inserted them in an imperial edict, and by this means they became a standing law in all his dominions.¹ This council was held on the first of August, but in the Acts no mention is made of the year. However, as it is said to have assembled in the reign of the glorious emperor Henry, it is manifest that it did not assemble till after the year 1013, since Henry was not crowned emperor till the 14th of February, 1014.

Benedict VIII. died, as we read in the authors, whose calculations seem to be the most exact, after a pontificate of eleven years, eleven months, and twenty-one days. He is commended by the contemporary writers for his charity and generosity to the poor, and his zeal in striving to reform the scandalous and dissolute manners of the clergy. He was a great friend to the monks, held in great esteem and received at Rome, with uncommon marks of distinction, St. Odilo, abbot of Cluny, and St. Romuald, founder of the order of Camaldulense, and is said to have enriched the monastery of Monte Cassino with many valuable relics sent thither from the Lateran church. Of these relics the reader will find an inventory in Leo Ostiensis, by whom the following are mentioned among the rest, namely, some of the wood of the cross, of the garment, and of the blood of the Saviour, a splinter of one of the stones with which St. Stephen was stoned, and some drops of his

blood, some of the veil of the Virgin Mary, and of the garments of most of the apostles, and of many other saints.¹ This pope, for all his good works, is said to have been condemned to purgatory, and appearing to John, bishop of Porto, to have told him that he should not be delivered from these scorching flames till Odilo, abbot of Cluny, prayed him out of them. This intelligence the bishop communicated to the abbot, who, falling immediately upon his knees, continued praying till it was revealed to him that his petition was heard.²

We have one letter of this pope addressed to the bishops of Burgundy, Aquitain, and Provence, to Burchard, archbishop of Lyons, and to eighteen other bishops or archbishops, who are all named. In that letter the pope excommunicates, and orders the bishops to excommunicate, those who had usurped the possessions of the monastery of Cluny, and thereby deprived the monks of the means of relieving the poor, and exercising hospitality. The pope says in that letter that he had complained of these usurpations in the presence of Robert, king of the Franks, and of the nobility, who attended him to Rome.³ From these words, it appears that the king undertook a journey to Rome, though not the least notice is taken of that journey by any of the contemporary writers; and we know not when he performed it, the pope's letter being dated the first of September, without any mention of the year.

JOHN XIX., THE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[BASILIUS, CONSTANTINE, *Emperors of the East.*—CONRAD II., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1024.] Upon the death of Benedict, his brother, named John, was raised to the see by dint of money, says Glaber, a contemporary writer,² though at the time of his election he was but a layman. We have seen Hadrian and the succeeding popes refusing to acknowledge Photius for lawful patriarch, and declaring his ordination to be null, because he had not passed through the inferior degrees. But these irregularities were overlooked by the Roman clergy; the best bidder, whether an ecclesiastic or layman, being sure at this time to carry his election. All we know for certain of the time of his ordination is, that he was ordained before the month of September, 1024, one of his bulls dated that month,

1027, being said to have been issued in the fourth year of his pontificate.⁴

In the very beginning of John's pontificate the emperor Basilius, and the patriarch of Constantinople, sent a solemn embassy to Rome, to obtain of the pope his consent, that the patriarch of the imperial city should style himself universal bishop of the East, as the patriarch of Rome was styled universal bishop of the whole world. As it is well known in the East and every where else, that all things were venal at Rome, the papacy itself not excepted, the ambassadors brought presents with them of an immense value for the pope and the rest of the clergy;

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 819.

² Glaber, l. i. c. 4.

³ Leo Ostiens. l. iii. c. 28.

⁴ Petrus Damian. vit. B. Odilon Sigeberl. Chron. &c.

⁵ Concil. tom. ix. p. 810.

⁶ Hist. Ital. Sacra tom. v. p. 48.

John crowns Conrad emperor ;—[Year of Christ, 1027.] Canutus, king of England, at Rome. The pope grants the use of the pall to the bishop of Girona. He dies ;—[Year of Christ, 1033.] His writings.

and they would have certainly carried their point, says Hugh, abbot of Fleury, had not both Italy and France taken the alarm, and the request of the Greeks been strongly opposed by some of the most eminent men then in the West for their learning and piety. Among these was William, abbot of the monastery of St. Benignus in Dijon, who wrote a short but very strong letter to the pope, to divert him from complying, upon any consideration whatever, with the unjust and insidious demands of the Greeks. The pope, finding he could not gratify the emperor and the patriarch without disobliging those, who had nothing so much at heart as the honor and dignity of his see, dismissed the ambassadors, telling them, that the title of universal bishop became none but the successors of St. Peter in the apostolic see, and that none but his successors should wear it.¹ This is the title, of which it was said by pope Gregory the Great, that whoever assumed it was either the antichrist or the forerunner of the antichrist.

The emperor Henry II. dying in 1024 without issue, Conrad, surnamed the Salic, chosen king of Germany in his room, entered Italy with a powerful army about the beginning of lent, 1026, and having reduced all the towns there, that had shaken off the yoke, he went to Rome, no doubt invited thither by the pope, who had gone as far as Como to meet him upon his first coming into Italy. He was received at Rome with the greatest demonstrations of joy by all ranks of people; and on Easter-day the pope crowned him emperor with the usual solemnity in the church of St. Peter. Queen Gisela was at the same time crowned empress; and this august ceremony was performed in the presence of Rudolph, king of Burgundy, and Canutus, king of England, who, when divine service was ended, attended the new emperor, says Wolferus, walking between them, back to his chamber.² It is to be observed, that Wippo, who lived in the court of Conrad, and was one of the priests of his chapel, speaking of his promotion to the imperial dignity, says, that he was chosen emperor by the Romans and crowned by the pope, calling him constantly king before, and constantly emperor after he was elected by the Romans, and the ceremony of his coronation or consecration was performed by the pope; which fully confutes what some have asserted, namely, that whoever was elected king of Germany became emperor by that election alone.

Canutus or Cnutus, who assisted, as has been said, at the coronation of Conrad, had undertaken a pilgrimage to Rome, in compliance with the fashionable devotion of

those times. From Rome the king wrote a letter to the bishops of his kingdom, wherein he expresses great satisfaction at the reception he had met with from the pope, as well as from the emperor and the king of Burgundy; and at the same time acquaints them, that he had obtained of those princes an exemption from all tolls and taxes for such of his subjects as should pass through their dominions either to trade, or to visit the holy places at Rome. He adds in his letter, that he had complained to the pope of the immense sums that were extorted from his archbishops when they went to Rome for the pall, and that the pope had promised to moderate those exorbitant charges. Whether the present age reaped any benefit from the pope's promise we know not; but it is very certain that future ages reaped none. In the same letter the king promises to rectify for the future whatever was amiss in his government, to square his conduct by the strictest rules of equity, and orders justice to be administered without distinction of persons.¹

In the year 1030 Peter, bishop of Girona, in Spain, coming to Rome, begged leave of the pope to wear the pall twelve days in the year, promising to redeem thirty slaves in captivity among the Saracens, provided his holiness granted him his request. It was readily granted, and the days were named, the chief solemnities of the year, on which he was allowed to use that ornament. But the pope declared that the privilege he granted him was only personal, and should not descend to his successors in that see.²

John XIX. died in 1033, having held the see nine years and nine days, as we read in the most exact catalogues. He is said to have been hated by the Romans on account of his uncommon severity; nay, Baronius supposes him to have been driven by them from his see in 1033, and to have been restored to it by the emperor Conrad. But as no notice is taken by any cotemporary writer of Conrad's going to Rome in that year, and all speak of his entering Italy at the head of a powerful army in 1038, and marching to Rome in order to restore the pope, (namely, Benedict IX., the successor of John) whom the Romans had driven from the see, what Baronius supposes to have happened to pope John, must have happened to pope Benedict.

Of this pope we have three letters, the one addressed to Jordan, bishop of Limoges, and to the other Gallican bishops, wherein he declares Martialis, the first bishop of that city, worthy of the title of an apostle, and allows him to be called so. For it had been disputed in two councils, the one held at Poitiers in 1023, the other at Paris in 1021, whether that holy bishop should be styled an apostle, or only a confessor; and as those

¹ Hugo Flavin. in Chron. Glab. l. iv. c. 1.

² Wippo in Vit. Cunegund. Wolfer. in Vit. Sancti Godehard apud Mabill. secul. Benedict. VI. Part. i. num. 25.

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 861. et apud Baron. ad ann. 1027.

² Baluz. Mari. Hispan. l. iv.

wise prelates could not settle that point among themselves, they applied to the pope, who decided the important question in the manner I have said.¹ Another letter of John XIX. has reached our times written in 1029 to Odilo, abbot of Cluny, whereby he offers him, and even commands him to accept the archbishopric of Lyons, vacant by the death of Burchard, who had been greatly beloved by his clergy and the people of the diocese. But the holy abbot withstood to the last so tempting an offer, though threatened by the pope with excommunication if he did not comply.² The third letter was written by the pope on the following occasion. In the council held at Limoges, in 1031, several Gallican bishops complained of the pope's absolving those whom they had excommunicated, upon their going as pilgrims to Rome. The bishop of Puy, in particular, remonstrated against that abuse, as entirely subverting the ecclesiastical discipline, told the fathers of the assembly, that a few years before the count of Auvergne, upon being excommunicated by the bishop for dismissing his lawful wife and marrying another, had gone to Rome, and there obtained a general absolution of the pope, as he did not know that the count was excommunicated. He added, that the bishop having complained thereof to the pope, his holiness had answered, that he was not to blame, but the bishop, who had not informed him that the count was excommunicated, as he might, and ought to have done; that if he had known it, far from taking off the excommunication, he would have confirmed it, as he thought it his duty to second his brethren, and not to contradict or oppose them; that it was far from his thoughts to give room to any schism or misunderstanding between him and them, and that he therefore revoked and annulled the absolution obtained by surprise, and desired them to let the person, whom he had thus absolved, know, that instead of his absolution and blessing, his curse should attend him till he satisfied his bishop, and by him was absolved. Another case was related of the same nature, said to have happened in the diocese of Angoulesme, where a person, upon being refused absolution by his bishop, delivered a letter to him from the pope, re-

quiring him to absolve the offender upon his performing the penance enjoined him at Rome. But to that letter the bishop paid no kind of regard, telling the person who brought it, that he should continue under the excommunication which he had incurred, till he had fulfilled the penance, that he or his archdeacon should, by his order, impose on him. Upon these two instances the council decreed, that the pope might lessen the penance imposed by a bishop, or add to it, in order to proportion it to the crime, and likewise impose penances on those who were sent by their bishops to obtain forgiveness at Rome; but could not prescribe penance, or give absolution to any person without the knowledge of his bishop, it being the duty of the vicar of St. Peter to maintain the other bishops in the possession of their just rights, that they may be able to support him in the possession of his.¹

This pope is greatly commended by Platina, Onuphrius, Ciaconius, &c., and by most of the modern writers. But I find no such commendations bestowed on him by the contemporary historians; nay Glaber, who lived in those days, says, in express terms, that he purchased the see with money, as has been already observed. Martinus Polonus tells us, that the pope caused all who had robbed the pilgrims coming to Rome, to be publicly executed; that the cardinal (who perhaps shared the plunder with the robbers) provoked at his putting so many persons to death, let him know in his last illness, that they did not think one who had shed so much Christian blood worthy of a place, after his death, among his holy predecessors in the church of the prince of the apostles; that thereupon the pope begged his body might be laid before the church door, giving them leave to dispose of it as they pleased, if the door, how carefully soever guarded, and locked, and barred, did not fly open of itself; and that his body being placed after his death as he had directed, a violent wind arose that moment, and blew the door to the other end of the church. This story is gravely related by Martinus Polonus, and after him by Palatius.²

¹ Concil. tom. ix.² Dach. Spicileg. tom. ii.¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 908.² Mart. Polon. in Greg. vi. et Palat. in Joan. xix.

Benedict IX. chosen. Visits the emperor;—[Year of Christ, 1037.] Is driven from the see and restored by the emperor;—[Year of Christ, 1038.] The pope absolves Casimir, a monk and deacon, from his vows.

BENEDICT IX., THE HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ROMANUS ARGYRUS, *Emperor of the East.*—CONRAD II., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1033.] John was succeeded by Theophylact, nephew to the two preceding popes, and at the time of his election about eighteen years old. But as his father Alberic, count of Tusculum, spared no money, his party prevailed, and Benedict IX., for he took that name, was ordained, as we read in the best writers, in the month of November, 1033. Desiderius, afterwards pope under the name of Victor III., speaking of Benedict, styles him the successor of Simon the sorcerer, and not of Simon the apostle, and paints him as one abandoned to all manner of vice.¹

In the year 1037, the emperor Conrad coming into Italy to quell a rebellion raised there by the archbishop of Milan and other discontented lords, the pope went to pay him a visit at Cremona, and being received by him with all possible marks of respect, he deposed and excommunicated the archbishop of Milan. But the archbishop, paying no sort of regard to that sentence, kept possession of the see to the hour of his death.² From Cremona the pope returned to Rome, but the Romans, shocked at his debaucheries, and the wicked life he publicly led, drove him soon after from the see. He fled to the emperor, who espousing his cause, marched straight to Rome, as he was then in Lombardy, and, entering the city without opposition, restored the pope, visited the holy places there, and then returned to Lombardy without hearkening to the just complaints brought by the Romans against him.³ Glaber tells us, that the pope was several times driven from his see, but that he always recovered it by some means or other, though universally hated and despised.⁴

Benedict IX. is the first pope that released a monk who had made his solemn profession, from his vows; and he did it on the following occasion: Misco, the second of that name, king of Poland, dying in 1034, and dreadful disturbances arising after his death in that kingdom, his son Casimir, not caring to undertake the government in times of such confusion, withdrew first to Hungary, and afterwards to France. During his stay in France he visited the famous monastery of Cluny, and being there taken with the conversation and exemplary lives of the monks, he embraced the same state

of life, and exchanging the name of Casimir for that of Charles, made his profession among them. But, in the mean time the Poles, weary of the anarchy that prevailed, and the disorders attending it, resolved to place the lawful heir on the throne, as the only means of restoring peace to the kingdom. But as they knew not where he was, nor what was become of him, they applied to the queen, his mother, who had fled with him, and was then in Germany, and being informed by her that he had embraced a monastic life in the monastery of Cluny, they sent thither some of the chief lords of the kingdom to represent to him the deplorable condition to which his unhappy subjects were reduced, and entreat him to return, and, by taking upon him the government, which he alone had a right to, put an end to their intestine divisions. The deputies found, upon their arrival at Cluny, that Casimir had not only made his solemn profession, but had been ordained deacon. However, having obtained leave of the holy abbot Odilo to speak to him, they delivered their message, earnestly entreating him, in the name of the whole nation, to come and redeem them from the calamities with which they had been so long afflicted. Casimir answered, that he had vowed perpetual obedience to his abbot, and therefore could not dispose of himself; that he pitied their condition, and wished they could find some other person to rescue them from the miseries which they so justly complained of; but as for himself, he could lend them no other assistance but that of his prayers, without a breach of his vow, which he was determined religiously to observe to the hour of his death. Hereupon the deputies applied to the abbot, who, thinking it exceeded the limits of his power to absolve a professed monk from his vows, referred them to the pope. They, therefore, undertook a journey to Rome, and having there represented to Benedict the distracted state of the nation, the little regard that was paid to religion, and the many enormities that were daily committed in the different parts of the kingdom, for want of a lawful governor to punish the delinquents, they obtained permission of his holiness for Casimir to exchange the cowl for a crown, nay, and though he was a deacon, to marry. As nothing was, in those days, to be got at Rome without money, the pope granted that extraordinary dispensation, upon condition that the nobles of Po-

¹ Desid. Dialog. l. iii.

² Hermann. Contract. ad ann. 1038.

³ Leo Ostiens. l. ii. c. 169. Glaber. l. iv. c. 69.

⁴ Idem l. iii. c. 5.

Benedict driven anew from the see and restored ;—[Year of Christ, 1044.] Sells the pontificate ;—[Year of Christ, 1045.] Gregory VI. raised by simony. Gregory, Silvester and Benedict deposed in a council ;—[Year of Christ, 1046.]

land paid yearly a penny a man to the apostolic see, shaved their heads after the manner of the monks, and, on the chief festivals of our Savior, and the Virgin Mary, wore a linen cloth round their necks in the shape of a priest's stole. With these terms the deputies readily complied, and Casimir, having upon his return assembled a general diet, sent a solemn embassy to Rome to thank the pope, in the name of the whole nation, for the dispensation, and pay him the tribute.¹

There were in this pope's time two very powerful factions in Rome, that divided the city into two opposite and irreconcilable parties. At the head of the one were the counts of Tusculum, and at that of the other the Roman family of the Ptolemies. The latter, no longer able to bear with the daily rapines, murders, abominations of the young pope, stirred up the Roman people against

him, and having got the better of the Tusculum party, drove Benedict out of Rome, and placed John, bishop of Sabina, under the name of Silvester III., in the chair in his stead. But the counts of Tusculum prevailing again, Silvester was driven out, in his turn, after three months, and Benedict restored.¹

The pope, though powerfully supported by his family, resolved, as he found himself become, by his enormous wickedness, a public object of contempt and abhorrence, to part with the popedom, that he might the more freely indulge himself in his debaucheries. He accordingly sold it to John, arch-priest of the Roman church, said by pope Victor III. to have been the most religious man, at that time, in the whole body of the Roman clergy.² What must the rest of the Roman clergy have been, if a simoniac was the most religious among them!

GREGORY VI., THE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE MONOMACHUS, *Emperor of the East.*—HENRY III., *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1046.] Benedict, having consigned the pontifical ensigns to John, called by some Gratian, betook himself to a private life, rioting without restraint or control in all manner of debaucheries ; and John, without any previous election, took possession of the chair he had purchased, under the name of Gregory VI. He was a native of Rome, and his family was one of the most powerful and opulent then in that city. Otto Frisingensis, who wrote in 1158, pretends Gregory to have paid a large sum of money to Benedict, with no other view but to induce him by that means to quit the pontificate, which he so much disgraced, to have been actuated therein by zeal, and not by ambition, and upon the resignation of the other to have been canonically chosen by the Roman people and the clergy. That writer adds, that he made it his study to reform the many scandalous abuses that had been introduced, or connived at by his wicked predecessors ; that with his discretion and prudence he restored good order in the city, and was therefore deservedly looked upon by the Romans as their deliverer.² But Hermannus Contractus, Bonizo, bishop of Sutri, who lived at this very time in the neighborhood of Rome, Victor III. and Clement II., the immediate successor of Gregory, speak of him as a si-

moniac intruder, as one who had not been raised by merit, but by corruption and bribery to the see of St. Peter.

In the mean time, Henry III., king of Germany, who had succeeded his father, Conrad, in that kingdom in 1039, hearing of the dreadful disorders that reigned in Rome, of the scandalous lives led by the popes, and the entire disregard that was shown by them, as well as their clergy, to all religion and virtue, resolved to go in person, and inquire upon the spot, into the conduct of the popes, and the state of the church. He accordingly set out from Germany in 1046, and arriving at Sutri, assembled a council in that city, at which were present almost all the bishops of Italy. The king invited Gregory to preside at it ; and he readily complied with the invitation, flattering himself that the king, by desiring him to preside at a council, tacitly acknowledged him for lawful pope. But he soon found that he had been sent for only to clear himself, if he could, from the charge brought against him, that of having purchased with money the pontifical dignity. He owned at once what he could not deny, the infamous bargain being well known to every bishop in the council, and quitting his chair, he divested himself, in full council, of the pontifical ornaments, gave up the pastoral staff,

¹ Joan. Languin. in *Hist. Rerum Polonic.*

² Otto Frisingens. l. vi. c. 25.

¹ Victor III. *Dialog.* iii. Leo Ostiens. l. ii. c. 80.

² *Idem* *Ibid.*

Clement II. chosen. Crowns Henry emperor, and his wife Agnes empress. Dispute between the archbishops of Ravenna and Milan;—[Year of Christ, 1047.] The pope excommunicates the Beneventans. He dies.

and begging forgiveness, renounced all claim to the chair of St. Peter. By the same council Benedict IX. and Silvester III. were declared usurpers, simoniacs, intruders, and as such deposed, and forbidden, on pain of excommunication, ever to attempt the recovery of a dignity, of which they had shown themselves unworthy by their wicked lives, as well as by the means they had employed to attain it. Thus Victor III., who lived at this time, and was chosen pope nine years after this council.¹ Though the election of Gregory was certainly null, he is reckoned in all the catalogues among the lawful popes,

for no other reason that I can see, but because the next Gregory called himself the seventh of that name, and speaking of Gregory VI. gives him the title of pope. He held the see two years and eight months. The emperor, on his return to Germany, took Gregory with him; and as for the other two pretenders to the see, Silvester III. was sent back to his bishopric, but Benedict IX. kept himself concealed so long as the emperor continued in Italy, and we shall see him raising new disturbances upon the death of the next pope.

CLEMENT II., THE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE MONOMACHUS, *Emperor of the East.*—HENRY III., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1046.] The see being declared vacant by the resignation of Gregory and the deposition of the other two, the king and the bishops of the council repaired to Rome, in order to choose there, jointly with the people and clergy, a new pope. They met on Christmas day, 1046, in the church of St. Peter, when the Romans declaring, that there was not a man in the whole Roman clergy whom they could recommend as worthy of the pontifical dignity, the king named Suiger, bishop of Bamberg, then in his retinue; and he was upon his nomination unanimously chosen, and placed, being already a bishop, on the pontifical throne.² Papebroche observes, that upon his election, he did not resign the bishopric of Bamberg. For that see is said to have become, nine months after, vacant by his death. He was a native of Saxony, and had been preferred by the king for his eminent virtues to the see of Bamberg. We are told that he declined the pontificate as long as he could, but was in the end forced to yield to the pressing instances of the king and the people. Upon his installation he took the name of Clement.³

The new pope upon the day of his election crowned Henry emperor, and Agnes his queen empress, and walked, in solemn procession, with both, from the church of St. Peter to the Lateran palace, attended by the Roman nobility and vast crowds of people flocking from all quarters to see the new pope and the new emperor.⁴

As simony prevailed, almost universally, all over the West, the pope assembled a council in Rome in order to extirpate so

common an evil; and several canons were issued against all who should sell or should purchase any ecclesiastical dignity whatever. In this council a warm dispute arose between the two archbishops of Milan and Ravenna about precedence, both claiming the privilege of sitting at the pope's right hand in the absence of the emperor, and at his left when the emperor was present. This important point gave occasion to a long debate; and the pope, after hearing both sides, gave sentence in favor of the archbishop of Ravenna, ordering, by virtue of his apostolic authority, the said archbishop always to sit at his right hand, unless the emperor should happen to be present, and in that case to sit at his left.¹

The emperor, after a short stay at Rome, went from thence to Beneventum, but the citizens refusing him admittance into their city, he obliged the pope, whom he had taken with him, to thunder out the sentence of excommunication against them. But they, in defiance of all his anathemas, kept their gates shut.² From Beneventum the pope repaired, with the emperor, to Salerno, and there confirmed the translation of John, bishop of Pesto, to the archiepiscopal see of that city, and gave him the pall.³ The pope and the emperor kept their Easter, this year 1047, at Mantua, and went from thence into Germany. But the pope must have stayed there a very short time, as we are assured by the most credible writers, that he died at Rome, or in the neighborhood of that city, (in Romanis partibus, in Romanis finibus) on the 9th of October of the same year, after a pontificate of nine months and fifteen days.⁴ From Rome or the neighborhood of Rome

¹ Victor Dialog. l. iii.

² Victor Dialog. l. iii. Herman. Contract.

³ Lambert. Schafnaburg. ad 1048.

⁴ Hermann. Contract. 21, et Lambert. ibid.

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 1257.

² Leo Ostiens. l. ii. c. 81.

³ Glaber, l. 5.

⁴ Herman. Contract. ad ann. 1048. Lambert. Schaf. Structor. Vit. Sancti Henrici.

Clement canonized St. Wiborada. His writings. Damasus appointed pope by the emperor. Dies;—[Year of Christ, 1048.] Leo IX. chosen in Germany.

his body was carried to Bamberg, and buried there with the following epitaph, "the most reverend father in Christ and lord Suiger of Mayendorf, a Saxon, the second bishop of Bamberg, and afterwards high pontiff, died at Rome on the 10th of October, 1047."¹ He is said, in his epitaph, to have died on the 10th of October: but all the ancient writers place his death on the 9th of that month. His being buried at Bamberg probably led Leo Ostiensis into the mistake of his dying beyond the mountains.

Clement, while in Germany, canonized

St. Wiborada, virgin and martyr, who had been martyred by the Hungarians in 925, that is, being informed of the holy life she had led, and the miracles she had wrought, he ordered her to be honored as a saint, and the day of her death to be annually solemnized as a festival.¹

Of this pope we have a bull dated the 21st of March, 1047, confirming the translation of John bishop of Pesto, to the archiepiscopal see of Salerno, and granting him leave to wear the pall on the same day, as his predecessors had done.

DAMASUS II., THE HUNDRED AND FORTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE MONOMACHUS, *Emperor of the East.*—HENRY III., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1047.] The see being vacant by the death of Clement, the Romans dispatched immediately messengers into Germany, to acquaint the emperor therewith, and desire him to appoint him a successor. But in the mean time Benedict IX., who had sold and resigned the pontificate to Gregory VI., as has been said, seized on it the third time, being supported by the interest and wealth of his family, and held it eight months and ten days, that is, from the 8th of November to the 17th of July of the following year, 1048, when Popponius, whom the emperor had nominated to the vacant see, arriving in Rome, he thought it advisable to quit the chair, and make room for one who had so powerful a protector. Popponius was a native of Bavaria, and bishop of Brixen, and looked upon as a man of great learning in those days, and no less piety.² The Romans recommended Halinard, arch-

bishop of Lyons, to the emperor. But he, not satisfied with rejecting the dignity they offered him, privately withdrew from court, and absconded till another was named. Halinard used yearly to visit the tombs of the apostles, was well known to the clergy and people of Rome, and by all greatly beloved and esteemed for his affability and the sanctity of his life; and it was upon his declining the pontifical dignity that the emperor conferred it on the bishop of Brixen.² But he enjoyed it a very short time, only twenty-three days, and died at Præneste on the 8th of August, 1048. Cardinal Benno supposes him to have died of a poisonous draught administered to him by Benedict. But of that no notice is taken by any other contemporary writer. He was buried in the church of St. Lawrence without the walls of the city.

LEO IX., THE HUNDRED AND FORTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE MONOMACHUS, *Emperor of the East.*—HENRY III., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1048.] Upon the death of Damasus the Romans applied anew to the emperor for one, worthy of so high a post, to succeed him. As they named no particular person, the emperor, upon the arrival of their deputies, convened at Worms an assembly of the chief lords and bishops of his kingdom, and leaving to them the

election of the new pope, charged them to choose one capable of restoring the see of St. Peter to its former reputation and dignity. At this assembly was present, among the rest, Bruno, bishop of Toul; and he was chosen at once, with the greatest unanimity that had ever been seen in the election of a pope. But he, thinking himself unworthy

¹ Papebroc. *Conat. Chronic.*

² Herman. *Contract. Leo Ostiens. l. ii. c. 81.*

¹ Burchard, l. vi. et Mabill. *sec. Benedict V.*

² Dacher. *Spicileg. tom. i.*

Leo opposes his election. Yields upon condition of his being freely elected by the clergy and the people of Rome. Goes to Rome in the habit of a pilgrim; is chosen there. This not suggested to him by Hildebrand. His family, &c. When enthroned.

of so high a dignity, and incapable of performing the duties attending it, long withstood the pressing instances of the whole assembly, and of the emperor himself. But finding that, in spite of his tears, his entreaties, and of all he could urge against his promotion, they persisted, all to a man, in the choice they had made, he begged they would allow him at least three days to deliberate with himself concerning an affair of the utmost importance to the whole church, as well as to him. They granted him his request; and he spent the whole time that was allowed him in prayer, abstaining from all manner of food. At last he made a public confession of his sins, flattering himself that he should thus lessen the opinion which they entertained of his sanctity. But such an instance of humility served only to heighten the esteem in which they held him before; and he was in the end forced to comply. But it was upon condition that the Roman people and clergy approved and confirmed his election. Thus Wibert, Bruno's archdeacon, and an eye witness of what he writes.¹ St. Bruno, bishop of Segni, who wrote in this very century, entirely agrees with Wibert. For he tells us, that the bishop of Toul, finding the emperor and the assembly unalterable in their resolution of placing him in the pontifical chair, yielded at last, upon condition that he was freely chosen by the people and clergy of Rome; nay, and that he acquainted the assembly with his intention of traveling to that city in order to be chosen there anew, adding, that he should otherwise look upon his election as null.² The same writer informs us, that the condition insisted upon by the holy bishop, being agreed to by the emperor and the assembly, he returned to his bishopric, celebrated the festival of Christmas there, and then set out for Rome in the habit of a pilgrim. The Romans, informed by the deputies they had sent to the emperor of what had passed in the assembly of Worms, no sooner heard of his approach, than flocking out to meet him, they received him with songs of joy and loud acclamations. He walked barefoot to the church of St. Peter, and having there prayed some time at the tomb of the apostle, he informed the clergy and people of his having been nominated by the emperor to the apostolic see; but added, that as by the canons the election of a bishop was null, unless made by the people and clergy, they were still at full liberty to choose or reject him, begged they would declare their thoughts freely, and assured them that it was against his own will, and in compliance with the emperor's, that he offered to take upon him so important a charge; and that if he was not unanimously

elected by them, he would return to his bishopric as willingly as he had left it unwillingly. His speech was received with the greatest demonstrations of joy by the clergy and people, and he was by them unanimously proclaimed sovereign pontiff, and placed a few days after on the pontifical throne under the name of Leo IX.¹

Thus Wibert, an eye witness, as has been said, of what he relates, and likewise the bishop of Segni, who flourished in the same century. We may therefore well conclude, from what we read in them, that Otto Frisingensis, who lived about the middle of the following century, was misinformed, when he wrote, that Leo IX. assuming the pontifical ornaments upon his election at Worms, traveled in that attire through France; but that having visited, on his journey, the monastery of Cluny, the famous Hildebrand, then prior, by representing to him how degrading it was for the sovereign pontiff to owe his dignity to a layman, prevailed upon him to quit the pontifical ensigns, and pursue his journey to Rome in the habit of a pilgrim; that the monk, taking upon him to manage his election, attended him to Rome, and there got him unanimously elected. This account contradicts that of the two more unexceptionable writers quoted above. For Wibert, who was then at Toul, tells us, that Leo set out from thence in the garb of a pilgrim, and takes no kind of notice of his passing through France, of his visiting the monastery of Cluny, or his meeting there with Hildebrand; nay, the bishop of Segni says in express terms, that Hildebrand was present at the assembly or diet of Worms, and that Leo took him from thence to Toul, and from Toul to Rome.²

Leo was descended of an illustrious family, and nearly related to the emperor. He was brought up under Berthold, bishop of Toul, and Heriman, who succeeded Berthold in that see. He was ordained deacon in 1025, and bishop of Toul on the 9th of September of the following year.³ Ordericus supposes him to have been preferred by his predecessor Damasus to the dignity of cardinal.⁴ But of that preferment no notice is taken by the contemporary writer of his life. From Worms, where he was elected by the lords and bishops of Germany, he returned to Toul, and setting out from thence on the 27th of December, 1048, he arrived at Rome on the 2d of the following February, was unanimously elected the same day, and on the 12th of that month enthroned, or placed with great solemnity on the pontifical throne, a ceremony that was always performed on a Sunday; and in 1049 the 12th of February fell on a Sunday.

The first thing we find recorded of this

¹ Wibert. in Vit. S. Leon. l. ii. c. 2.

² Bruno in Vit. Leon. IX.

³ Bruno in Vit. Leon. IX.

⁴ Idem ibid.

² Wibert. in ejus Vit.

⁴ Orderic. l. ii. p. 372.

The pope consecrates the abbot of Richenou. Holds a council at Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1049.] Goes to France. Holds a council at Pavia. Council of Reims. Some bishops accused of simony.

pope is his consecrating Udalric, abbot of the monastery of Richenou, and confirming all the privileges that his predecessors had granted to that monastery. This bull is dated at Rome the 26th of March, which in 1049 was Easter-day; whence it is plain that he did not celebrate his Easter, as we read in some writers, in the monastery of Monte Cassino.

Leo, impatient to redress the many scandalous abuses that prevailed in the church, more especially to extirpate the vice of simony, that had almost every where taken deep root, assembled a council at Rome the second week after Easter, at which were present all the Italian, and the greater part of the Gallican bishops, with Halinard archbishop of Lyons. By this council all simoniacal bargains were forbidden on pain of excommunication and deposition; some bishops convicted of simony were deposed, and it was ordained, that they, who had received ordination at the hands of a simoniacal bishop, should perform no ecclesiastical functions till they had performed a forty days' penance. The pope was for having all simoniacal ordinations declared null; but he was therein opposed by the major part of the bishops, remonstrating, that if such a decree should take place, scarce any would be found in some dioceses capable of performing the sacerdotal or episcopal functions. By the same council it was decreed, that all Christians should pay tythes, the very name of tythes being unheard of in Apulia, and in several other places; some marriages within the forbidden degrees were annulled, and the parties, though persons of distinction, separated; clerks, who, apostatizing from the church, had joined in communion with heretics, were allowed to keep their former ranks upon their return to the church, but debarred from ever rising to a higher degree. Several other canons were issued by this council, all calculated to correct and reform the licentious lives of the laity as well as the clergy.¹ Wibert writes, that the bishop of Sutri, accused in this council of simony, produced several false witnesses to confute that charge, but that while he himself was upon the point of taking the false oath, that his witnesses had taken, he suddenly dropt down, and being carried out of the council expired soon after.²

The council ended about the 12th of April of the present year; and the pope, having first obtained leave of the Romans, says the writer of his life, set out soon after for France, in order to consecrate the new-built church of St. Remigius at Reims, pursuant to the promise he had made to the abbot Herimar, and at the same time to redress, if by any means he could, the many abuses that prevailed in most of the churches of that king-

dom. On his arrival at Pavia, he there assembled a council in Whitsun-week, which festival fell this year on the 14th of May. The council consisted of the neighbouring bishops, and those, who attended the pope. But none of the acts of that assembly have been transmitted to us. From Pavia, the pope went first to pay the emperor a visit in Saxony, celebrated with him the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul at Cologne, and from thence repairing to Toul, wrote to the Gallican bishops and abbots, requiring them to meet him at Reims, where he intended to hold a council on the 1st of October.

The pope arrived at Reims in the latter end of September, attended by the archbishops of Treves, of Lyons, of Besançon, and the bishop of Porto, and having consecrated with great solemnity the new church of St. Remigius, and translated thither the body of the saint, he appointed the council to meet there the next day, the 1st of October. It was composed of four archbishops, of fifteen bishops, among whom was an English bishop named Dudocus, sent by Edward the Confessor, and of a great number of abbots and other ecclesiastics of all ranks. As a dispute arose at their first meeting, between the archbishops of Treves and Reims, about precedency, the pope, leaving that controversy to be settled at a more proper season, caused the seats of the bishops to be placed in a circle, and his own in the middle. When they were all thus seated, Peter, deacon of the Roman church, rising up, told them, in the pope's name, that his holiness had assembled them, in order to advise with them about the most effectual means of suppressing the many abuses that prevailed in their churches; that in many places the church lands had been usurped, and were held by laymen; that simony was publicly practised, and both abbeys and bishoprics publicly sold; that incestuous marriages were contracted without any regard to the canons strictly forbidding them, as if no such canons had ever been issued; that monks, apostatizing from their order, returned with impunity to the world, which they had solemnly renounced; that clerks, neglecting the functions of their office, and abandoning their churches, bore arms and served in war, &c.; and that it was to redress these abuses that his holiness was come into France, and had called them together. In the next place, the deacon, addressing himself to the bishops, ordered them, in the pope's name, and on pain of excommunication, to declare whether they had been simoniacally ordained. All the bishops but four, namely, those of Langres, Nevers, Coutances, and Nantes, readily declared that no simony had intervened in their ordination. The examination of the four bishops was put off to another day; and the abbots being, in the mean time, required to make the same declaration, some of them,

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 1098. Wibert. in Vit. Leon. c. 4.

² Idem ibid.

Crimes laid to the charge of the bishop of Langres. Withdraws from the council, and is deposed. Other bishops forgiven or cleared. Canons of this council. The body of St. Remigius translated. Council of Mentz. Privileges granted to some churches.

with their silence, owned themselves guilty. In this session, the abbot of Poitiers, arraigned by the bishop of Langres, and convicted of incontinence, was deposed; and the testimonies of the fathers in favour of the primacy of the apostolic see being read, they were anathematized, who should give the title of universal primate, to any but the bishop of Rome.

In the next session the bishop of Langres was charged with simony, with having borne arms, committed murder, tyrannized over his clergy, &c. One of his clerks deposed, that he had taken his wife from him by force, while he was yet a layman; that he had debauched her, and afterwards caused her to be shut up in a monastery. One of his priests attested, that he had delivered him up to some ruffians, who had used him most cruelly, in order to extort from him a sum of money by that means. The archbishops of Lyons and Besançon undertook his defence; but the latter was suddenly struck dumb, and the former could not help owning that the bishop had exacted money for his ordinations, and compelled the priests to pay him the sum of money he mentioned, but denied his having ever put him to the torture, or having committed any of the other crimes that were laid to his charge. As the day was far spent, the pope caused the canons forbidding simony to be read, and put off the trial of the other bishops charged with that crime to the next session.

In the mean time the bishop of Langres privately withdrew, and not appearing after he had been thrice summoned, was deposed in the third session, and declared incapable of ever performing any ecclesiastical function whatever. In the same session, the bishop of Nevers owned, that his relations had paid a considerable sum of money for that bishopric, but unknown to him; that he had not lived up to the purity that was required of one in his station; and was therefore ready to resign a dignity of which he thought himself altogether unworthy. When he had done speaking, he laid down his crosier at the pope's feet, and began to divest himself of his episcopal ornaments. But the pope, touched with compassion, stopped him, and upon his taking a solemn oath that the bargain was made and the money paid without his knowledge, he restored to him his crosier, and confirmed him in his dignity, with full power to exercise all episcopal functions. The bishop of Constance owned that his brother had purchased his bishopric for him; but as he declared upon oath that it was done without his privity, nay, that he opposed his ordination to the utmost of his power as soon as he was informed of it, he was not only cleared from all simony, but commended by the pope and the council. The bishop of Nantes had succeeded his

father in that see, and he ingenuously owned that it was not without money he had been allowed to succeed him. He was, therefore, divested of the episcopal dignity, but suffered, in consideration of his voluntary confession, to retain his priesthood, and perform the functions of a priest. The archbishop of Reims was likewise arraigned of simony; but the examining of his cause was referred to a council to be held at Rome about the middle of the ensuing April. In this session the bishops, who had been summoned to the council, and had neither appeared nor excused, in writing, their non-appearance, were suspended from all ecclesiastical functions whatever, the abbot of St. Medard was excommunicated for privately withdrawing from the council, and the same sentence was pronounced against the archbishop of St. James in Galicia for styling himself apostolical, a title which none but the pope had a right to.

The twelve canons issued by this council were chiefly calculated to banish simony out of the church; to restrain the clergy from bearing arms or serving in war; to prevent marriages within the forbidden degrees; to restore to the people and clergy the right of choosing their own pastors. By the fifth canon the clergy were strictly forbidden to demand or receive any fee or reward whatever for burying the dead, for visiting the sick, or for administering baptism and the eucharist.¹

The day after the council the pope assisted at mass in the church of St. Remigius, attended by most of the bishops, and the service being ended, took the body of the saint from the altar, where it had been laid, and carried it on his shoulders to the place that was prepared for it in the same church.

From Reims the pope returned to Germany, and passing through Metz, consecrated the church of St. Arnulphus in that city. On his arrival at Mentz he held another council, at which were present five archbishops, and about forty bishops. The emperor himself assisted at this council, and with him the chief lords and princes of Germany. All we know of it is, that all simoniacal bargains or contracts were forbidden on pain of excommunication, and marriages of priests not only prohibited but declared null. Wibert writes, that Sibicho, bishop of Spire, charged in this council with adultery, denied the charge, and took the sacrament as a proof of his innocence; but that his mouth was suddenly distorted, and so remained to the hour of his death.²

The pope, during his stay in Germany, ordered divine service to be daily performed at the altar of St. Peter, in the cathedral of

¹ Ansel. Itinerar. apud Lalbeum, tom. ix. Concl. Joan. Papien. in Spec. Radulph de Dicet. p. 475.

² Wibert. c. 5.

The archbishop of Cologne made chancellor of the Roman church. The pope returns to Rome, visits Monte Gargano, &c. ;—[Year of Christ, 1050.] Council of Sipontum. Gerard of Toul canonized. Some account of Berengarius and his doctrine. The doctrine of Paschasius.

Cologne; and to distinguish the seven priests whom the archbishop should appoint to perform it, he granted them the privilege of wearing sandals, then an episcopal ornament, during the service.¹ To the canons of Bamberg he allowed the use of the mitre on the chief festivals, and on the anniversary of the emperor St. Henry, the founder of that church.² The same mark of distinction was afterwards granted by the popes to the canons of other churches, who enjoy it to this day. The pope, before he left Cologne, appointed Herman, archbishop of that place, chancellor of the holy apostolic see; and he thenceforth constantly signed himself S. A. S. (that is, "sacræ apostolicæ sedis") "Archicancellarius et Coloniensis Archiep." That was, it seems, a new dignity, no mention being any where made of it till the present year, 1049, when Leo conferred it upon Herman and his successors in the see of Cologne for ever.³

From Mentz the pope set out, soon after the breaking up of the council, on his return to Rome, celebrated the festival of St. Clement, and kept the First Sunday in Advent, which in 1049 fell on the 26th of November, in the monastery of Richenou, not far from the city of Constance, and from thence pursuing his journey to Rome, was met at a great distance from the city by the nobility and the clergy, and attended by them, in a kind of triumph, to the church of St. Peter, and from thence to the Lateran Palace.⁴ The precise time of his arrival at Rome is no where mentioned. But he must have staid there a very short time. For we find him at Monte Gargano, in the beginning of the following year, 1050, and on Palm Sunday at Monte Cassino. He visited several cities in those parts, restoring every where the decayed discipline, and inquiring upon the spot, into the lives led by the clergy. At Sipontum, a city that stood at the foot of Monte Gargano, but is no more, he held a council, and deposed two archbishops convicted of Simony; which is all we know of that council.⁵ We are told that a Beneventum, a woman who for fifteen years had been confined to her bed by illness, was suddenly cured by drinking the water with which the holy pontiff had washed his hands.⁶ During his stay at Monte Cassino he dined with the monks in the common refectory, conformed to the rules of the monastery, and would suffer no particular marks of distinction to be shown him. Being well pleased with the regular and exemplary lives of the monks, he granted to the abbot and his successors the privilege of

wearing, on the great festivals, sandals, gloves, and the dalmatic, all ensigns of the episcopal dignity.¹

From Sipontum the pope returned to Rome, and there canonized, in a council which he held soon after Easter, Gerard, bishop of Toul, who had governed that church thirty-one years, and died in 994, with the reputation of a great saint; nay, and had lately appeared to a monk, and told him, that as he reigned in heaven with the saints, he ought to be honored upon earth as a saint.²

In the same council was condemned the doctrine of the famous Berengarius concerning the Eucharist, contained in a letter which he had written to Lanfranc, a monk of the monastery of Bec, in Normandy, and afterwards archbishop of Canterbury. Berengarius, of whom I shall have frequent occasion to speak in the sequel, was born at Tours about the beginning of the tenth century, studied under Fulbert, bishop of Chartres, and upon his death returned to Tours, where he was employed to teach in the public school of St. Martin. In that employment he acquitted himself so well that he was admitted into the chapter, and made treasurer of that church. However, he left Tours, history does not inform us on what account, and removed to Angers, was preferred by Bruno, called also Eusebius, bishop of the place, to the dignity of archdeacon of that church. It was there, and about the year 1047, that he first began to teach his doctrine concerning the Eucharist, namely, that Christ was not really but only figuratively present in that sacrament; or that it was not the real body and blood of our Lord, but only a type or figure of his body and blood. Two of the most learned writers of the preceding century had handled this subject before him, and maintained quite contrary opinions concerning it, namely, Paschasius Radbertus, a monk of Corby, and the famous Johannes Scotus.

In the year 831 Paschasius wrote a treatise "upon the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Lord," for the instruction of the Saxon youth, who had been late converted to the faith, and were educated in the new monastery of Corby in Saxony. That treatise he afterwards revised, and sent it improved with additions to Charles the Bald, of France, when he was abbot of Old Corby, and consequently after the year 844, the year in which he was made abbot. In that piece he plainly maintains the real presence, and what has been since called transubstantiation, as appears from the following words; "though there be still the figure of bread and wine, yet we are to believe, that after consecration nothing remains but the body

¹ Wibert. l. ii. c. 4.

² Vit Sancti Henrici apud Surium 14 Julii.

³ Cardinalis Raspon. in Basilic. Lateran. Wibert. ubi sup.

⁴ Wibert. l. ii. c. 6. Herman. Contract. ad ann. 1050.

⁵ Idem ibid.

⁶ Idem ibid.

¹ Wibert. l. ii. c. 6.

² Mabill. sec. v. Benedict. p. 194.

The doctrine of Johannes Scotus. His treatise on the eucharist. Letter of Berengarius to Lanfranc.

and blood of Christ our Lord, and he therefore said, 'this is my flesh for the life of the world;' and to say what is still more wonderful, no other flesh than that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which suffered on the cross, and rose from the grave. This the whole world holds and confesses, and no man openly contradicts."

On the other hand, Johannes Scotus, so called because a native of Scotland or Ireland, that name being then common to those of both nations, held the quite contrary opinion. He came into France about the beginning of the reign of Charles the Bald, that is, about the year 829, and having soon gained great reputation there by his erudition and learning, he was distinguished with an honorable place in the university of Paris, and consulted by the king concerning the eucharist. For it was by the king's express order that he wrote the treatise "of the Body and Blood of our Lord," wherein he as plainly impugned the real presence, as the other maintained it, declaring, that "the body of our Lord is by the faithful received figuratively, mystically, sacramentally, spiritually, and not really or corporally." That treatise he published under the feigned name of Bertram, which induced Siegebert and Trithemius to ascribe it to Ratram, a monk of Corby, who flourished at this time, and wrote, by order of Charles the Bald, two books upon predestination. For in the disputes that arose in after days about the eucharist, the treatise in question is constantly quoted as the work, not of Bertram or Ratram, but of Scotus, and no mention is ever made of any writer upon that subject under either of those names. Scotus having taught some doctrines in France displeasing to Rome, pope Nicholas complained of him to the king; and he thereupon left France, and came into England in the reign of king Alfred. Being employed here to instruct the youth, it is said that at Malmesbury the boys committed to his care stabbed him to death with their penknives. Thus William of Malmesbury.¹ But he speaks doubtfully of what he relates, as if it had no better foundation than a report or tradition; "ut fertur," says he, and all the rest have copied the story from him.

That Christ is present in the eucharist was the ancient doctrine and belief of the catholic church. But as to the manner of his presence, Paschasius was the first who explained it in the terms which I have mentioned above, as is owned by the learned Sirmundus, and many other Roman catholic writers.² Till that monk's time, all had understood our Savior calling the elements of bread and wine his body and blood, as they had understood him calling himself the shepherd, the vine, the way, the truth, the

bread that came from heaven, &c., that is, in a figurative sense, as has been proved by many protestant writers with innumerable passages out of the fathers. This new doctrine gave great offence to the Gallican church; and it was on that occasion that Charles the Bald put the following question to Scotus, and desired him to solve it: "Whether the body and blood of Christ be mysteriously received by the faithful in the eucharist, or in truth, and whether it be the same body that was born of the Virgin Mary, that suffered on the cross, that rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father?" In answer to that question Scotus wrote his treatise "on the Body and Blood of Christ," wherein he maintained the bread and the wine in the eucharist to be only the sign, figure, type, or image of Christ's body and blood. Scotus had his followers, and so had Paschasius; and both pleaded antiquity and the authority of the fathers, plainly establishing the reality of Christ's presence, according to one party, and plainly denying it according to the other. However, the opinion of Paschasius, as vesting in the priesthood a most extraordinary power, that of "making the God that made them," prevailed in the end. For when Berengarius revived, about two hundred years after, the opinion of Scotus, it was combated as a new doctrine by almost all men of any learning or knowledge in France and Italy. Among these Adelman of Liege, who had been his school-fellow, and was afterwards preferred for his learning to the see of Brescia, no sooner heard of his holding and propagating an opinion, repugnant, as he said, to the belief of the church, than he wrote a long letter to him, exhorting him to walk in the beaten path, and not disturb, with new opinions, the peace of the church; that is, blindly to believe what others believed, and sacrifice truth to the peace of the church. In the same letter he undertook to prove, that in the eucharist Christ was truly and substantially present.¹ Many others, and some of them the ablest men of that age, engaged in the same dispute, all declaring for the real and corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament, a mystery, they said, which all were to believe, though none could explain it. Among the rest Lanfranc, who taught then in the public schools at Bec in Normandy, censured the opinion, denying or questioning the reality of Christ's body in the eucharist, as repugnant to the belief of the church and the fathers. Of this Berengarius was no sooner informed, than he wrote to Lanfranc the following letter. "My brother—You hold as heretical the sentiments of Johannes Scotus concerning the sacrament of the altar, as disagreeing with those of Paschasius, which you receive. If

¹ Malmesb. de reg. i. ii. c. 4.

² See Usher's Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, p. 74.

¹ Bibliothec. Patrum, tom. xviii.

Berengarius' letter to Lanfranc sent to Rome, and the doctrine it contained condemned there, and in Normandy. Council of Vercelli condemns the doctrine of Berengarius. Anelin's letter to Berengarius.

that be true, you have, my brother, decided too hastily, and acted in a manner unworthy of a man of your talents. You have not studied the Holy Scripture with those who are best versed in it. I should therefore be glad, unlearned as I am, to reason with you upon that subject in the presence of such judges or hearers as you shall think fit. Till that happens desist not what I say, namely, that if you hold John, whose sentiments concerning the eucharist I adopt, for a heretic, you must likewise hold St. Ambrose, St. Jerom, and St. Austin for heretics, not to mention the rest of the fathers.¹

The messenger, whom Berengarius sent with this letter, not finding Lanfranc in Normandy, for he was gone to Rome, delivered it to some clerks, who read it, and gave it to others to read. And thus was the doctrine it contained made public, and Lanfranc, to whom it was addressed, suspected of approving the sentiments of his friend. The letter was even sent to Rome, and after being perused by many of the Roman clergy, shown to the pope, who ordered it to be read in the council that had been assembled for the canonization of the bishop Gerard, as has been said above, and was still sitting. The fathers of the council, upon hearing it read, pronounced at once the doctrine heretical, repugnant to the belief of the whole catholic church, and inconsistent with that of the Scriptures and fathers. At the same time the sentence of excommunication was thundered out against Berengarius, and all who should countenance either him or his doctrine. As Lanfranc, to whom the letter was written, happened to be present at the council, the pope ordered him to make a public confession of his faith, especially with respect to the article of the eucharist, that no room might be left for the least suspicion of his approving the same doctrine. Lanfranc, in compliance with the pope's order, rose up, declared his belief, and explained it to the full satisfaction of the pope and all who were present. The pope, before he dismissed the bishops, who assisted at the council, appointed another to meet at Vercelli in the month of September of the present year 1050, and invited them to it.¹ Thus was Berengarius, with the utmost injustice, condemned without being heard, or so much as summoned to the council that condemned him, and for disapproving a doctrine, which, how generally soever received, had not yet been defined, or proposed by the churches an article of the catholic faith.

Berengarius, informed of what had passed in the council of Rome, withdrew into Normandy, and being there kindly received by Ansfred, abbot of Preaux, he endeavored

to gain William, duke of Normandy, over to his party. But that prince, though then but a youth, suspending his judgment, ordered a conference to be held at Brienne, consisting of all the prelates and learned men in the country; and by all the new doctrine, as they styled it, was, with one voice, condemned and rejected.¹ Berengarius therefore, leaving Normandy, retired to Chartres, but there kept his opinion to himself, telling those who were desirous to know it, that he would acquaint them with it at a more proper season, that is, when he should have convinced the pope of the truth of his doctrine, which he did not despair of effecting at the council appointed to meet at Vercelli. In the mean time he wrote a letter, strongly reflecting on the conduct of the pope, condemning him as a heretic, and cutting him off from the communion of the church, without hearing what he had to offer in defence of his doctrine. This letter has not reached our times, but Durandus, abbot of Troarn, who read it, tells us, that the Roman church, and the holy pope Leo, head of the church universal, were there taxed with heresy, and blasphemously called heretics.²

The council of Vercelli met at the time appointed, in the beginning of September of the present year 1050. It was composed of bishops from different countries, especially from France and Germany, and of most of the learned men then in the West. The pope presided in person, and such of the nobility, as chose it, were allowed to be present. To this council Berengarius had been summoned at the breaking up of the council of Rome. But not thinking it safe for him to comply with that summons, he appointed two clerks, his disciples, to maintain his and their doctrine in his room. Lanfranc, who was present, informs us, in a very few words, of what was transacted in that assembly. The book of Johannes Scotus, says he, was read and condemned, and the two clerks, sent by Berengarius to maintain his doctrine, confounded and silenced.³ The doctrine of Berengarius was the same with that of Scotus, and the council by condemning Scotus condemned Berengarius.

The opinion of Scotus being thus condemned, Anelin, monk of St. Evrou in Normandy, wrote to Berengarius, with whom he had formerly had a conference about the doctrine in dispute, exhorting him to condemn an opinion, that was maintained by one man, but condemned by two full councils. He declared in that letter, that he firmly believed the bread and wine in the Eucharist to be changed, by the ministry of the priest, into the real body and real blood of our Lord, it being impossible, he said, to

¹ Lanfranc in Comment. contra Bereng. Herman. Contract.

¹ Durand. Troarn, de Corpore et Sang. Christi.

² Idem ibid. part ix. p. 106.

³ Lanf. in Comment. contra Bereng.

Berengarius' answer to Anelin's letter. His doctrine condemned in a council at Paris. The doctrine of Paschasius unknown at this time to the English church.

understand the words of our Savior in any other sense, than that he held in his hands and gave them to eat of the very body which was sitting at table with them; that such an opinion was neither contrary to the laws of nature, which depended upon the will of the author of nature, nor to any thing revealed in the Gospel; that he would therefore ever adhere to the doctrine of Paschasius, and believe with him, and the catholic church, that the faithful receive the true and real body and blood of Christ under the appearance of bread and of wine.¹ In answer to this, and many other letters of the same kind from others, Berengarius appealed to the fathers, especially to St. Ambrose, St. Austin, and St. Jerom, who had held, as he said he was ready to prove, the very doctrine that Scotus had taught; and from thence he concluded Paschasius, and not Scotus, to have introduced a new doctrine.

As this dispute made a great noise in France, the king, Henry I., summoned all the bishops and learned men of his kingdom to meet at Paris, on the 16th of October, 1050, in order to examine it, and Berengarius among the rest. But as he did not appear, Isambardus, bishop of Orleans, produced a letter, which he had written to one named Paul, and the bishop had intercepted. This letter being read in the council, the bishops with one voice pronounced the doctrine it contained heretical. For in that letter Berengarius had opened his mind to his friend, without reserve, condemning, in plain terms, the opinion of Paschasius as repugnant, and extolling that of Scotus as entirely agreeable to the belief of the church in the primitive times, and the doctrine of the fathers. At the same time the book of Scotus, whom they styled the author of the new heresy, was condemned; and it was enacted, that Berengarius and his followers should be sought for, should be apprehended, and wherever found even put to death, if they did not publicly retract their impious doctrine.² Who can but admire the Christian spirit of those good bishops! This decree sufficiently justified the conduct of Berengarius in not venturing to appear at that council. Of this cruel and unjust sentence he complained in a letter to an abbot named Richardus, one of the king's chief favorites, entreating him to undeceive that Prince, whom the enemies of truth had found means to prejudice so strongly against him, and let him know, that he was ready to defend, in his presence, the doctrine, that had been so rashly condemned by the bishops of his kingdom. He added, that the king ought to be informed, that Scotus wrote his book, at the request of Charles the Great (meaning Charles the Bald, who was sometimes distin-

guished with the title of Great) in order to undeceive the ignorant, and confute the many gross errors, relating to the eucharist, that had been introduced, chiefly by Paschasius, into the church; and that so deserving a man should, on that account, be protected after his death by the successors of the prince, in obedience to whose commands he had undertaken so useful a work.¹ But the monk either did not apply to the king, or his application proved ineffectual.

That the doctrine of Christ's real presence in the eucharist was utterly unknown to the English church, and consequently was not held and confessed by the whole world, as was boldly asserted by Paschasius, undeniably appears from an ancient Saxon sermon or homily, appointed to be read in the churches of England on Easter-day. It is supposed by some to have been written by Ælfric, who succeeded Sigeric in the see of Canterbury about the year 995, but by others ascribed to Ælfrick the younger, raised to the see of York in 1028. It is still in manuscript in the public library at Oxford, and in that of Bennet college in Cambridge, has been long ago published in the Saxon with an English translation, and since by the learned Wheelock, both in Saxon and in Latin, in his edition of Bede's Ecclesiastical History.² I shall transcribe here out of that invaluable piece, some passages that will put it out of all doubt, that in the latter end of the tenth, or in the beginning of the eleventh century, the doctrine of Christ's real or corporeal presence in the eucharist was not the doctrine of the English church. The homily begins thus:

"Men beloved, you have been often discoursed to concerning our Savior's resurrection, &c. Now we shall, by God's grace, explain something to you about the holy eucharist, which this day we are bound to frequent, and instruct your understandings about this mystery, both according to the Old and New Testament, that no doubt may disturb you concerning this life-giving banquet.—Christ before his suffering, consecrated bread, and distributed it to his disciples, saying, 'eat this bread, it is my body, and do this in remembrance of me.' He likewise consecrated wine in a cup, and said, 'drink ye all of this, this is my blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' The apostles did as Christ commanded, they consecrated bread and wine for the eucharist.—Now men have often disputed, and still do dispute, how that bread, which is prepared of corn, can be changed into Christ's body, and how that wine, by any blessing of it, can be changed into Christ's blood? To such men I answer, that some things are spoken of Christ by

¹ Dacher. in Not. ad Vit. Lanfran.

² Dunrand. Abbot. Troarn, par. ix.

¹ Dacher. Specileg. tom. ii. et Concil. tom. ix. p. 1062.

² Bed. Eccl. Hist. p. 462.

signification, some others by a known thing. It is a true thing and known, that Christ was born of a virgin, that he voluntarily suffered death, was buried, and this day rose from the dead. He is called bread, and a lamb, and a lion by signification. He is called bread, because he is our life, a lamb for his innocence, a lion for his strength. Yet according to true nature Christ is neither bread, nor a lamb, nor a lion. Why, then, is the holy eucharist called Christ's body, or his blood, if it be not truly what it is called? Truly the bread and wine, which are consecrated, show one thing outwardly to men's senses, and another thing they declare inwardly to believing minds. Outwardly, bread and wine are seen both in appearance and in taste; yet they are truly, after consecration, Christ's body and blood by a spiritual sacrament. So the holy font-water, called the well-spring of life, is like in nature to other waters, and is subject to corruption; but the power of the Holy Ghost, by the priest's blessing, comes upon that corruptible water; and after that it can wash both body and soul from all sin by spiritual virtue. We see now two things in this one creature; that, whereby it is, according to nature, corruptible water, and that, whereby it has, according to the spiritual mystery, a saving power. In like manner, if we look upon the holy eucharist according to a corporeal sense, we see that it is a creature corruptible and changeable. But if we own a spiritual power therein, then we understand that life is in it, and that it confers immortality on those who taste it by faith. There is much difference between the invisible power of the holy eucharist, and the visible appearance of its proper nature. By nature it is corruptible bread, and corruptible wine, but by virtue of the divine Word, it is truly the body and blood of Christ, yet not corporally so, but spiritually. There is a great difference between the body that Christ suffered in, and that body which is consecrated for the eucharist. The body that Christ suffered in, was born of the flesh of Mary, with blood and bones, with skin and nerves, animated with a rational spirit in human members. But his spiritual body, which we call the eucharist, is collected from many grains of corn, without blood and bone, without member or soul; and therefore there is nothing in it to be understood corporally, but all is to be understood spiritually. This sacrament is a pledge and a type: the body of Christ is the truth. We keep the pledge sacramentally till we come to the truth itself; and then is the pledge at an end. It is indeed Christ's body and his blood, not corporally but spiritually. Do not dispute how this can be effected, but believe it firmly. Paul, the apostle, speaking of the Israelites, says, 'they all drank of the spiritual rock, and that rock was Christ.' That rock was not Christ in a corporal sense, but it signified

Christ. The heavenly food, that fed them for forty years, and the water, that flowed from the rock, signified Christ's body and blood, which are now daily offered in the church. It was the same which we offer to-day, not corporally, but spiritually. Christ consecrated bread and wine for the eucharist, and said, this is my body and blood; he had not yet suffered, and yet he changed the bread into his body, and the wine into his blood, as he did before in the wilderness, when he changed the heavenly food into his flesh, and the water flowing from the rock into his blood. They saw, that the heavenly food was visible and corruptible; but they understood that thing spiritually. Jesus said, 'whoever eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.' He did not command them to eat that body, which he had assumed, nor to drink that blood, which he shed for us; but by that speech he meant the holy eucharist, which is spiritually his body and his blood."

We have two other pieces written by Ælfric, that contain the very same doctrine; the one an epistle to Wulfine, bishop of Shirburne, where he speaks thus: "The eucharist is not the body of Christ corporally, but spiritually; not the body in which he suffered, but the body of which he spoke when he blessed bread and wine for the eucharist, saying, 'this is my body,' &c." The other is an epistle to Wulstane, archbishop of York; and he there expresses himself, with respect to the eucharist, in the following terms: "Christ himself consecrated the eucharist before his passion; he blessed bread and broke it, saying, 'eat this bread, it is my body;' and again, he blessed the cup, saying, 'drink ye all of this, it is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.' The Lord, who consecrated the eucharist before his passion, and said that bread was his body, and wine truly his blood, daily consecrates, by the priest's hands, bread for his body, and wine for his blood, in a spiritual mystery. However, that life-giving bread is not the same body in which Christ suffered, nor that holy wine the blood of our Savior, that was shed for us, in bodily thing, but in a spiritual sense. That bread indeed was his body, and that wine his blood, just as that heavenly bread, which we call manna, was his body, and the clear water, that flowed from the rock in the wilderness, was his blood. The apostle, who says they all did eat, &c., does not say corporally, but spiritually."¹

I shall conclude on this head with a few observations. And, 1. The doctrine, denying Christ's real or corporeal presence in the eucharist, is here asserted in such plain terms, as leave not the least room to question the meaning of the writer. 2. As the

¹ Not. ad Bed. p. 332, 333, 334, & Usher's answer to the Jesuits, p. 79.

Council of Rome 5;—[Year of Christ, 1051.] The pope absolves Edward the Confessor from a vow. He returns to Germany.

sermon, containing that doctrine, was appointed to be read on Easter day, for the instruction of the faithful, before they received the eucharist: it was not the private opinion of Ælfric, but the doctrine of the English church. 3. The same doctrine must have been once taught by the Roman church, since the English church was instructed in the chief mysteries of the Christian religion by the Roman. 4. What Paschasius wrote, namely, that "no man openly contradicted his doctrine," was certainly true, as no man had ever heard of it till he published his famous treatise. But it was no sooner known than contradicted by some of the most learned men of that age, and among the rest by Raban, archbishop of Mentz, as appears from an epistle of his to Heribald, wherein he speaks thus, alluding, no doubt, to the treatise of Paschasius; "some of late, not thinking rightly of the sacrament of our Lord's body and blood, have said, that the very body and blood of our Lord, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which he suffered on the cross, and rose again out of the grave, is the same that is taken at the altar, which error we have opposed as we are able.¹ Lastly, from what has been said it is evident that the present doctrine of the church of Rome concerning the eucharist was, so late as the ninth century, unknown to the English church, and even looked upon as an error by some of the most learned men of that age, and consequently, that it was not taught, from the earliest times, by the catholic church. And now to return from this digression to Leo.

From Vercelli, the pope, instead of returning to Rome, after the council, paid a second visit to his flock at Toul, for he never resigned that bishopric, and there translated, with great pomp and solemnity, the body of St. Gerard, whom he had lately canonized. He was still in that city on the 30th of October, as appears from a charter granted at Toul, bearing that date.² But he kept the feast of the purification at Augsburg with the emperor, and from thence returning to Rome, held a council soon after Easter, in which he excommunicated Gregory, bishop of Vercelli, for committing adultery with a widow betrothed to his uncle. The bishop was absent when this sentence was given, but he flew to Rome as soon as he heard of it; and upon his promising to perform the penance that his holiness imposed upon him, he was absolved from the excommunication and restored to the functions of his office. On that occasion the canons issued by other councils against the incontinence of the clergy were confirmed, some new ones were added to them, and in order to check more effectually the scandalous irre-

gularities of the Roman clergy in particular, it was decreed, at the request of the pope, that all women who should, for the future, prostitute themselves to priests within the walls of Rome, should be condemned to serve as slaves in the Lateran palace.¹

It was probably in this council that the pope absolved Edward the Confessor from a vow he had made to visit the holy places at Rome. The king showed a great inclination to undertake that pilgrimage, the visiting of the tombs of the apostles being still in reputation, and thought highly meritorious. But his council, apprehending the evil consequences of his being absent at a time when the state was divided into opposite parties, as it happened then, persuaded him to send a solemn embassy to Rome, to acquaint the pope with the vow he had made, and laying before him the evils that would inevitably attend his performing such a journey, to beg his holiness would absolve him from it. The ambassadors were kindly received by the pope, and he very readily granted their request, but upon condition that the king bestowed upon the poor the money which he had reserved to defray the expenses of his journey; and besides, either repaired or built anew and enlarged the monastery, dedicated to the prince of the apostles, St. Peter. The king, in compliance with these terms, immediately undertook the rebuilding of St. Peter's, at Westminster; which work was completed, and the new church consecrated, on the 28th of December, 1065.²

Upon the breaking up of this council, the pope took a third journey into Germany, to mediate a peace between the emperor and Andrew, king of Hungary, refusing to pay the tribute that his predecessors had annually paid to the emperor, as a token of their subjection to the empire. The emperor had thereupon besieged a strong-hold, called Berziburg, that belonged to the king, who, apprehending he would reduce it, and open himself a way into the heart of his kingdom, wrote to the pope, offering to pay the usual tribute, and begging his holiness to interpose with the emperor in his behalf. Leo complied with his request, and having other affairs to transact with the emperor, he had no sooner dismissed the council than he set out for Germany. But the vigorous resistance, which the emperor met with from the garrison of Berziburg, having, in the mean time, obliged him to raise the siege, the king would no longer stand to the terms which the pope had proposed, at his desire, to the emperor. Leo, highly provoked at the conduct of the king, threatened him with excommunication;³ but what was the issue of that affair history does not inform us.

¹ Baluz. in append. ad Regimon. p. 516.

² Wibert in Vit.

¹ Herman. ad ann. 1051. Petrus Damian. in ep. ad Cunibert.

² Concil. tom. ix. p. 1186. ³ Herman. ad ann. 1051.

The pope canonizes two saints at Ratisbon;—[Year of Christ, 1052.] Council at Mantua;—[Year of Christ, 1053.] Disturbances on occasion of that council. Council of Rome. Some opinions of the Greeks condemned.

The following year, 1052, Leo being still in Germany, canonized at Ratisbon two bishops of that city, namely, Wolfgang, who was made bishop in 972, and died on the 21st of October, 994, and Erhard, who governed the same church with great reputation of sanctity, and was believed to have wrought many miracles in his lifetime and after his death.¹ From Ratisbon the pope went to meet the emperor at Worms, and there they both celebrated the Christmas festival. It was in that city, and in the present year, 1052, that Leo exchanged the bishopric of Bamberg, the monastery of Fulda, and several other places, for the city of Beneventum, in Apulia.² But this exchange did not take place till the year 1076. A late historian supposes the whole principality of Beneventum, comprising at this time several provinces, and many great cities, to have been yielded to the pope.³ But Leo Ostiensis, the most ancient writer who mentions this exchange, and Petrus Diaconus, who wrote soon after him,⁴ say in express terms, that the emperor gave the city of Beneventum in exchange for the bishopric of Bamberg, and no man can think, that if he had given the whole principality, as well as the city, they would only have mentioned the city.

The following year, 1053, the pope, having celebrated the festival of the purification at Augsburg, set out from thence on his return to Italy, and arriving at Mantua about Shrove Sunday, assembled a council in that city. But the domestics of the bishops quarreling, at the instigation of their masters, with those of the pope's retinue, raised such disturbances, as obliged the pope to dismiss the assembly, after he had attempted in vain, and not without endangering his life, to appease the tumult. For, thinking the rioters would be awed by his presence, he quitted his seat in the council, and showed himself at the church doors in his pontifical robes. But they still continued to pursue his servants with showers of darts and stones, that flew thick about the pope himself, and even wounded one of his domestics, who had taken shelter under his mantle. Thus did the bishops prevent the pope from inquiring into their conduct, which they knew would deservedly draw upon them the severest censures. The authors of these disturbances were discovered the next day; but the pope forgave them, lest he should be thought, as the affront was offered to him, to have been actuated, in punishing them, by a spirit of revenge.⁵ I have observed elsewhere, that at Mantua was kept a sponge, steeped, as was

believed, in the blood of our Savior.¹ That relic the pope attempted to carry with him to Rome: but the whole city taking the alarm, he was obliged to content himself with a small portion of the holy sponge, which he deposited in the Lateran church, where it is shown to this day.²

Leo returned to Rome in the beginning of Lent, and in a council which was held there after Easter, he declared Dominic of Grado, metropolitan or primate of the provinces of Venetia and Istria, gave him the pall, subjected all the bishops of those two provinces to his see, and confined to Lombardy the jurisdiction of the bishop of Friuli, who had long disputed the metropolitan dignity with the bishop of Grado. The patriarchal see was transferred from Aquileia to Grado in 579,³ which city was therefore called New Aquileia, and in 1450 it was removed from Grado to Venice.

It was, probably, in this council, that the pope condemned the opinion of the Greeks, teaching, that the eucharist ought to be administered with leavened bread, which alone they pretended to be true bread, and therefore censured the Roman church, as deviating from the practice, introduced by our Savior himself, in solemnizing that sacrament with unleavened bread. That was the subject of a letter, written by Michael Cerularius, at this time patriarch of Constantinople, and Leo, metropolitan of Achriss in Bulgaria, to John, bishop of Trani in Apulia. John showed the letter to Humbertus, bishop of the White Forest, who translated it into Latin, and communicated it to the pope. Leo, finding the Roman church strongly attacked in that piece, and arraigned of adopting both doctrines and practices inconsistent with those of the primitive church, wrote a long answer to it, reproaching the Greeks, especially the bishops of Constantinople, with the many heresies they had taught or countenanced, and extolling the Roman church as having been instructed by St. Peter himself, and ever preserved by him free from all heresy. He speaks of the famous donation of Constantine, long since universally exploded, as a thing that in his time no man questioned; blames the Greeks for admitting eunuchs even to the episcopal dignity; and supposes the report of a woman having been promoted to the patriarchal see of the imperial city, to have been owing to that report, which, however, he says, he cannot believe. In the end of his letter, he tells the patriarch and the bishop of Achriss, for to them his letter was addressed, that he had sent some passages out of the fathers to the bishops of Apulia, as an antidote against the venom, with which they were striving to poison their minds.⁴

¹ Mabil. Sec. Benedict V. Botland ad diem 8 Jan.

² Herman. ad ann. 1053. Leo Ostien. l. ii. c. 81.

³ Giannetas. Hist. Neap. l. ix.

⁴ Leo Ostiens. ubi supra. & Petr. Diacon. ad Ostiens. l. ii. c. 81.

⁵ Herman. Wibert. in Vit Leon. l. ii. c. 8.

¹ See p. 187.

² Hyppolit. Donesmund. Hist. Mant. l. iil. p. 203.

³ See vol. 1. p. 353. ⁴ Wibert. in Vit. Leon. l. ii. c. 9.

The pope makes war upon the Normans. On what occasion the Normans came first into Italy. Are defeated, with great slaughter, by the Greeks.

But the practice that Leo condemned, namely, that of consecrating in leavened bread, is now thought, even by many learned divines of the church of Rome, to have been the practice of the whole primitive church.¹ Our Savior, it is true, celebrated his last supper with unleavened bread, but that was as those writers observe, at the time of the passover, when no other bread could be used.²

As Michael Cerularius, the present patriarch, was the first who reproached the Roman church with the use of unleavened bread, and wrote against it to the bishops who were subject to his see in Italy, some conclude from thence, that custom to have been adopted by the Roman church about this time. It did not, at least, prevail in the time of Photius, else he would have taken notice of it, as he did of every other rite or practice, wherein the Roman church differed from that of Constantinople and the other churches in the East.

We have hitherto seen this good pope exerting his zeal as sovereign pontiff, and not unsuccessfully, in reforming the many abuses that prevailed in the church, and assembling for that purpose frequent councils in Italy, France, and Germany. We shall now view him acting in a very different capacity, that of a commander, heading an army, and leading it in person, not against the infidels, as two of his predecessors had done, but against a Christian people, remarkable for their piety and religion; not in defence of the faith, but of the temporal dominions and wealth of the church. The people, upon whom he made war, were the Normans, who, coming from that part of Neustria, which from them was called Normandy, had established themselves, by their valor, in Apulia, and gave great umbrage to the pope by the acquisitions they made in that country. Of their first coming into Italy, and their warlike exploits there, we read the following account in Guillelmus Apuliensis, who wrote it in verse, but more like an historian than a poet, and published it at the request of pope Urban II., preferred

to the pontificate in 1088. That small piece, containing a succinct relation of the adventures of the Normans, from their arrival in Italy in 1016, to the death of the famous Robert Guiscard, in 1085, is ascribed to Roger, the son and successor of Robert. The substance of that relation is as follows:

One Melus, a man of great power and authority in the city of Bari, in Apulia, not able to bear with the tyrannical government of the Greeks, to whom that city was subject, conspired with several of his fellow-citizens to drive them out, and to rescue themselves and their country from the oppression they groaned under. But the conspiracy being discovered before it was ripe for execution, Melus made his escape, first to Ascoli, and from thence to Monte Gargano. There he found some Normans, come from Neustria, their native country, to visit that sanctuary, according to the devotion that was then in vogue; and upon his learning who they were, he gave them an account of himself, assuring them, that with a small number of their countrymen he would drive out the dastardly Greeks, and put their nation in possession of the most fertile country of all Italy. There wanted no more for those bold adventurers. They went home, and returned the next year with a choice band of their countrymen, who, being supplied with arms at Rome, marched from thence in a body into Apulia, where Melus put himself at their head. They had several encounters with the Greeks, whom they always defeated. But in a battle fought in 1019 near Cannæ, a place famous for the defeat of the Romans, the Greeks gained a complete victory over them, cut most of them in pieces, and obliged the rest to save themselves by a precipitate flight. In this battle the Normans behaved with unparalleled bravery. But the troops that Melus had hired of the Italian princes gave way, which occasioned the rout. Melus finding his army greatly reduced by the loss he had sustained, and no longer in a condition to withstand the numerous forces of the Greeks, recommended his Normans to Pandulphus, prince of Capua, and Guaimarus, prince of Salerno, and went himself into Germany to solicit succors of the emperor. Benedict VIII., then pope, apprehending that the Greeks, if not timely opposed by a superior force, would soon make themselves masters of all Italy, undertook a journey into Germany for the same purpose. But the emperor, Henry I., could spare them no troops at that juncture, being engaged in other wars, and in the mean time Melus died. His death happened in 1021, while he was with the emperor, who caused him to be buried in a royal manner, "ut regius est mos," says the historian, and attended his funeral in person.

The Normans chose, upon the death of

¹ Bona *Res. Liturg.* l. i. c. 23. Schelstrat. *Disciplin. Arcanic.* c. 7. Pagi. *Critic. Baron. ad ann.* 313. n. 15.

² That the church has always used common bread they prove with the following reasons: 1. Because the bread and wine for the use of the eucharist were taken out of the oblations of the people, who, no doubt, offered common bread and wine, so long as they continued to make oblations. 2. Epiphanius, speaking of the Ebionites, takes notice of their consecrating in unleavened bread and water only, as a peculiar rite of those heretics; (*Epiph. Heres.* 30.) which plainly shows that they did not use the same bread as was used by the church. 3. The ancients all speak of the bread for the eucharist as common bread, such as they used upon other occasions; (*Ambrose de Sacram.* l. iv. c. 4.) and that such it really was, appears from a story we read in the life of Gregory the Great, of a woman, who smiling when he administered the eucharist to her with the usual words, "the body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy soul," and being asked why she smiled, answered, because he called the bread, which she had made with her own hands, the body of Christ.—(*Greg. Vit.* l. ii. c. 41.) It was therefore common bread.

The Normans serve under the emperor; and under the Italian princes and the Greek. Build the city of Aversa. Ranulphus made count of Aversa. Ill used by the Greeks, they make themselves masters of several places belonging to them in Apulia. Gain several remarkable victories over the Greeks. Choose William Bras-de-fer for their leader. Divide Apulia into twelve counties.

Melus, one of their own countrymen, named Ranulphus, for their leader, and under his conduct distinguished themselves in the war which the emperor made in the following year, 1022, upon the Greeks in Italy. But the emperor being obliged to return to Germany, they kept in a body, serving under the banners of such of the Italian princes as happened to engage them the first, in the wars which they waged with each other. In 1028 they joined Sergius, duke of Naples, against Pandulphus, prince of Capua, who had made himself master of that city, drove him from it, after he had held it three years, and restored Sergius. To reward this important service, Sergius granted some lands in the neighborhood of Naples to Ranulphus and his Normans, with leave to build a city in that place for their habitation, which might serve as a barrier against the princes of Capua, as it lay between that city and Naples. They built a city accordingly, and called it, if some writers are to be credited, Aversa, to show their aversion to the prince of Capua, by whom they had been very ill used, though they had served him with the greatest fidelity. In 1038 they were prevailed upon by Guaimarius, prince of Salerno, and their great friend, to cross over into Sicily, and assist the Greeks against the Saracens, who had made themselves masters of the greater part of that island; and it was chiefly by their valor and bravery that the Greeks recovered the city of Syracuse, and several other places possessed by the Saracens. Upon their return home, the emperor Conrad, who had succeeded Henry I., granted, at the request of the prince of Salerno, the title of Count to Ranulphus, and gave him the investiture of that small county.

The Greeks, though indebted to the Normans for all the advantages they had gained over the Saracens, had not allowed them the least share of the plunder, pretending they had acquired it, not by the valor of the Normans, but their own; nay, they commanded Arduinus, a noble Lombard, who served with the Normans, to restore a fine horse he had taken from a Saracen, whom he had killed, and ordered him, because he refused to comply with that unjust command, to be ignominiously whipt round the camp. To revenge this affront the Normans resolved to fall upon the dominions of the Eastern empire in Italy, and establish themselves there at the expense of the Greeks. They marched accordingly, soon after their return from Sicily, against the city of Melfi, and being reinforced with great numbers of new adventurers from Normandy, they laid siege to that place, and in a very few days obliged the inhabitants to open their gates, and receive them into their city. This same year, 1041, they made themselves masters of Venosa, Ascoli, and

Lavelli, and fortified the city of Melfi, strong by its situation, with such works as baffled all the attempts the Greek emperors afterwards made to recover it.

Constantine Monomachus, at this time emperor of the East, alarmed at the conquests the Normans made with so much rapidity in Apulia, sent a powerful fleet, and a very numerous army into Italy, under the command of Duclius, ordering him to give no quarter to the Normans, but to extirpate the whole race. But Duclius, though a brave and experienced commander, had the mortification to see three numerous armies, headed by him, put to the rout by a handful of Normans. The first battle was fought near the Olivento, the other at Cannæ, and the third on the banks of the Ofanto, and the Normans, though they had, in these three engagements, fresh troops to encounter, made dreadful havoc of the enemy, while the loss was very inconsiderable on their side. The emperor, therefore, recalling Duclius, sent Anno with a new and more numerous army than any of the other three, to succeed him. But he was attended with no better success than his predecessor. For, having engaged the Normans near Monte Peloso, his army was almost entirely cut to pieces, and he himself taken prisoner.

The Normans, to avoid giving umbrage to the neighboring Lombard princes, and to gain the affections of their people, had hitherto chosen one of that nation for their leader in the wars they waged with the Greeks. But being now under no apprehension of the Greeks ever prevailing over them, they resolved to have no other leader but one of their own nation; and they accordingly put themselves under the command of William Bras-de-fer, who had distinguished himself above all the rest in the late engagements. He was the eldest son of Tancred of Hauteville, and came into Italy soon after the building of the city of Aversa, with two of his brothers, namely, Drago and Humbert or Umfred, and several other Normans. As he was a man of uncommon strength, and thence called Bras-de-fer, or Iron-arm, of great skill in war, and of prudence equal to his bravery, the Normans chose him for their leader in 1043, distinguishing him, on that occasion, with the title of count of Apulia, which was but an honorary title. For they divided the whole country into twelve counties, and appointed so many counts over them, but left the city of Melfi common to all; and there they met to consult about the important affairs of the nation. William, the first count of Apulia, called by Guillelmus Apuliensis, a lion in battle, and lamb in conversation, died in 1046, and his brother Drago, to whose share the city of Venosa

The emperor grants the Normans the investiture of the countries they had conquered. Snare laid for them by the Greek emperor. The Apulians bribed to conspire against them. Many of them murdered, and Drago among the rest. The Apulians prejudice the pope against them, and the pope the emperor.

had fallen in the above-mentioned division, was in an assembly of the Normans, that met at Meli, appointed count of Apulia in his room. In Drago's time many more Normans, leaving their native country, came to try their fortune in Italy, and among the rest Robert, surnamed afterwards Guiscard, half-brother to Drago, being Tancred's eldest son by his second wife. Drago, knowing him to be a man of great resolution and intrepidity, sent him, soon after his arrival, with a chosen body of men against a strong hold, possessed by the Greeks, on the borders of Apulia and Calabria, which he reduced, and made from thence frequent incursions into Calabria, which still belonged to the Greeks.

The conquests, made by the Normans in Apulia and Calabria, gave not the least umbrage to the emperors of the West, who wished to see the Greeks driven quite out of Italy, and only wanted the Normans to hold those provinces of them as fiefs of the empire. To this the Normans readily agreed, and Drago was thereupon, in 1046, invested by Henry II. who came that year into Italy, in all the countries that he and his Normans had taken from the Greeks. Thus were the Normans put upon the same footing with the princes or dukes of Benevento, Capua, Salerno, and the other Lombard princes, who acknowledged the emperor, as king of the Lombards, for their sovereign, and held, as feudatories, their dominions of him.

In the mean time Constantine Monomachus, emperor of the East, despairing of ever being able to recover, by force, the countries which the Normans had seized, resolved to employ other means, which he flattered himself would prove more successful. He pretended to be upon the point of undertaking an expedition against the Persians, and under that pretence sent one of his chief officers, named Argyrus, with a great sum of money and many rich presents, to engage the Normans to pass over into Greece, in order to serve under his banner in that undertaking. But they had already learned by experience how little Greek faith was to be relied on; and therefore rejected, with scorn, the emperor's presents, and laughed at the great promises that were made them in his name.

Argyrus, finding they were aware of the snare that was laid for them, resolved to employ the treasure he had brought from Constantinople, for a still more wicked purpose; which was, to bribe several of the citizens, in the different cities of Apulia held by the Normans, to conspire against them, and rising at an appointed time, murder them all without distinction. The conspiracy was carried on with the greatest secrecy, and executed with such barbarity,

that the Normans are said to have lost, on this occasion, a greater number of their brave countrymen, than they had done in all their wars with the Greeks. They lost among the rest Drago, the second count of Apulia, who was stabbed, as he was going to prayers in the castle of Montoglio, by one of the conspirators, who had concealed himself behind the door of the chapel. The other conspirators fell upon those who attended the count, massacred such of them as had not the good luck to make their escape, and seized on the castle. But Umfred, who was but at a small distance, hearing of the barbarous murder of his brother, flew with a small body of Normans, assembled in great haste, to the castle, and having made himself master of it, in spite of the vigorous resistance he met with, he caused the conspirators to be all put to most cruel deaths. This instance of treachery and barbarity in the Greeks provoked the Normans to such a degree, that they resolved, by way of revenge, to drive them out of Calabria as well as Apulia.¹ How they executed this resolution, I shall relate in the course of the present history, and in the mean time return to the expedition of pope Leo against that people, which gave occasion to this digression.

The Normans, finding that the Apulians were no more to be trusted than the Greeks, began from this time forward to keep a watchful eye over them, and to treat them with the severity they deserved. Of this treatment they complained, first to the emperor, and afterwards to the pope, representing the government of the Normans as cruel and tyrannical, charging them with many crimes, and painting them as barbarians, without either laws or religion. These calumnies were all credited by the pope, as appears from one of his letters to Constantine Monomachus, emperor of the East, wherein he taxes the Normans with plundering and burning churches and monasteries, with racking and putting to death, by the most exquisite torments, such of the Apulians as gave them the least offence, with extending their savage fury even to women and innocent children, and turning the countries, which they conquered, into deserts.² No wonder therefore, that Leo, thus prejudiced against them, and at the same time jealous of their growing power, should have exerted all his interest with both emperors to get them driven out of Italy; with that view he took a journey into Germany in 1052. But all he could obtain of the emperor, engaged at that juncture in other wars, was a small body of German troops to keep the Normans in awe, till he was at leisure to march with his whole

¹ Guili. Apul. l. i. et ii. Leo Ostiens. l. ii. c. 58, 65, 67, 72, 85.

² Apud Baron. ad ann. 1054.

The pope marches in person against the Normans, who strive to divert the pope from the intended war, but in vain. They gain a complete victory. The pope taken prisoner, but used by the Normans with the greatest respect and politeness. Letters to the pope from the emperor of the East and the patriarch of Constantinople for restoring the union between the two churches.

army against them; which he promised to do as soon as he settled his affairs at home.

But the pope, impatient to see Italy delivered from those public robbers, as he styled them, resolved to undertake so meritorious a work himself. Having therefore, upon his return to Rome, assembled a very numerous army, he marched with all possible expedition to the borders of Apulia, not doubting but he should surprise the Normans, and make himself master of the country, before they could assemble their forces and put themselves in a posture of defence. They were indeed not a little alarmed at the unexpected approach of so numerous an army, and could scarcely believe that it had been raised, and was commanded by the pope, to whom they were conscious to themselves they had never given the least provocation. They therefore deputed some of the chief men among them to wait on his holiness, to learn what was his true design, what he complained of, and to offer him, if he had taken anything amiss of them, all the satisfaction he could wish for. The pope received the deputies with great haughtiness, reproached them with cruelly oppressing the people they had conquered, with seizing and holding a country to which they had no kind of right, with trampling under foot all laws, human and divine, &c. Leo added, that he was come with a powerful army to rescue the unhappy inhabitants of Apulia from the yoke they groaned under; that he would allow the Normans to march unmolested out of Italy, but would grant them quarter upon no other terms. The deputies strove to clear their nation from the crimes with which they were charged; showed the necessity of treating the Apulians, who had treacherously murdered so many of their countrymen, with the severity they so loudly complained of; expressed the greatest veneration and respect for the successor of St. Peter, and offered themselves ready to serve against the enemies of the apostolic see, when or wherever his holiness should think fit to employ them. But as to their tamely quitting a country which they had purchased with the blood of so many brave men, it was a condition they could not comply with, and were therefore unalterably determined to defend it to the last drop of their blood, and repel force by force, by whomsoever attacked.

With these words the deputies took leave of the pope, and returned to their countrymen, who, finding that the pope would hearken to no other terms but those which they could not agree to, flew to arms, and marching out, without loss of time, against the enemy, under the command of Umfred, count of Apulia, of Richard, count of Aversa, and of the brave Robert Guiscard, fell upon them with incredible fury in the neigh-

borhood of Civitate. The count of Aversa put the Italians to flight at the first onset, and pursued them with great slaughter. But the Germans withstood all the efforts of count Umfred, and many fell on both sides. But Robert, who commanded a body of reserve, coming seasonably to the assistance of his brother, and falling sword in hand upon the Germans, they were forced to give ground, and betake themselves, in the end, to a precipitate flight. Robert pursued them so close, that not one of them escaped the slaughter of that day.¹

The pope, who beheld the fight from a rising ground, at a small distance, seeing his army thus put to flight, and the flower of his troops cut to pieces, flew to Civitate, and there shut himself up with such of his men as he had been able to stop in their flight. But the place was soon invested by the Normans, and forced to surrender at discretion. The pope, who looked upon the Normans as a barbarous people, expected to be treated by them, as their avowed enemy, with the utmost severity. But the treatment he met with was very different from that which he expected, and had reason to expect. Count Umfred, hearing that the pope was in the city, and his prisoner, went immediately to wait upon him, accosted him with all the respect that was due to his character, and conducted him, attended by all the chief officers of the army, to his camp. There he entertained him for a few days with the greatest magnificence, and then not only set him at liberty, but, upon his choosing to be conducted to Benevento, attended him thither in person. Leo, no less surprised at, than pleased with the polite and extremely obliging behavior of the Normans, absolved them from the censures which they had incurred, blessed their arms, approved of the conquests they had made, and encouraged them to pursue the advantages they had already gained, and add the reduction of Calabria to that of Apulia.² This memorable battle was fought on the eighteenth of June, 1053; and those who fell in it on the pope's side, being looked upon as martyrs, though they died in fighting against as good Christians as themselves, a church was built to their memory upon the field of battle.³

The pope arrived at Benevento on the twenty-third of June of the present year 1053, and continued there to the twelfth of March 1054. During his stay in that city he received a very respectful letter from the emperor Constantine Monomachus, wherein he expressed a great desire to see the ancient, but long interrupted union restored between the sees of Constantinople and

¹ Malater. l. ii. c. 14. Leo Ostiens. l. ii. c. 87.

² Idem ibid.

³ Wibert. Vit. Leon.

The pope sends legates into the East. They are well received by the emperor;—[Year of Christ, 1054.] But the patriarch declines all conferences with them. They publish a treatise in defence of unleavened bread. Nicetas obliged by the emperor to condemn his treatise against the same. The legates excommunicate the patriarch.

Rome, and offered himself ready to contribute, so far as in him lay, to so good a work; nay, he obliged the patriarch, Michael Cerularius, to write to the pope at the same time, entreating his holiness to concur with him in re-establishing the so much wished-for harmony between the two churches. The emperor flattered himself, that by thus writing to the pope, he should gain him, and by his means procure assistance from the emperor Henry to drive the Normans out of Italy; for that Constantine had in his view, little solicitude about the union between the Greek and Latin churches.

The pope, upon the receipt of these letters, dispatched three legates into the East, namely, Humbert, cardinal bishop of the White Forest, Peter, bishop of Amalfi, and Frederic, then chancellor of the Roman church, and afterwards pope under the name of Stephen IX. or X. They were charged with two letters in answer to those which the pope had received from the emperor and the patriarch. Leo declared in both, his earnest desire of seeing the perfect harmony restored that had once subsisted between the East and the West, assured the emperor that nothing should be wanting on his side to revive it, but complained, in very strong terms, of the patriarch, for presuming to condemn the practice of consecrating in unleavened bread, a practice, which, he said, the Roman church had adopted, and constantly followed ever since the passion of our Savior, or the institution of the sacrament.¹

The legates set out in the month of January, 1054, for the East, and being, upon their arrival at Constantinople, received by the emperor with extraordinary marks of distinction, they told him that they were sent, at his request, by the holy pope Leo, to renew the ancient correspondence and good understanding between Constantinople and Rome, and begged his concurrence in an undertaking that would no less redound to the honor of the see of the imperial city than to his. The emperor promised to assist them to the utmost of his power. But the patriarch could by no means be prevailed upon to confer with the legates, or so much as to see them. Humbert, therefore, thought it necessary to answer, in writing, the letter he wrote to the bishop of Trani against the use of unleavened bread in the eucharist, as well as some other practices, wherein the Greek church differed from the Roman. That letter he answered accordingly in a dialogue between a member of the church of Constantinople, and one of the Roman, the former objecting and the latter solving the objections. The Roman lays great stress on our Savior's having consecrated in un-

leavened bread, (which does not prove that no other should be used, as has been shown above) and on the indecency of using bread, bought in the common market, and kneaded with impure hands; whereas the bread, consecrated in the Roman church, was kneaded by the priests, the deacons, and the subdeacons in their sacred garments, and singing all the while psalms. The Roman finds fault with several other practices, which, it seems, prevailed at that time among the Greeks, such as their crumbling the consecrated bread into the chalice, and taking it with a spoon, their burning or burying the remains of the eucharist, their refusing the communion to women in childbirth, though in danger of their lives, and not baptizing infants till the eighth day. This piece was written in Latin, but translated into Greek by the emperor's order, and sent to the patriarch, and to all the bishops under the jurisdiction of his see.

Humbert likewise answered a piece that had been published by a monk of the monastery of Studium, named Nicetas, who was deemed one of the most learned men at that time in the East. In that piece the monk undertook to prove, that leavened bread only should be used in the eucharist, that the Sabbath ought to be kept holy, and that priests should be allowed to marry. But the emperor, who wanted by all means to gain the pope, for the reasons mentioned above, was, or rather pretended to be, so fully convinced with the arguments of the legate, confuting those alleged by Nicetas, that he obliged the monk publicly to recant, and anathematize all who held the opinion that he had endeavored to establish, with respect to unleavened bread, the Sabbath, and the marriage of priests. At the same time Nicetas, in compliance with the command of the emperor, anathematized all who should question the primacy of the Roman church with respect to all other Christian churches, or should presume to censure her ever orthodox faith. The monk having thus retracted all he had written against the holy see, his book was burnt by the emperor's order, and he absolved, by the legates, from the censures he had incurred.¹

Constantine spared no pains, no threats, nor promises, to get the patriarch to retract, after the example of Nicetas, what he had written against the Roman church in his letter to the bishop of Trani. But his endeavors were all to no purpose, the patriarch declaring, with unshaken constancy, that the emperor might, if he pleased, remove him, but that no power upon earth should ever make him betray his trust, by subjecting the see of the imperial city to that of Rome. The legates, therefore, finding

¹ Wibert. Vit. Leon.

¹ Apud Baron. ad ann. 1054.

The legates leave Constantinople. Snare laid for them by the patriarch. The patriarch guilty of forgery. The sentence against the patriarch left by the legates at their departure.

him thus unalterable, went, on the sixteenth of July to the church of St. Sophia, attended by their retinue and some of the chief officers of the empire, and there, after complaining of the obstinacy of the patriarch, in the presence of the clergy and a great multitude of people come to assist at divine service, they laid the sentence of excommunication against the patriarch in writing upon the high altar, and then leaving the church, shook off the dust from their feet, saying, let God look down and judge him.

The legates left Constantinople two days after, pronouncing, upon their departure, sentence of excommunication against all who should thenceforth receive the sacrament administered by any Greek who found fault with the sacrifice or mass of the Latins. The emperor loaded them, at their setting out, with presents for St. Peter, the pope, and themselves. But two days after their departure, the patriarch, applying to the emperor, declared that he was willing to confer with them, and begged they might be recalled. The emperor thereupon immediately dispatched a messenger after them, who overtook them at Selimbria; and they returned with him the next day to Constantinople. The patriarch, hearing of their return, invited them to meet him the following day in a council, which he had appointed to assemble in the great church of St. Sophia. But the emperor, apprehending that the patriarch had laid some snare for the legates, declared that no council should meet unless he was present at it in person. This put the patriarch into some confusion, which greatly increased the emperor's suspicion, who thereupon advised the legates to depart without delay; and they did so accordingly. It was afterwards found that the patriarch had falsified the sentence of excommunication left by the legates on the altar, and filled it with such severe reflections on the Greeks in general, as would have incensed the multitude, and, in all likelihood, proved fatal to the legates. The patriarch, finding his design thus defeated by the emperor, stirred up the people against him, as acting in concert with the legates, and sacrificing the undoubted rights of the church of Constantinople to the ambition of the pope and his legates. The discontent this occasioned among the people, as well as the clergy, became so general, that the emperor, to satisfy them, was obliged to cause the two Latin interpreters, Paul, and his son Smaragdus, to be publicly whipped and delivered up to the patriarch.

In the mean time the emperor, suspecting the sentence of excommunication left by the legates to have been falsified by the patriarch, dispatched a messenger after them for a true copy of that sentence. The messenger overtook the legates in the country of

the Russians, and from thence brought back with him a copy of that sentence, which he solemnly attested to be genuine. That copy the emperor caused to be immediately made public, to the no small mortification of the patriarch: but not thinking it safe to remove him, as he was a great favorite of the populace, he contented himself with depriving his friends and relations of their employments, and banishing them all from the court.

The substance of the true sentence, as published by the emperor, was as follows: "We Humbert, by the grace of God, cardinal bishop of the holy Roman church, Peter archbishop of Amalfi, Frederic deacon and chancellor, to all the sons of the catholic church. The holy Roman and apostolic see, the first of all sees, and charged, as such, with the care of all churches, has sent us to this imperial city, to inquire, upon the spot, into the truth of what is reported concerning it. Indeed we have found what affords us great matter of joy, and likewise what gives us great grief and concern. For as to the pillars of the empire, those, who are distinguished with dignities in the government, and the citizens of any rank in the city, are most Christian and orthodox. But as to Michael, improperly called patriarch, and his adherents, the tares of numberless heresies are sowed daily by them. They are simoniacs, and sell the gift of God; they not only ordain eunuchs, but prefer them, in defiance of the canons, to the episcopal dignity; like the Arians, they rebaptize those who have been baptized in the name of the Trinity, especially the Latins; they maintain, that besides the Greek church there is no true church in the world, and no true sacrifice, no true baptism out of that church; like the Nicolaites, they permit the ministers of the altar to marry; like the Severians, they call the law of Moses an accursed law; like the Pneumatomachi, they have left out of the Symbol the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son; like the Manichees, they maintain, among other things, that whatever is leavened is animated; like the Nazarenes, they observe the purifications of the Jews; will not suffer children, even in imminent danger, to be baptized before the eighth day, nor women in childbed to receive the eucharist, or baptism, if they are Pagans; they deny their communion to those who cut their hair, or shave their beards, as is practised in the Roman church. Of these errors and many wicked deeds Michael has been admonished by our lord pope Leo, but has not hearkened to his admonitions; nay he would not so much as see us, or converse with us, though desirous of curing these evils jointly with him, nor would he allow us churches for the celebration of mass. He had before shut up the churches of the Latins, calling them,

Letter of the patriarch of Constantinople to the patriarch of Antioch. The patriarch of Antioch's answer. Leo returns to Rome and dies.

by way of contempt, Azimites, persecuting them as heretics, and in them the holy apostolic see; in opposition to which he assumes the title of universal patriarch. We therefore, by the authority of the holy and undivided Trinity, of the holy apostolic see, of all the orthodox fathers, of the seven general councils, and of the whole catholic church, subscribe the anathema, that our most reverend lord the pope has pronounced against Michael and his followers unless they repent, and say—May Michael, the false patriarch, the neophyte, who took the monastic habit out of fear of men, and is even now charged by many with the worst of crimes, and with him Leo, called bishop of Acris, and Constantine, Michael's treasurer, who has profanely trodden upon the sacrifice of the Latins, may they and all their followers be anathematized with the above mentioned and all other heretics, nay with the devil and his angels, unless they repent. Amen, amen, amen." Another excommunication was thundered out by the legates, in the presence of the emperor and the nobles of his court, in the following words: "Whoever shall find fault with the faith of the holy see of Rome, and its sacrifice, let him be anathematized, and not looked upon as a Christian catholic, but as a Prozimite heretic. Fiat, fiat, fiat."

The patriarch, highly provoked at the insolence of the legates, wrote a long letter to Peter, patriarch of Antioch, calculated to persuade him to break off all communication with the Roman church. In that letter he pretended that the three legates were impostors, not sent by the pope, but by Argyrus, the emperor's lieutenant in Italy, with a design to promote the opinions of the Latins, and engage them, by that means, to assist him in his wars with the Normans. He tells the patriarch of Antioch, that the emperor, and he at the emperor's request, wrote to the pope, expressing, in their letters, a most sincere desire of seeing the two churches happily re-united, but that Argyrus, applying to his own use the presents which the emperor had sent to the pope, and keeping the letters, forged answers to them in the pope's name, and sent them by three impostors to Constantinople, namely, by one, who had been bishop of Amalfi, but was driven from that see, and deposed for his wickedness; by another who styled himself chancellor; and a third who assumed the title of archbishop, but nobody could tell where his bishopric lay. In the next place the patriarch describes the haughty behavior of the three pretended legates to the emperor as well as to him, and then enumerates the many abuses that prevailed in the Roman church, and most other churches in the West, such as their using unleavened bread in the eucharist; their shaving their beards; eating unclean and suffocated meats; forbidding priests to

marry; eating flesh on Wednesdays, and cheese and eggs on Fridays, and adding to the Symbol that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son. He closes his letter with exhorting the patriarch of Antioch to renounce the communion of a church infected with so many errors in faith, as well as practices repugnant to those of the primitive church.¹

This letter the patriarch of Antioch answered, expressing great surprise, in his letter, at the boldness of Argyrus, in presuming to impose forged letters upon the emperor, as written by the pope; and he seems to question the truth of the fact. As to the errors charged upon the Latins, he was of opinion that most of them might be connived at; for what matters it, said he, whether they shave their beards, or let them grow; whether they eat certain meats, or abstain from them, as no meats are forbidden; whether on certain days they fast or they feast: they are our brethren, and as we can only look upon them as barbarians, it behoves us to wink at their less gross errors, and content ourselves with their holding the true doctrine concerning the mysteries of the Trinity and the incarnation. With respect to leavened or unleavened bread, the patriarch will have the different churches to retain their different customs, and not to quarrel about a point of so little moment, but thinks that the Greeks should all insist upon the Latins allowing their priests to marry, and altering the symbol, where the Holy Ghost is said to proceed from the Father and the Son. He closed his letter with exhorting his brother, the patriarch of Constantinople, to use moderation, and bear with the customs of the Latins, though different from those of the Greeks, rather than break the union, as such a breach would be attended with the worst of evils. But the patriarch, provoked beyond measure at the haughty behavior of the legates, instead of following the more moderate councils of his brother of Antioch, sowed such seeds of division between the East and the West, as keep them divided to this day, notwithstanding the frequent attempts that have been made, at different times, to heal that division.

Leo died before the legates returned to Rome. He staid at Benevento till the 12th of March, 1054, when, being taken ill, he desired count Humfrid to escort him to Capua, which the count did very readily, attended by most of the chief officers of his army. At Capua the pope staid twelve days, and from thence returned to Rome a little before Easter, which in 1054 fell on the 3d of April. He remained a few days in the Lateran palace, and it being revealed to him there, as we are told, that his end was at hand, he caused himself to be carried in a litter to the oratory of St. Peter. There he received the sacra-

¹ Baron. ubi supra.

Leo's character. Victor II. chosen;—[Year of Christ, 1055.] Holds a council at Florence. Council of Lyons. A bishop miraculously convicted of simony.

ment, and being removed from thence to an adjoining house, that belonged to his see, he died the next day, the 19th of April, in the fiftieth year of his age, having governed the church of Toul twenty-eight years, and that of Rome, five years, two months, and seven days.

He spared no pains during the whole time of his pontificate to reform the many scandalous abuses that had been tolerated, and even encouraged by his wicked predecessors. Simony, that prevailed all over France, as well as Italy, he entirely extirpated, punishing, with the utmost severity, all whom he found guilty of that crime. He constantly lay on the ground, wore a hair-cloth next to his skin, practised many other austerities, and, while he was at Rome, walked bare-footed, three days in the week, from the Lateran palace to St. Peter's. His generosity to the poor knew no bounds; and, we are told, that seeing one day a leper at the door of his palace, he carried him upon his shoul-

ders, and put him into his own bed, but that though the doors were kept shut, he could not be found the next day, whence it was concluded, that Christ himself had taken that shape. In ambition, he equalled the most ambitious of his predecessors, letting no opportunity of aggrandizing his see pass unimproved. His crediting the false reports that were spread of the Normans by their enemies, his painting them to both emperors as a most barbarous and savage race, his making war upon them, and heading his army in person, are actions that even those have highly condemned who speak the most favourably of him. However, he has been honoured with a place in the calendar, and his remains are still worshiped under the altar in St. Peter's church, that Paul V. erected, in 1606, to his memory. Leo was the first pope that marked in his bulls the years of our Lord, the preceding popes using no other date but that of the indications.

VICTOR II., THE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[THEODORA PORPHYROGENITA, MICHAEL STRATIOTICUS, ISAACIUS COMNENUS, *Emperors of the East.*—HENRY III. HENRY IV., *Emperors of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1055.] As, upon the death of Leo, no person was to be found in the Roman church fit to be raised to the pontifical chair, the people and clergy of Rome dispatched the monk Hildebrand, a man of great cunning and address, into Germany, empowering him to choose there one, in their name, whom he should think equal to so great a trust. This commission Hildebrand readily undertook, and the person he chose was Gebhard, bishop of Eichsted, a near relation of the emperor, and the most wealthy and powerful lord in the whole empire. As he was a man of uncommon parts, of great experience in the management of public affairs, and the emperor was entirely governed by his counsels, he could not, for a long time, be prevailed upon to consent to his election, and deprive himself of so able and so faithful a counsellor; the rather as Gebhard himself strongly opposed his own election, being as unwilling to part with the emperor, as the emperor was to part with him. But Hildebrand obstinately persisting in the election he had made, though many others were named to him, all men of unexceptionable characters, they were both in the end forced to yield. Gebhard therefore, taking his leave of the emperor, repaired with Hildebrand to Rome, where he was received with the greatest demonstrations of

joy both by the people and the clergy, and enthroned, under the name of Victor II., with the usual solemnity, on Maunday-Thursday, which in 1055 fell on the 13th of April, when the see had been vacant ever since the 19th of the same month 1054.¹

Victor, a few days after his inauguration, went to meet the emperor at Florence, and held there a general council; that is, a council consisting of most of the Italian, and such of the German bishops as attended the emperor. By this council several abuses were redressed, the alienating the goods of the church was strictly forbidden,² and the doctrine of Berengarius was anew condemned.³ At the same time the pope sent Hildebrand, though then only a subdeacon of the Roman church, into France, with the character of his legate, to correct the abuses that prevailed in those parts, especially simoniacal ordinations. Hildebrand convened a great council at Lyons, and proceeding, with the utmost severity, against the delinquents, deposed no fewer than six bishops accused and convicted of different crimes. Among these was one arraigned of simony; but the charge not being fully proved on the day when it was first brought against him, he found means, in the night, to buy off the ac-

¹ Leo Ostiens. l. ii. c. 90.

² Petrus Damian. l. xii. ep. 4.

³ Lanfranc.

Berengarius condemned in a council held at Tours. Ferdinand, king of Castile, ordered by the pope not to take upon him the title of emperor. Council of Toulouse;—[Year of Christ, 1056.] The pope goes into Germany, and attends the emperor in his last hours. Victor dies;—[Year of Christ, 1057].

cusers, as well as the witnesses, and appearing the next day undaunted before the council, he pleaded not guilty, challenging those who had accused him, to produce their witnesses and prove the charge to the satisfaction of the council. As nobody appeared, the bishops were all of opinion that judgment should be given in his favor. But Hildebrand, addressing him with a deep sigh, "do you believe," said he, "that the Holy Ghost is of the same divine substance with the Father and the Son?" "I do believe it," answered the bishop. "If you do," replied Hildebrand, say, "Glory be to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost." The bishop named, without the least hesitation, the Father and the Son, but could never utter the name of the Holy Ghost, though he attempted it several times; which struck the bishop with such terror, that being conscious to himself of his guilt, he threw himself at Hildebrand's feet, confessed his crime, and being thereupon divested of his episcopal dignity, he immediately pronounced the name of the Holy Ghost with the same ease as he did the names of the two other divine persons. Strange! that any of the popes should have been able, for a whole century, to utter that divine name. This story is related by Petrus Damianus, who lived at this time, in a letter to pope Nicholas,¹ by Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, who declares, in his dialogues, that he had it from Hildebrand himself, and by Malmsbury, upon the authority of St. Hugh, abbot of Cluny, a contemporary writer.²

In the same year, another council was held by Hildebrand, at Tours, in which the doctrine of Berengarius was again condemned; for it had taken deep root in France, and begun to spread there. An anonymous author, who wrote in 1088, tells us, that in this council, leave was given to Berengarius to defend his doctrine; but not being able to maintain it, he abjured his heresy, and promised, upon oath, to hold thenceforth no other doctrine but that of the church, with respect to the eucharist.³ Lanfranc, who was present at this council, reproaches his antagonist, Berengarius, in the following words: "In the council of Tours, at which assisted the legates of pope Victor, you were permitted to defend your opinion, but not daring to do it, you confessed, in the presence of all, the common faith of the church, and swore that you would thenceforth hold no other." But though he thus publicly retracted his opinion out of fear, he was not convinced of its being erroneous, and therefore still continued to hold, and even to teach it, with good success.

To this council the emperor Henry sent ambassadors, to complain of Ferdinand the Great, king of Castile and Leon, for assuming the title of emperor, and refusing to obey the emperor of the Romans. Henry begged that Ferdinand might be excommunicated, and his kingdoms put under an interdict, if he did not obey him, and relinquish the title of emperor. Hildebrand did not let so favorable an opportunity of extending the papal power and authority over princes, pass unimproved. He immediately acquainted Victor with the request of the emperor, and having prevailed upon him to comply with it, he dispatched legates into Spain, to let Ferdinand know that if he did not renounce the title of emperor, to which he had no kind of right, and submit to Henry, the only true emperor, pursuant to the decree of the sovereign pontiff, and the council assembled, by his orders, at Tours, the sentence of excommunication and interdict would be thundered out against him and his subjects. This haughty message occasioned the assembling of a council, at which were present most of the chief bishops and lords of the two kingdoms; and it was determined, after a long and warm debate, that the king should, for the sake of peace, comply with the command of the pope and the council; and he complied with it accordingly.¹

The following year, 1056, another council was held, by the pope's order, at Toulouse, under Rambald, Pontius, and Wilfrid, archbishops of Arles, Aix and Narbonne, appointed to preside at it with the character of legates of the apostolic see. The council met on the 13th of September, consisted of seventeen bishops, and thirteen canons were made by it against simony and the incontinence of the clergy.² The council was yet sitting when the pope, at the request of the emperor, who was taken dangerously ill, went into Germany, and finding him, upon his arrival at Goslar, near his end, he attended him in his last hours. Henry died on the 5th of October of the present year, having caused his son Henry, the fourth of that name, then about seven years old, to be acknowledged by the pope for his successor; and it was chiefly for that purpose he had sent for him. The pope assembled a general diet at Cologne, before he left Germany, in order to reconcile the malecontents, among whom were some lords of great power, with the empress Agnes, appointed to govern during the minority of her son.

The pope celebrated the Christmas festival at Ratisbon with the young prince, and from thence returned to Rome. But leaving that city soon after, he went into Tuscany, and died there in June, 1057, having held the

¹ Petrus Damion. Opuscul. 19. c. 6.

² Malmsb. de Gest. Reg. Angl. l. 3.

³ Anonymus. Chifflet de multiplici Bereng. Damnatione. Malmes. ubi sup. p. 113.

¹ Mariana in Ferdinand. & apud Baron. ad hunc ann.

² Concil. tom. ix. p. 1084.

Stephen IX. chosen. His family employments, &c. Councils held at Rome. The pope at Monte Cassino.

see two years, three months and some days. Of this pope we have but one letter, whereby he confirms all the privileges granted by his predecessors to the bishops of the White Forest. He is said to have been preserved from an imminent danger by the following miracle: A subdeacon put a dose of poison, upon what provocation we know not, into the chalice, while the pope was celebrating mass, which would have soon put an end to his life; but he could not, with all his might, lift up the chalice to drink the consecrated wine. Such an extraordinary event surprised him and the whole congregation, and

they all fell upon their knees, beseeching the Almighty to discover the cause of so miraculous an effect. While they were praying, the subdeacon was suddenly seized with the devil; and he thereupon publicly confessed his crime, begging the pope and the congregation to forgive him, which the holy pontiff not only did very readily, but continued praying for him with all who were present, till the evil spirit left him. As for the poisoned chalice and the consecrated wine, he caused them to be shut up in an altar, and to be kept there for ever with other relics.¹

STEPHEN IX. OR X., THE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[ISAACIUS COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East.*—HENRY IV., *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1057.] The unexpected news of Victor's death was brought to Rome by Boniface, bishop of Albano; and Frederic, cardinal of St. Chrysogonus, and chancellor of the Roman church, happening then to be there, the leading men of the people and clergy went immediately to the palace Pallaria, where he was lodged, to advise with him about the election of a new pope. The cardinal named five to them, whom he thought the most worthy of, and all alike equal to the pontifical dignity. These were Humbert, bishop of the White Forest or St. Rufina, the bishops of Veletri, of Perugia, of Tusculum, and Hildebrand, subdeacon of the Roman church. But the Romans, thinking none better qualified for so high a station than Frederic himself, declared they would choose him, and no other. He answered, "God's will be done; you can neither bestow that dignity upon me, nor take it from me against his will." Some were for putting off the election till Hildebrand returned, who had attended the late pope into Tuscany. But the greater part, thinking no time was to be lost, went early the next day to the palace of Pallaria, and carrying Frederic from thence to the church of St. Peter ad Vincula, they there unanimously elected him, under the name of Stephen IX., his election happening on the 2d of August, the festival of the pope of that name. He was at the same time enthroned in the Lateran basilic, and the next day solemnly consecrated in the church of St. Peter, where that ceremony was constantly performed, sometimes after, but commonly before the enthronation.¹

Frederic was brother to Godfrey, duke of Lorraine, in those days a very powerful

prince. In the time of Leo IX., he was archdeacon of the church of Liege; but having attended that pope while in Germany, and accompanied him from thence to Rome, he was by him made chancellor of the Roman church, and sent, with Humbert and Peter of Amalfi, into the East, to negotiate an union between the churches of Constantinople and Rome. On his return to Rome, he was created cardinal deacon of St. Chrysogonus, and embracing soon after a monastic life at Monte Cassino, he was, by the intrigues of cardinal Humbert, made abbot of that monastery; and it was on his return from Tuscany, whither he had gone to be consecrated abbot by the pope, that he received the unexpected news of his death.

The new pope stayed four months at Rome after his election, during which time he held several councils against incestuous marriages and the marriages of priests; and in one of these councils it was decreed that such priests as had married since the prohibition of Leo IX. should be degraded, and for ever expelled the order, and that even those among them who sincerely repented of their crime, and had done penance for it of their own accord, should nevertheless quit the ecclesiastical order for a time, and be forever debarred from saying mass.²

The pope continued at Rome till the festival of St. Andrew, and then repairing to Monte Cassino, he staid there till the feast of St. Scholastica, that is, till the 20th of February, 1058, striving to reform some abuses, especially that of private property, which had crept into that monastery. During his stay at Monte Cassino he fell dangerously ill, and thinking himself near his

¹ Lambert. Schaffnaburg. ad ann. 1054. Uspergens. Abb. ad eundem ann.

² Petrus Damian. Epist. ad Epis. Taurin.

¹ Leo Ostiens. l. ii. c. 98.

Petrus Damianus made cardinal and bishop of Ostia ;— [Year of Christ, 1058.] The pope seizes on the wealth of Monte Cassino ; but restores it. The pope issues a decree concerning the election of his successor. He dies at Florence. His writings.

end, he desired the monks to choose themselves another abbot in his room ; and they accordingly chose, with one consent, Desiderius, monk of that monastery, who was afterwards created cardinal by pope Nicholas II., and raised, upon the death of Gregory VII., to the pontifical dignity, under the name of Victor III. The pope approved and confirmed the election of Desiderius, but upon condition that it should not take place till after his death, and he still should be abbot, if he recovered.¹ He is said to have followed therein the example of his two immediate predecessors, who kept, after their promotion, what they held before it, the one the bishopric of Toul, and the other that of Eichsted.

Stephen upon his return to Rome conferred the dignity of cardinal on Petrus Damianus, and at the same time preferred him to the bishopric of Ostia. He was one of the most learned as well as the best men of his age, had embraced a monastic life, and was so fond of retirement, that he could by no means be prevailed upon to accept either of those dignities, till the pope threatened him with excommunication if he did not comply.² Ciaconius supposes, upon what authority I know not, six other cardinals to have been created at the same time, and will have this to have been the first solemn creation of cardinals that we meet with in history. Be that as it will, Damianus, upon the death of Stephen, whom he styled his persecutor, applied to Nicholas, his successor, for leave to resign but could not obtain it.³

From Rome the pope sent an order, soon after his return to that city, to the treasurer of the monastery of Monte Cassino, enjoining him to convey to Rome without delay, and as secretly as he possibly could, all the silver and gold belonging to that sanctuary. The monks were greatly alarmed at so unprecedented an order ; but not daring to disobey it, the whole treasure of the church was privately brought to Rome and delivered to the pope. The holy pontiff proposed to confer the imperial dignity upon Godfrey, his brother, who had lately married Beatrix, the widow of Boniface, duke of Tuscany, and had by that marriage added that dukedom to Lorraine. But as he wanted money to defray the expenses of that ceremony, and to maintain his brother on the imperial throne against the empress Agnes, who governed, during the minority of her son, he thought it no crime to rob the churches of their wealth for so pious a purpose, and began with that of Monte Cassino. But he soon changed his mind, being greatly affected with the tears the monks shed in part-

ing with their treasures, and ordered them all to be carried back, nay and terrified with a vision or dream, he added to them many rich presents, whereof the reader will find and inventory in Leo Ostiensis.¹

The pope, after a short stay at Rome, repaired to Florence, to confer there with his brother Godfrey, whom he was very desirous of promoting to the imperial dignity, flattering himself that he should, with the assistance his brother would lend him, were he placed upon the imperial throne, be able to drive the Normans, of whose growing power he entertained great jealousy, quite out of Italy. While he was upon the point of setting out for Florence, he dispatched Hildebrand into Germany, to transact with the empress Agnes some affairs relating to the apostolic see ; and on that occasion, he issued a decree, strictly forbidding the people and the clergy to proceed to the election of a new pope, if he should die in the mean time, before Hildebrand returned to Rome, and at the same time exhorting them to acquiesce in his councils whenever the see became vacant. Stephen was, it seems, sensible of the approach of death ; and he died on the twenty-ninth of March, 1058, soon after his arrival at Florence, having held the see from the second of August, 1057, to that time. He was attended on his death-bed by St. Hugh, abbot of Cluny ; and we are told that the devil appeared to him several times in his last illness, but constantly left the room as soon as the holy abbot entered it.² He was buried at Florence, where he died, and is said to have wrought many miracles after his death, but has not nevertheless been canonized by the church, though his name is to be met with in some martyrologies of the Benedictine order with the epithet of saint. A monument was erected to his memory by his brother Godfrey, duke of Tuscany, in a more elegant style than we commonly meet with in compositions of that century.³ He was concerned in the writings that cardinal Humbert published at Constantinople, in answer to the patriarch Michael Cerularius, and the monk Nicetas ; and we have besides two letters of his, the one to the archbishop of Reims, wherein he invites him to a council, which he had appointed to meet at

¹ Leo Ostiens. l. ii. c. 100, 103.

² Ap. Surium, Die 19 April.

³ It is as follows :

D. O. M.

“Stephano Papæ Nono, olim Juniano Friderico, Gozelonis Lotharingiæ Ducis Filio, Apostolicæ Sedis Cancellario, Monacho et Abbati Casinensi, Cardinali tit. S. Chrysoconi, Pontifici opt. max. pio, felici, Sanctitate et Miraculorum Gloria, illustri, Gothifredus Hetruscorum Dux, ut defuncto Fratri Domi suæ et inter proprios Amplexus, quas potest, Charitatis suæ Vices rependat, non sine Lacrymis parentat. Monachi Abbatie Florentinæ in Edibus ad divi Joannis Baptistæ offerunt, et justa solvunt. IV. Kalendas, Aprilis, M.LVIII.” This monument is still to be seen at Florence in the palace of the grand duke.

¹ Leo Ostiens. l. iii. c. 8.

² Joann. Lacedens. in ejus Vit. c. 6.

³ Epist. apud Baron. ad ann. 1057.

Benedict X. simoniacally elected. Said to have sent the pall to Stigand of Canterbury.

Rome fourteen days after Easter. By the other, addressed to Pandulphus, bishop of Marsi, he restores that bishopric, which had been divided into two, to its former condition. He resolved, a little before he died, to attempt a reconciliation between the churches of Constantinople and Rome, and named Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, with cardinal Stephen, and Mainard, afterwards

bishop of the White Forest, to go into the East with the character of his legates, and they had got as far as Bari, intending to embark for Constantinople. But being there informed of the pope's death, and thinking it advisable not to proceed, Desiderius returned to his monastery, and the other two to Rome.¹

BENEDICT X., THE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[ISAACIUS COMNENUS, *Emprcor of the East.*—HENRY IV., *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1058.] The deceased pope had, as has been said, issued a decree, forbidding a new pope to be chosen, if he should die, till Hildebrand returned from Germany. But though the decree was made with the consent and approbation of the clergy and the people, news of Stephen's death was no sooner brought to Rome, than a strong party, headed by the counts of Tusculum, chose John Mincius, bishop of Velletri, and placing him upon the pontifical throne, gave him the name of Benedict X. A contemporary writer gives us the following account of his election: Stephen, says he, dying, one Benedict immediately invaded the apostolic see without the knowledge or approbation of the king, being supported in that attempt by a party, that he had gained with money.¹ And the continuator of Hermannus Contractus—Pope Stephen, says he, died, and the Romans, bribed by one John, chose him contrary to the canons, and placed him by force upon the apostolic throne.² Petrus Damianus, with the other cardinals and leading men of the Roman church, being determined to adhere to the decree of the late pope, and wait for the return of Hildebrand, as if he were to bring the Holy Ghost along with him, opposed the simoniacal election of John, nay, and solemnly anathematized all who were anyways concerned in it. But they were thereupon obliged to quit the city, and leave Benedict and his party masters of Rome. Petrus

Damianus, by whom, as bishop of Ostia, the new pope was to be consecrated, being fled, they seized upon a priest belonging to that church, and obliged him, with a dagger at his throat, to perform the ceremony on the thirtieth of March, 1058. Benedict, thus intruded and consecrated, held the see nine months and twenty days;² but we find nothing recorded of him, during that time, besides his sending the pall to Stigand, who, in the year 1047, had been translated from the see of Helmham to that of Winchester, and was about the year 1052 preferred to the see of Canterbury. We are told that as he still retained the bishopric of Canterbury, and none of the preceding popes would, upon that account, grant him the pall, he acknowledged Benedict in order to obtain it of him; and he obtained it accordingly.³ Thus Malmsbury: But I can hardly believe that all the preceding popes would have refused him the pall merely because he held two bishoprics, since two of them were, in his time, guilty of the same fault, namely, Leo IX. and Victor II. who held the bishoprics of Toul and Eichsted with that of Rome. I have placed this anti-pope among the lawful popes, under the name of Benedict X., the next pope of that name, chosen in the beginning of the fourteenth century, being called, in all the catalogues, Benedict XI.

¹ Leo Ostiens. l. iii. c. 8.

² Herman Contract ad ann. 1058.

³ Malms. Pontif. l. i.

¹ Lambert. Schafnab.

² Ad ann. 1058.

Nicholas II. named by the king of Germany. Is unanimously chosen. Benedict deposed in the council of Sutri, and Nicholas enthroned;—[Year of Christ, 1059.] Desiderius made cardinal. Berengarius condemned in a council at Rome.

NICHOLAS II., THE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[ISAACIUS COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East.*—HENRY IV., *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1058.] As Benedict had been chosen without the knowledge of the king, and consecrated without his approbation or consent, the chief citizens of Rome, and such of the clergy as had remained there, apprehending that the empress Agnes would resent such an open violation of the rights of her son, dispatched some of their body into Germany to assure her that they had no share in so uncanonical an election, that they did not look upon the bishop of Veletri as lawful pope, but were ready to receive, and place upon the pontifical throne, the person whom it should please the king to name. The Roman envoys were well received at court; and the king, or rather the empress, nominated Gerard, then bishop of Florence, a native of Burgundy, and one equally acceptable to the Italians and the Germans.¹ In the mean time Hildebrand returned from Germany, and stopping at Florence upon the news of the election of Benedict, he wrote from thence to the Romans, finding great fault with their conduct, and exhorting them to proceed, without delay, to a new election. As this could not be done in Rome, where the party of Benedict prevailed, the cardinals and the rest of the Roman clergy, who had retired from the city lest they should be forced to acknowledge Benedict, met at Siena, and there chose unanimously, with the consent of the Roman people, the person whom the king had named. This happened on the 28th of October, 1058.

The pope immediately after his election appointed a council to meet at Sutri, in order to consult with the cardinals, and the other bishops, about the most proper means of driving Benedict from the see. At this council assisted most of the Italian bishops, and with them duke Godfrey, whom the king had ordered to attend the new pope to Rome, and see him placed on the pontifical throne. The bishops declared, all with one voice, Gerard lawfully elected, and the sentence of excommunication was thundered out against Benedict, if he did not forthwith relinquish the see and retire. He retired accordingly as soon as he was informed of the sentence pronounced against him, sensible that his friends were not able to support him against the king, and the duke of Tuscany. Upon his retreat Gerard repaired to Rome with the bishops of the council and duke Godfrey,

and being there received with all possible marks of respect and esteem, he was solemnly enthroned in the beginning of January, 1059, under the name of Nicholas II.¹ A few days after his enthronation the anti-pope Benedict, being admitted to his presence, threw himself at his feet, owned himself an usurper, and begged forgiveness, protesting that he never had aspired to the pontifical dignity, but that it was offered him, and he was forced to accept the offer. Nicholas absolved him from the excommunication which he had incurred, but divesting him at the same time of the episcopacy and the priesthood, he obliged him to spend the rest of his days at St. Mary the Greater in Rome.² He lived there accordingly, being admitted by the pope to lay communion, and was buried in that church between the altar of the manger, and that of St. Jerom.³

The first thing we find recorded of this pope is his sending for Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, his ordaining him priest, consecrating him abbot, creating him cardinal of St. Cecilia, and appointing him his vicar in the provinces of Campania, Apulia, and Calabria.⁴

As Berengarius continued, notwithstanding his repeated recantations, to teach the same doctrine concerning the eucharist, and daily gained many followers, the pope, to put a stop to the spreading evil, resolved to condemn it again, and to assemble for that purpose the bishops of different nations at Rome. He accordingly appointed a council to meet there in the Lateran palace, invited to it all the bishops of Italy, France, and Germany, and summoned Berengarius himself to appear and maintain his opinion, assuring him that no violence should be offered him. The council met in the month of April of the present year, consisted of one hundred and thirteen bishops, of a great number of abbots, priests, and deacons, the pope presiding at it in person. Berengarius appeared, and is said to have for some time defended his opinion against Alberic, monk of Monte Cassino, but to have yielded in the end, convinced by that monk of his error, nay, and to have declared that he was ready to sign, hold, and believe the confession of faith, that the pope and the council should think fit to dictate to him. The council, pleased with his submission, ordered cardi-

¹ Leo Ostiens. l. iii. c. 12.

² Idem ibid.

³ Paulus de Angelis in Descript. Basilicæ, &c. p. 157.

⁴ Leo Ostiens. l. iii. c. 14.

¹ Lambert. Schafnaburg. ad ann. 1059.

Confession of faith prescribed to Berengarius. The belief of the church of Rome different from what it was in the time of Berengarius. Decree concerning the election of the pope.

nal Humbert to draw up a formulary to be signed by him; and the cardinal drew it up in the following words.

“I, Berengarius, unworthy deacon of the church of St. Maurice of Angers, knowing the true catholic and apostolic faith, do anathematize all heresies, especially that of which I have been accused, endeavoring to maintain that the bread and wine, placed upon the altar after consecration, are only a sacrament, and not the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and cannot, save only in the sign, be handled or broken by the priest’s hands, or be ground by the teeth of the faithful. But I agree with the holy Roman church, and the apostolic see, and do with my mouth, and from my heart profess, that I hold the same faith concerning the sacrament of the Lord’s table which our lord the venerable pope Nicholas, and this holy synod, by evangelical and apostolical authority, has delivered to me to hold, and confirmed to me, namely, that the bread and wine, which are placed on the altar, after consecration, are not only a sacrament, but also the true body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which are sensibly, not only as a sacrament, but verily and in truth, handled and broken by the priest’s hands, and ground by the teeth of the faithful. This I swear by the holy and consubstantial Trinity, and by these holy Gospels, declaring those who shall oppose this faith, as well as their followers, worthy of an eternal anathema; and if I myself shall dare to hold or to teach any thing repugnant to this faith, I will readily submit to the rigor of the canons. I have voluntarily signed this writing after it was twice read over to me.” Berengarius, after signing this formulary, threw his own writings, and with them, those of Scotus, containing the same doctrine, into a fire kindled for that purpose, in the midst of the council.¹ The pope, believing the conversion of Berengarius to be sincere, sent copies of his recantation into all the countries where his doctrine had been heard of, that they who had been scandalized by his heresy might be edified by his repentance.² But that his repentance was only pretended, will appear in the history of the following pontificate.

From the confession of faith before us, approved by the pope and a council of one hundred and thirteen bishops, it is manifest, that the doctrine it contains was the doctrine or belief of the church at that time. But it would now be heresy to say that “the true body and blood of our Lord are, not only as a sacrament, but verily and in truth, handled and broken by the priest’s hands, and ground by the teeth of the faithful;” the species only, or the accidents, being, according to the present doctrine of that church, “handled, bro-

ken, and ground with the teeth.” Peter Lombard, master of the sentences, says, in express terms, and in direct opposition to Berengarius’ recantation, that Christ’s body is handled, &c. “only in sacrament,” that is, in the visible species.¹ Joannes Semeca, author of the gloss upon the canon law, speaks much to the same purpose: “Unless you understand the words of Berengarius in a sound sense,” says he, “you will fall into a greater heresy than that which he was guilty of; and therefore you must refer all to the species;”² which is directly contradicting the pope and the council defining, that the body of Christ, not only as a sacrament, but verily and in truth, is handled, broken, &c. Joannes Parisiensis was of the same opinion, as has been shown by Dr. Allix, in a dissertation prefixed to that learned writer’s “determination concerning the manner of the existence of Christ’s body in the sacrament of the altar.”³ Thus has the church of Rome, for all her infallibility, evidently changed her belief, with respect to the manner in which Christ’s body is eaten in the eucharist.

By the same council, a decree was issued concerning the election of the pope; and it was ordained, that the cardinal bishops should elect the first; the cardinal priests after them; the clergy and the people in the third place; and that the king should, in the last place, be applied to for his approbation and consent. They were to choose out of the bosom of the Roman church, if a proper person was to be found there; if not, out of any other church, “save the honor and respect (these are the words of the decree) that are due to our beloved son Henry, who is at present king, and will, if God please, be emperor. The same honor and respect shall be paid to such of his successors as shall have personally obtained the same right of the apostolic see.” Nicholas here supposes the emperor’s right of confirming the election of the pope, to be a personal privilege, granted to the emperors by the holy see, though we have seen them exercising that right, for many ages, quite independent of the popes. By the same decree it was enacted, that if a free election could not be made in Rome, the cardinals, with the clergy and laity, should have a right to proceed to the election, in what place soever they should think the most convenient; and that, if the elect could not be conveniently enthroned, he should, nevertheless, by virtue of his election, be acknowledged by all for true pope; and, as such, have full power and authority to govern the Roman church, and dispose of the goods of the holy see.⁴ Till this pope’s time, the popedom

¹ Lombard. Sent. l. iv. dist. 12.

² Gloss. apud Grat. de Consecratione, dist. 2. c. Ego Berengarius, &c.

³ Determinatio Johan Paris. Lond. 1686.

⁴ Chronograph. Virdun. Gratian. Dist. 23.

¹ Alger de Sacram. l. i. c. 19. Lanfranc. de Corp. Domi. l. i. c. 2.

² Lanf. ibid.

Other decrees of the council of Rome. Legates sent to reform the church of Milan. Council of Melfi. The pope comes to an agreement with the Normans.

was not thought to be conferred by election only, but by election and consecration; so that if the elect died before consecration, he was not placed in the catalogue of popes, as has been shown elsewhere.¹ This decree, as it is related by Petrus Damianus, confined the election to the cardinals, and only left to the people, to the clergy, and to the emperor, the power of confirming the election which they alone had made.²

By this council several canons were made against simony, incestuous marriages, the marriages of priests, and other abuses, that the preceding popes had endeavored, but in vain, to extirpate. They who had been ordained by simoniac bishops, but had not paid for their ordination, were allowed to continue in the orders they had received; but were all forbidden, on pain of degradation, to take any orders, for the future, at the hands of a simoniac, though he should not require any fee or reward for conferring them. By another canon priests, who kept concubines, were suspended from the functions of their office, excluded from sharing with the rest the income of the church, and ordered to live without the precincts of the church till they should have atoned for their crime. By the eleventh canon relations were forbidden to intermarry, and that prohibition was extended to the seventh generation. It is to be observed, that till the time of the emperor Theodosius, there was no law, civil or ecclesiastic, forbidding even the marriage of cousin-germans. Such marriages were indeed forbidden by that emperor; but Arcadius revoked his law, declaring the marriage of cousin-germans to be lawful, and their children legitimate; and Justinian made this the standing law of the empire.³ These marriages, however, were forbidden by the church before the time of pope Gregory the Great, as appears from his answer to the monk Austin, in the following words: "The civil law of the Roman empire allows the marriage of cousin-germans, but the sacred law forbids it."⁴

The same year the pope sent Peter Damian, cardinal bishop of Ostia, and Anselm, bishop of Lucca, with the character of legates, to Milan, in order to redress, jointly with Guido, archbishop of that city, several abuses that prevailed there, especially simony and the marriages of priests. The legates were, upon their arrival, well received both by the people and clergy: but the next day, when they acquainted them with the subject of their legation, the clergy, loth to part with their wives, stirred up the populace against them, giving out that they were come to subject the church of Milan to that of Rome; which so incensed the multitude, that, surrounding the episcopal palace,

where the legates were lodged, they threatened them with death if they offered to subject the church, that had been ever free, to any other. But Damian, assuring them that they had been sent by the holy pope Nicholas for no other purpose but to correct the abuses that had crept into their church, and that they were not empowered to meddle with their privileges, the multitude acquiesced, and the clergy were obliged to submit to the intended reformation. Several conferences were held, in the presence of the legates and the archbishop, and after the most diligent enquiries it appeared, that in so numerous a clergy as that of Milan, scarce one had been ordained, for some years past, without paying for his ordination. This greatly embarrassed the legates, thinking it, on the one hand, unjust to punish some and pardon others, when they were all alike guilty; and on the other not advisable to punish all. They, therefore, agreed to overlook what was past, and by new regulations obviate such disorders for the future. They accordingly obliged the archbishops and the rest of the clergy to promise upon oath, that in time to come they would avoid all simony, and forthwith dismiss their concubines.¹

The same disorders prevailed in the lower part of Italy, now called the kingdom of Naples; nay, the incontinence of the clergy was so notorious there, that scarce a bishop, priest or deacon was to be found in those provinces who kept not publicly his concubine; and their concubines, styling themselves their lawful wives, had the assurance to claim the same privileges and exemptions as were enjoyed by the clergy to whom they belonged. The pope, therefore, a few days after the breaking up of the council at Rome, set out for Apulia, to assist in person at a council, which he appointed to meet at Melfi, the capital of that province. The council met in the month of August of the present year, 1059, consisted of a hundred bishops, and a great number of abbots, presbyters, and deacons, by whom many severe laws were issued against the incontinent or married clergy.

While the pope was at Melfi, he received a solemn embassy from the famous Robert Guiscard the Norman, who had by this time reduced all Apulia, and extended his conquests over the greater part of Calabria. He was sensible that it was his interest, and that of his nation, to have the popes for their friends; and being, therefore, determined to purchase their friendship at any rate, he sent some of his chief lords to wait upon his holiness in his name, and beg an interview, in order to settle with him some matters of the utmost importance to both. Nicholas readily agreed to the proposal, being as desirous as the Normans themselves to establish a

¹ See p. 91.

² Petrus Damian. l. i. ep. 20.

³ Cod. Justin. l. v. tit. 4. de Nuptiis. leg. 19.

⁴ Greg. l. i. ep. 31.

¹ Petrus Damian. Opuscul. 5.

Conditions of the agreement with the Normans. Investitures granted by the pope to them. The pope returns to Rome, attended by the Normans. Goes to Monte Cassino;—[Year of Christ, 1060.] Council of Tours. Council of Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1061.]

good understanding between so warlike a nation and the apostolic see. Robert, therefore, leaving his generals to carry on the siege of Curiato, a city in Calabria, which he had invested, hastened to Melfi, attended by Richard, count of Aversa, and the flower of the Norman nobility. They were all received by the pope with extraordinary marks of respect and esteem, and in a few conferences, the following agreement was concluded between Robert and the pope, namely, that the pope should absolve the Normans from the excommunication which they had incurred; that he should confirm to Robert, to his heirs and successors, the dukedoms of Apulia and Calabria, which he had taken from the Greeks; and likewise Sicily, when he should drive the Greeks and Saracens out of that island. As Richard of Aversa had lately made himself master of the city of Capua, and driven out Landolphus V., the lawful prince, it was added in the agreement that the pope should acknowledge Richard for lawful prince, and confirm to him and his heirs the possession of that principality. On the other hand, Robert and Richard were to own themselves vassals of the apostolic see, were to swear fealty to pope Nicholas and his successors, and Robert was to pay yearly at Easter twelve deniers, money of Pavia, for each yoke of oxen.¹ The oath Robert took on this occasion was couched in the following terms, as we read in Baronius, who transcribed it from a book lodged in the Vatican library, under the title of "Liber Censuum:" "I, Robert, by the grace of God and St. Peter, duke of Apulia and Calabria, and future duke of Sicily, promise to pay to St. Peter, to you, pope Nicholas, my lord, to your successors, or to your and their nuncios, twelve deniers, money of Pavia, for each yoke of oxen, as an acknowledgment for all the lands that I myself hold and possess, or have given to be held and possessed by any of the ultramontanes; and this sum shall be yearly paid on Easter-Sunday by me, my heirs and successors, to you, pope Nicholas, my lord, and to your successors. So help me God, and these his holy Gospels." When Robert had taken this oath, the pope acknowledged him for lawful duke of Apulia and Calabria, confirmed to him and his successors, forever, the possession of those provinces, promised to confirm to him in like manner the possession of Sicily, as soon as he should reduce that island, and putting a standard in his right hand, declared him vassal of the apostolic see, and standard-bearer of the holy church. From this time Robert styled himself "Dux Apulie & Calabriae, & futurus Siciliae."² Thus did the popes begin to dispose of provinces and kingdoms, as their own, to which they

had no kind of right; and it is upon duke Robert's having declared himself and his successors vassals of the apostolic see, that the popes to this day look upon the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily as fiefs of the church, and claim the power of transferring them, at pleasure, from one nation to another.

The pope, well pleased with the agreement between him and the Normans, left Melfi, and after holding another council at Beneventum, set out on his return to Rome, attended by a numerous body of Normans, who, by his order, laid waste the territories of Præneste, Tusculum, and Nomentum, obliged the inhabitants to submit to the pope, from whom they had revolted, and crossing the Tiber, destroyed all the strong holds of Gerard count of Galera, who lived chiefly upon plunder. Thus was Rome delivered by the brave Normans from the many petty tyrants that surrounded it on all sides. From Rome the pope, in the beginning of the following year 1060, took a journey to Florence, and from thence went to Monte Cassino, where he conferred the dignity of Cardinal upon Oderisius, the son of the count of Marsi, who was a monk in that monastery, and raised another monk, named Martin, to the episcopal see of Aquino, in the room of Angelus, whom he deposed, because he had been made bishop without passing through the inferior degrees, and had by his conduct shown himself unworthy of that dignity.¹

The pope on his return to Rome sent Stephen, cardinal priest, into France, with the character of his legate, to reform the abuses that prevailed in the Gallican church, and were connived at by the bishops in those parts. The cardinal assembled a council at Tours, and by the ten bishops who composed it, several canons were made against simony, the alienating of church lands, and the incontinence of the clergy, there being as few of that order to be found in France as in Italy that did not keep concubines, and even appear in public with them as their lawful wives.²

The following year 1061 the pope assembled a council in the Lateran palace, at which were present, besides the Italian bishops, Aldred, archbishop of York, Guiso and Walter, both bishops elect, the former of Wells and the latter of Hereford. Aldred had been translated from Worcester to York, and it was to receive the pall at the pope's hands that he undertook a journey to Rome. The two other bishops accompanied him, in order to be ordained by the pope himself. Nicholas ordained them accordingly, in the presence of the bishops of the council, but would not grant the pall to Aldred, on account of his having been translated from a lesser see to a greater without his knowledge,

¹ Leo Ostiens. l. iii. c. 15.

² Idem, l. ii. c. 16.

¹ Leo Ostiens. l. iii. c. 14.

² Concil. tom. ix. p. 1109.

Nicholas grants the pall to Aldred of York. Death of pope Nicholas. Disturbances in Rome about the election of a pope.

and his not having yet quitted the see from which he was translated. Aldred, finding the pope inflexible, set out with the other two bishops on his return home; but the highways leading to Rome being then greatly infested by robbers, they were by them stript of all they had, some of their attendants, who perhaps offered to defend them, being grievously wounded, and used with great barbarity. In this miserable condition they returned to Rome, and acquainted the pope with their misfortune, who was so affected with it, that to comfort Aldred he granted him the pall, but upon condition that he resigned the see of Worcester.¹ Malmshury writes, that Aldred was arraigned of simony, that the pope refused him the pall on that account, and that Tostin earl of Northumberland, who had accompanied Aldred to Rome, told the pope, that unless he complied with the request of the archbishop, the king would withdraw the contribution, which he paid yearly to St. Peter.² But no notice is taken by any other writer of the charge of simony, or the threats of Tostin; nay, Malmshury himself clears Aldred from that imputation, in his life of Wulstan, the successor of Aldred in the see of Worcester.³ Aldred in his return to England brought letters from the pope to king Edward, containing a confirmation of all the privileges granted by his predecessors to the monastery of Westminster.

Nicholas did not long survive the holding of this council; for going soon after it broke up to Florence, he died there on the 22d of July of the present year 1061, having governed the Roman church two years six months and twenty-five days, that is, from the 28th of December, 1058, to the 22d of July, 1061. But it is to be observed, that the pope himself reckoned the time of his pontificate from the day of his enthronation and not of his election. Peter Damian, in one of his letters to the archbishop of Ravenna, paints this pope as a man of learning, of a sprightly genius, and of great resolution in pursuing what he undertook. He was chaste, says that writer, beyond suspicion, and his generosity to the poor knew no bounds.¹ Damian adds, upon the authority of Mainard, who had succeeded the famous cardinal Humbert in the see of the White Forest or St. Rufina, that the good pope washed daily the feet of twelve poor people; and that if his other occupations did not allow him to finish that charitable task in the day-time, he completed it at night.² We have several letters of this pope, most of them addressed to the bishops of France, whom he exhorts to reform the many abuses that his predecessors had labored to root out, especially simony and the incontinence of the clergy.

ALEXANDER II. THE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[CONSTANTINE DUCAS, ROMANUS DIOGENES, MICHAEL DUCAS, *Emperors of the East*.—HENRY IV., *King of Germany*.]

[Year of Christ, 1061.] The death of Nicholas was attended with great disturbances, the whole city being divided into two powerful and irreconcilable factions about the choice of a new pope. The one, headed by Hildebrand, was for choosing a pope, as Henry was a minor, without consulting him, and thus excluding him from having any share in the election, which belonged, as he pretended, to the clergy and people of Rome alone. With him were almost all the cardinals, and the far greater part of the clergy, thinking the minority of the king too favorable an opportunity of shaking off the yoke to be let pass unimproved. On the other hand the counts of Tusculum and Galera, and with them most of the Roman nobility, determined to maintain the just rights of the king, protested against the iniquitous pro-

ceedings of Hildebrand and those of his party, and sent deputies to acquaint the king with them. The deputies carried with them a crown of gold for the young king, and were empowered to confer upon him the dignity of patrician, in the same manner as it had been conferred on Charlemagne; which was investing him with an unlimited power in Rome. Hereupon Hildebrand, finding he could not carry his design into execution, sent cardinal Stephen, a monk of Cluny, to acquaint the king and the empress Agnes with the death of Nicholas, and beg leave to proceed to the election of a new pope. This letter was written in the name of the cardinals of the holy Roman church. But the empress, provoked at the proceedings of that party, would not so much as see the cardinal legate; and he returned with the letter unopened. Upon his return to Rome the cardinals, resolved to wait no

¹ Decem Scriptores, p. 386. Stubbs in Act. Pont. Ebor.

² Malmsh. de Gest. Pont. Angl. l. iii. p. 271.

³ See Warton *Angliæ Sacre*, part. xi. p. 20.

¹ Petrus Damian. ep. 14.

² Dam. Opusc. ix. c. 7.

Alexander II. chosen pope by one party, and Cadalus by another; who marches to Rome with an army, but is defeated and Alexander established. Anno of Cologne wrests from the empress the tutelage of the young king. The monks at Florence quarrel with the bishop;—[Year of Christ, 1063.]

longer, chose Anselm, a native of Milan, and at that time bishop of Lucca, flattering themselves that the empress would approve the election they had made, as the elect was well known, and even a favorite at court. He was chosen on the 1st of October, 1061, and took the name of Alexander II.¹ But on what day he was enthroned we are nowhere told. Robert Guiscard assisted at this election, having promised upon oath to the deceased pope to second the cardinals in the election of his successor.

The empress Agnes, looking upon the election of Alexander as an encroachment upon the rights of her son, not only refused to confirm it, but by the advice of Gibert, great chancellor of Italy, appointed a council to meet at Basil, in order to declare the election, made by the cardinals without the knowledge of the king, to be null, and to choose another in his room. This council consisted of the bishops of Lombardy, and some German bishops; and by them the election of Alexander was annulled, as an open violation of the rights of the king, and Cadolus, or Cadolous, was chosen, with one consent, on the 28th of October of the present year 1061. He was at the time of his election bishop of Parma, but a man of a most infamous character, if Peter Damian is to be credited: for he not only kept publicly a concubine, styling her his wife, but maintained that it was as lawful for a priest to marry, as for any other man; and we are told, that it was to get the laws concerning the celibacy of the clergy revoked, that the Lombard bishops so unanimously chose him. He had been arraigned and convicted of simony in three different councils, namely, of Pavia, Mantua, and Milan, but had been forgiven upon owning himself guilty of the charge, and submitting to the penance that was enjoined him.² His election being approved of by Agnes and the young prince her son, the Lombard bishops, those especially of Placentia and Vercelli, took care to supply him both with men and money to drive his antagonist from the papal throne. With that view he marched at the head of a considerable army from Basil straight to Rome, and having, by dint of money, gained some of Alexander's friends over to his party, he would have made himself master of the city, had not Godfrey, duke of Tuscany, espousing the cause of Alexander, fallen with a more numerous army upon his troops, and obliged him with great slaughter to raise the siege, and return to Parma. Cadolus himself would have been taken prisoner, had not an officer of the duke's army, whom he bribed with a large sum of money, assisted him in making his escape.³

Upon his retreat, Alexander, who had fled at his approach, returned to Rome, and was there received, with great demonstrations of joy, by the cardinals, and the rest of the Roman clergy.

Cadolus was preparing to return to Rome with a more numerous army, being strongly supported by the empress Agnes, by the chancellor Gibert, and by all who had any zeal for the maintenance of the imperial rights. But in the mean time Anno, archbishop of Cologne, declaring for Alexander, seized on the king, who was then but twelve years old, and carrying him to Cologne, where he was treated with all the respect that was due to his high rank, he assembled a council at a place in Germany called Osborium, and there caused the election of Cadolus to be declared an intrusion, and that of Alexander a lawful election. As this council was held in the presence of the king, Alexander was said to have been acknowledged by him for lawful pope. Anno held another council or diet, by which he got himself declared regent and guardian of the king during his minority. Agnes, finding the tutelage of her son, and with it all power, thus wrested from her by the ambitious archbishop, retired to Rome, and there acknowledging Alexander, was absolved by him from the censures she had incurred by adhering to Cadolus. She spent the rest of her days in that city, leading a most exemplary life, and died there in 1077.

Alexander, having now nothing to fear from Cadolus, sent Peter Damian to Florence, with the character of his legate, upon the following occasion: The bishop of that city, named Peter, was arraigned of simony, and his father, one of the principal citizens of Pavia, coming to visit his son at Florence, owned, as he was a very simple man, that he had paid the king a very large sum for the promotion of his son. Hereupon the monks, headed by the famous St. John Gualbert, founder of the order of Vollumbrosa, began publicly to inveigh against the bishop, as a simoniac and a heretic, pretending that the sacraments administered by him were null. This occasioned great disturbances, and even a kind of civil war among the citizens, some siding with the bishop against the monks, and some with the monks against the bishop. Several frays happened, and in one some of the monks were killed; which obliged the pope to send Peter Damian to Florence, with full power to employ what means he should think the most proper to reconcile the contending parties. But the monks, insisting upon the nullity of the sacraments administered by the bishop, as well as by those whom he had ordained, would hearken to no terms; so that Damian, finding them bent upon the deposition of the bishop, left matters as he

¹ Herman. Contract. Leo Ostiens. l. iii. c. 20.

² Petrus Damian. Opusc. ix. c. 8.

³ Leo Ostiens. l. iii. c. 20.

The monks apply to the pope. A new kind of ordeal by fire. The bishop deposed by a council at Rome. Canons of that council. Peter Damian sent to France. Holds a council at Chalons. The first instance of a plenary indulgence.

found them and returned to Rome. He was soon followed by several monks sent by their brethren to accuse the bishop to the pope, and beg his holiness would remove him, as several persons chose rather to die without receiving the viaticum, than to receive it at his hands, or at the hands of any whom he had ordained. As the pope had appointed a council to meet in the Lateran palace, he told the monks, that the cause of their bishop should be examined by the bishops of that assembly, and that if he was found guilty of the charge which they brought against him, he should be punished as was prescribed by the canons. The monks acquiesced, and upon their return to Florence, one of them, by name Peter, to convince the citizens that their bishop was guilty of the crime they charged him with, offered to undergo a new kind of fiery trial, and underwent it accordingly, walking barefooted and quite unhurt upon a very narrow path, covered with burning coals, between two huge piles of dry wood set on fire. We are told, that having dropped his handkerchief as he walked between the two burning piles, he returned with great composure, and took it up from amidst the flames quite entire. The reader will find a minute account of this wonderful performance in the letter, which the clergy and people of Florence, who were all eye-witnesses of it, wrote to the pope on the occasion.¹ Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, and afterwards pope under the name of Victor III. speaks of this trial as a thing that was notorious, or well known to all the world; and adds, that, at the time he wrote, the monk was still living, and bishop of Albano.² He was from that time distinguished with the epithet of *Igneus*, and is styled by the writers who speak of him, *Petrus Igneus*, or *Fierus Peter*.

The council, which the pope had appointed to meet in the Lateran palace, was held soon after this miraculous trial, and Peter, bishop of Florence, found guilty of the charge of simony, was deposed, and forbidden, upon pain of excommunication, to exercise thenceforth any episcopal or even sacerdotal functions. It is to be observed, that notwithstanding the authentic account of the miraculous preservation of the monk and his handkerchief, transmitted to Rome by the clergy and people of Florence, the pope did not condemn the bishop till several witnesses, appearing before the council, deposed that, to their certain knowledge, the bishopric was purchased of the king or his ministers with a large sum of money, a plain proof that the pope paid very little regard to that account; and his holiness was better informed of every circumstance at-

tending so extraordinary an event, than we are, or can be, at so great a distance of time. This council consisted of one hundred bishops and upwards, and the canons were confirmed by it, which had been issued by the two preceding popes, Leo and Nicholas, against simony, the marriage of the clergy, incestuous marriages, that is, marriages within the forbidden degrees, or to the seventh generation, and the raising of any man at once, let his merit be ever so great, to the episcopal dignity. By the fourth canon it was ordained, that the clerks should eat and sleep together near the churches which they served, and that, banishing all private property, they should enjoy their income in common.¹ To this canon the regular canons owe their institution.

In this council, Hugh, abbot of Cluny, complained to the pope of Drago, bishop of Maçon, pretending, in defiance of the papal bulls, to exercise jurisdiction over that monastery, because situated in his diocese. Peter Damian, who was a monk himself of the holy cross of Avellana, near Engubio, and a most zealous defender of the monkish orders, hearing this complaint, offered to go to France, and there maintain the privileges of the monastery against the unjust usurpations of the bishop. The pope not only accepted his offer, but charging him with several other commissions, vested him with the character and the power of his legate a Latere. The legate, on his arrival in France, held a council at Chalons, on the Saone, and having caused the bulls of the popes, exempting the monastery of Cluny from the jurisdiction of the bishop, to be read in that assembly, the bishop was by all found guilty of a breach of the privileges granted by the apostolic see to the monks and their monastery. But he declaring, upon oath, that he never had heard of those privileges, and at the same time asking the pope pardon on his knees, in the midst of the assembly, the legate contented himself with enjoining him to fast seven days upon bread and water.² In the same council, the bishop of Orleans, named Haderic, was arraigned of simony. But as he denied that charge upon oath, the legate would not so much as hear his accusers. However, the crime being afterwards proved, the pope ordered the archbishop of Sens to excommunicate and depose him.³

In the mean time the Normans were extending their conquests, not only in Italy, but in the island of Sicily, under the conduct of Roger, brother to Robert Guiscard, duke of Calabria. This year Roger gained a memorable victory over the Saracens,

¹ Concil. tom. ix. p. 1275.

² Coucill. tom. ix. p. 1177, et Bibliothec. Cluniac. p. 509.

³ Petrus Damian. l. vi. ep. 2.

¹ Apud Baron. ad ann. 1063.

² Desider. Dialog. l. iiii.

Two councils held at Rome. The pope sends a standard to William, duke of Normandy;—[Year of Christ, 1066.] The Roman territories ravaged by Richard, the Norman.

masters of the far greater part of that island, and having acquired a very rich booty, he sent a considerable share of it to the pope, sensible that it was his interest to have the pope for his friend, and that he could no otherwise more effectually gain him than by presents. The pope, well pleased with his share of the spoils, granted to Roger in return, and to all who had assisted him, or who should for the future assist him, in driving the Saracens quite out of Sicily, full remission of all their sins, provided they sincerely repented of the sins they had committed, and were determined to commit none in time to come.¹ This was granting them a “plenary indulgence,” as it is now called; and it is the first instance of such a grant that occurs in history. At the same time the pope sent a standard to Roger from the tomb of St. Peter, that he and his men might fight more courageously under the protection and the banner of the prince of the apostles.²

The two following years two councils were held at Rome against those who maintained that the degrees of consanguinity ought not to extend beyond cousin-germans; and by both councils all were excommunicated as heretics who held that opinion. But Damianus informs us, that scarce one out of many thousands paid any kind of regard to the anathemas of those councils, or to the canons forbidding marriages of relations to the seventh generation.³ However, they who held those marriages to be lawful, were looked upon by the pope as heretics, and their pretended heresy was called the “heresy of the incestuous.”

The ensuing year 1066 arrived at Rome, Giselbert, archdeacon of Lizieux, sent thither by William, duke of Normandy, on the following occasion. Edward, king of England, surnamed the Confessor, dying on the 5th of January of the present year, Harold, son to Godwin, earl of Kent, and brother to Egiltha, the deceased king’s wife, caused himself to be proclaimed king the very next day. But Edward, having no male issue, had promised, and was said to have left by his last will the crown to William, who was therefore no sooner informed of what had passed in England, than assembling the chief lords and prelates of his dukedom, he acquainted them with his claim to the crown, advising at the same time with them about the most proper means of ascertaining it. They were divided in their opinions, some, in compliance with the inclination of the duke, encouraging him to pass over into England without delay, while others strove to divert him from such an undertaking as too hazardous, it being impossible for a handful of Normans to overcome the whole English nation. Upon their disagreement

the duke resolved to apply to the pope; and it was to consult and engage him in his cause that he dispatched the archdeacon of Lizieux to Rome. Alexander received him with extraordinary marks of esteem, and being informed by him that Harold had, by the breach of an oath he had taken to William, assumed the ensigns of royalty, his holiness not only approved of the intended expedition, but that he might be protected in such an undertaking by the merits of St. Peter, he sent him the standard of that apostle.¹ William, having received the standard, crossed over with his army into England in the latter end of September, and having defeated with great slaughter the army of Harold, who was killed at the first onset, he was on Christmas day following, 1066, consecrated and crowned king of England in the basilic of St. Peter, Westminster. The ceremony was performed by Aldred, archbishop of York, in the presence of the prelates, abbots, and nobility of the whole kingdom.²

Giselbert, the duke of Normandy’s envoy, had scarcely left Rome, when Richard, brother to Robert Guiscard, appeared unexpectedly at the head of a considerable body of troops in the neighborhood of that city. The late pope had granted him the investiture of the dukedom of Capua, which he had taken from Landulphus, the lawful duke. But he now wanted to be made a Roman patrician, a very great dignity in those days; and because neither the pope nor the Romans would confer that honor upon him, he laid waste the neighboring country, and threatened Rome itself. But the ministers of the king, hearing of the ravages he committed, ordered Godfrey, duke of Tuscany, to march against him and protect the city. At his approach Richard retired; but the duke, attended by the pope himself and all the cardinals, pursued him as far as Aquino, where, after several skirmishes, without any advantage on either side, a peace was concluded, but upon what terms history does not inform us; we only know that the pope absolved Richard and his Normans from the excommunication they had incurred by ravaging the lands of the church. From Aquino the pope repaired to Monte Cassino, and there, by the advice of Hildebrand, preferred several monks to different employments and dignities in the church, and at the same time exempted, by a special bull, not only their church and monastery, but all their houses and tenements, from the jurisdiction of any bishop but that of the bishop of Rome.³

As Codolus had not yet quitted the ensigns of the pontifical dignity, but was still acknowledged by many for lawful pope,

¹ Malaterra. l. ii. c. 33.

² Idem *ibid.*

³ Damian. Opusc. xlii. c. 29.

¹ Orderic. Vital. Hist. Eccles. l. iii.

² Orderic. Vital. *ubi supra.*

³ Leo Ostiens. l. iii. c. 23.

Cadulus condemned in a council at Mantua;—[Year of Christ, 1067.] Arialdus canonized. The pope will not allow the king to divorce his wife;—[Year of Christ, 1068.] The archbishops of Mentz and Bamberg summoned to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1069.]

Anno, archbishop of Cologne, proposed the assembling of a council, in order to put an end by that means to the schism. This proposal was not at all relished by Alexander; but being persuaded by his friends to agree to it, a council was appointed to meet at Mantua, and the Italian bishops, those especially of Lombardy, were invited to it. Cadulus was particularly summoned; but he did not appear, pretending that nobody had a power to summon him, since his election had been approved by a council, that of Basil, and confirmed by the king. The council, however, met at the time appointed, and it being made plainly to appear that Cadulus had been preferred to the see by dint of money, his election was declared simoniacal and null, and he forbidden, on pain of excommunication, to exercise thenceforth any pontifical, episcopal, or sacerdotal functions. Alexander too was arraigned of simony, but having denied the charge upon oath, (which he at first showed himself averse to, as inconsistent with the dignity of high pontiff,) his election was declared canonical, and he acknowledged by the whole council for lawful pope.¹ Cadulus, however, not intimidated with the sentence pronounced against him, found means to get one night, with several of his attendants, privately into the Leonine city, and even to take possession of the church of St. Peter. This occasioned a general alarm in the morning, when those whom Cadulus had brought with him, consulting their own safety, left him to the mercy of his enemies. But Cencius, governor of the castle of St. Angelo, coming seasonably to his relief, carried him with him into that fortress. There he remained two years besieged by the Romans, and very ill used by Cencius, who, to extort money from him kept him in the castle, though he might have made his escape, as the place was not closely besieged, without exposing himself to the least danger. Cencius at last granted him his liberty, but not till he had paid down for it three hundred pounds weight of silver. Having thus ransomed himself, he privately left the castle in the night, and in the disguise of a pilgrim, reached undiscovered the town of Baretta. Some writers tell us, that to the hour of his death he claimed the pontifical dignity, that he exercised all the functions of that office, and looked upon Alexander as anti-pope.² But others will have him to have owned his fault, to have acknowledged Alexander, and to have died a sincere penitent.³

The pope in his way to the council of Mantua passed through Milan, and there canonized Arialdus, a clerk of that church,

who had been inhumanly murdered by his brethren for exposing such of them as were married to the contempt of the laity, being a most strenuous assertor of the celibacy of the clergy. Andrew, abbot of Vallombrosa, assures us in his life of this holy martyr, that having happened to touch his body after his martyrdom, his fingers exhaled the sweetest odor he had ever smelt.¹ On the other hand Landulphus positively asserts, that the body of Arialdus sent forth such a stench as no man could bear.² The abbot was for the celibacy of the clergy, and Landulphus against it; and thus may we account for their different sensations.

The pope, upon his return from Mantua to Rome, was informed that the king of Germany wanted to divorce his wife Bertha, the daughter of Otho, an Italian marquis, whom he had married but two years before; that he was countenanced therein by Sigerfrid, archbishop of Mentz, whom he had gained with great promises; and that a council was appointed to meet at Mentz in order to determine that affair. Upon this intelligence he immediately dispatched Peter Damian into Germany with the character of legate *a Latere*, strictly enjoining him to oppose the intended divorce, and threaten, in his name, with the censures of the church, such as should presume to countenance it by what title soever dignified or distinguished. The council met soon after the arrival of Damian at Mentz; but the lords, as well as the bishops, terrified with the menaces of the legate, declared, all to a man, against the divorce, as forbidden by the laws both of God and the church, and earnestly entreated the king not to encourage with his example a crime which it was his duty to punish in his subjects. The king finding his design thus disapproved by all the lords and prelates of his kingdom, as well as the pope, acquiesced, but treated the queen thenceforth with great indifference, though it does not appear that he ever afterwards thought of a divorce.³

The following year 1069 was employed by the pope in redressing several abuses, and examining into the conduct of several bishops arraigned of simony, or other crimes. Among the former were the archbishops of Mentz and Bamberg, whom the pope therefore summoned to Rome to plead their cause in his presence. They were both found guilty of the charge, there being then scarce one bishop in the whole church that did not receive, nay that did not exact, money for performing the functions of his office. However the pope forgave them, upon their promising upon oath to avoid all simony in time to come. The historian adds, that the pope was highly incensed against them, and

¹ In Collect. Concil. ad ann. 1064, et apud Bar. ad eun. ann.

² Lambert. Schafnaburg. ad ann. 1064.

³ Apud Baron. ubi sup.

¹ Vit Ariald. c. 31.

² Puricell. t. i. c. 2.

³ Lambert. Schafnab. ad ann. 1063.

The pope sends legates into England;—[Year of Christ, 1070.] Stigand, archbishop of Canterbury, deposed in a council at Winchester. Other bishops deposed in the council of Windsor. Lanfranc archbishop of Canterbury.

would have punished them more severely, had they not softened him with rich presents.¹

The following year the pope received an agreeable message from William, the new king of England, desiring his holiness to send over legates to assist at a council which he intended to assemble, in order to regulate the affairs of the English church. The pope, in compliance with the king's request, dispatched, without delay, the two cardinals Peter and John, and with them Ermenfred, bishop of Sion, with the character of his legates *a Latere*, to assist the king with their counsel in so laudable an undertaking. The legates, says the historian, were received and honored by the king like angels sent from heaven, and employed by him in affairs of the utmost importance. As he kept his Easter this year at Winchester, he appointed a council to meet there on the octave of that festival; and by that council, or rather by the legates and the king, who presided at it jointly with them, Stigand, archbishop of Canterbury, was deposed, as unworthy of that dignity. The crimes charged upon him were, his holding the bishoprics of Winchester and Canterbury together; his intruding himself into the later in the lifetime of his predecessor Robert the Norman, driven out by the English party, and his being stained, says Odericus Vitalis, with perjuries and murders.² It seems somewhat strange, that the holding of two bishoprics should have been deemed a crime in Stigand worthy of deposition, when the pope himself held two bishoprics at this very time, namely, those of Lucca and of Rome, and several of his predecessors had kept, as we have seen, the sees from which they were preferred to the papal dignity. As for the crimes of which Stigand is said by Odericus to have been arraigned, no notice is taken of them by any other writer; so that they, perhaps, are not mistaken, who suppose him to have been deposed by the king and his tools the legates, chiefly to make room for Lanfranc, who was a Norman, and held in great esteem both by the pope and the king; whereas Stigand had greatly disoblged the present pope, as well as several of his predecessors, by performing, for many years, all the archiepiscopal functions without procuring the pall from Rome; nay he had, on that account, been often excommunicated, but paying no kind of regard to those excommunications, he continued to exercise the same functions as before; and this was the true reason why the conqueror chose to be crowned by Aldred of York, and not by him. He was by the king's order kept closely confined from the time of his deposition to the hour of his death.

In this council, and another held soon

after at Windsor, several other bishops were deposed for their vicious lives, says Ordericus, and their ignorance of the pastoral duty.¹ But it is to be observed, that they who were preferred in their room were all either Normans or persons in the Norman interest; which plainly shows that it was not chiefly for their ignorance, or their vicious lives, that those prelates were removed, but because the king wanted to put all the great trusts in the church, as he had already done those in the state, into the hands of his Normans, or of other foreigners, whom he knew to be more zealously attached than the English to his person and interest.

In the same year Lanfranc was preferred by the king to the see of Canterbury in the room of Stigand. He was a native of Pavia in Italy, the son of a lawyer, and had himself been bred to that profession, but not choosing to pursue it, he left his country and went into Normandy, where he was soon preferred, for his learning and parts, to a professorship in the city of Avranches. He afterwards embraced a monastic life in the monastery of Rey, was made prior of that monastery, and chosen, while in that station, by William, then duke of Normandy, for the first abbot of St. Stephen's in Caen, a monastery which the duke had built and endowed. He was one of William's chief favorites, was consulted by him in all affairs of importance, and looked upon, not undeservedly, as the ablest man of his council, and one in whom he could entirely confide. He was no less acceptable to the pope than the king, on account of the zeal he exerted against Berengarius, in defence of the doctrine concerning the eucharist, defined by the popes in so many councils. He at first declined the archiepiscopal dignity, and even wrote to the pope, begging his holiness would not oblige him to quit the retired life he had chosen, and undertake a trust to which he knew himself unequal. But the pope insisting upon his compliance with the will of the king, he left his monastery this year, came into England, and was consecrated in the cathedral of Canterbury by the bishops of the province, and by Ermenfred, the pope's legate, who, at the request of the king, remained in England, while the other two legates returned to Rome.²

The new archbishop, after his consecration, sent a deputy to Rome for the pall. But apprehending that the pope might require him to come for it in person, and being unwilling to undertake so long a journey, he wrote to Hildebrand, by whose counsels pope Alexander was, as his four immediate predecessors had been, entirely governed, begging him to interpose his good offices in

¹ Oderic Vital. ubi supra.

² Lanfranc Vita Oderic. l. iv. Chron. Sax. ad ann. 1070.

¹ Lambert. Schafnab. ad ann. 1068.

² Oderic. Vital. l. iv.

Lanfranc goes to Rome for the pall;—[Year of Christ, 1071.] The archbishop of York and the bishop of Lincoln said to have been deposed by the pope. The possession of the cathedrals in England confined to the monks. The controversy between the archbishops of Canterbury and York, concerning the primacy, finally determined;—[Year of Christ, 1072.] The pope's letter to the king.

his behalf. Hildebrand answered, that his holiness, desirous to see him, insisted upon his coming to Rome; and that it was necessary he should undertake that journey, not only to receive the pall, but to concert measures relating to other affairs.¹ Upon the receipt of this letter, Lanfranc set out with Thomas, archbishop of York, and Remigius, bishop of Lincoln, for Rome, was received, upon his arrival there, with all possible marks of esteem by the pope, and even honored with the pall that his holiness himself wore in celebrating mass. As for the other two bishops, they were both deposed, says Malmsbury; Thomas as the son of a priest, and Remigius because guilty of simony, having assisted the king with men and money, in his expedition against England, upon condition that, if the undertaking was attended with success, he should be preferred to a bishopric. The pope, however, upon their consigning their crosiers and rings to him, delivered them to Lanfranc, with a power to restore them, if he thought fit, and he restored them accordingly. Thus Malmsbury. But as by no papal decree, or canon of the church, the son of a priest was excluded from the episcopal dignity, it seems altogether incredible that an archbishop should have been deposed (if he really was deposed) on that account. As for Remigius, he was, before his preferment, but a private monk of the monastery of Feschamp in Normandy, came into England with the quota of men which his monastery was obliged to assist the duke with in his wars, and being known to him on that occasion, he was advanced to the see of Lincoln, when it became vacant.² In all this there was no simony, as he could not, being a private monk, assist the duke with men or money upon condition of being made a bishop, he could not, on that account, be deposed by the pope as guilty of such a charge.

As the clergy here in England, had formed a design of driving the monks from all the cathedrals, and were therein supported by the nobility and the king himself, Lanfranc, to prevent such a design from being ever put in execution, prevailed upon the pope, during his stay at Rome, to confirm the possession of those cathedrals to the monks by a special bull, directed to Lanfranc himself. In that bull or decretal, the pope says he has been informed, that some clerks, with the assistance of the secular power, have conspired to force the monks away from the metropolitan, or cathedral church of Canterbury, as well as from all the other cathedrals in England; that such an attempt is derogatory to the constitution of Gregory the Great, ordering Austin, the apostle of the English

nation, to place in the cathedral of Canterbury, men of the same profession with himself; that the order, which Gregory had given to Austin, was confirmed by Boniface IV., in a letter to king Ethelbert, and to Laurence, the successor of Austin; and that he therefore could not suffer the monks to be deprived of that church, or of any other, which had, by his predecessors at any time been granted to them. He closes his letter with thundering out the sentence of excommunication against such as should presume, upon any pretence whatsoever, to disturb the monks in the possession of their churches.¹ Thus was the design of driving the monks from the cathedrals entirely dropped.

While the two archbishops continued at Rome, the dispute between them, begun some years before, concerning the primacy, was revived, and referred to the pope; the archbishop of York maintaining, that neither of the two archiepiscopal sees was subject to the other, according to the plan of Gregory the Great, who, he said, had fixed the primacy of England to the person of Austin, and not to his see; that the two archbishops should therefore take place according to their seniority, or priority of consecration; and that the sees of Dorchester, Lincoln, Worcester, and Litchfield, had been, from the earliest times, subject to that of York. On the other hand, Lanfranc produced the bulls of Gregory, Honorius, Vitalian, and Sergius, granting or confirming the primacy of England to Austin and his successors in the see of Canterbury, which primacy, he said, appealing to the records of the English church, his see had enjoyed for the space of near four hundred years quite undisturbed. The pope heard both sides; but not caring to determine in favor of either, he left the final decision of the controversy to the English bishops, advising them to convene a council for that purpose, and promising to send a legate to preside at it in his name. A council was accordingly held the following year, at which assisted all the bishops as well as the abbots of the kingdom, and, by all, the primacy of England was adjudged to the see of Canterbury. Their sentence was confirmed by Hubert, subdeacon of the Roman church, sent from Rome to preside at that assembly, and afterwards by the pope himself. Thus was the primacy ascertained and confirmed for ever to the see of Canterbury.²

The pope charged Lanfranc, on his leaving Rome, with a letter for the king, wherein he commends him for his piety and zeal for religion, exhorts him to take all religious persons, as well as widows and orphans, into his protection; advises him frequently to consult Lanfranc, and acquiesce in his

¹ Lanfr. Opera, p. 304.

² Hist. Norm. Scrip. p. 1045.

¹ Eadmer. l. i. Alexand. ep. 49.

² Malmsb. de Gest. Reg. Angl. l. i. Concil. tom. ix. p. 1211.

The pope cites the king of Germany to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1073.] His death. His miracles. Some particular actions of his. Hildebrand chosen.

counsels; tells him that he has vested his beloved brother with the whole power of his see; and that his decisions ought, therefore, to be received in all cases the same as his own, were he present in person.¹

The following year the pope died, and by his death a quarrel was prevented between him and Henry, the young king of Germany, that, in all likelihood, would have been attended with fatal consequences. For the Saxons, revolting from that prince, justly provoked at the cruel treatment they met with from him and his ministers, sent ambassadors to complain thereof to the pope, and at the same time to inform his holiness that the king sold all the great benefices to the best bidder, and paid his troops with the money accruing from those sales. Hereupon the pope, at the instigation, as is commonly supposed, of Hildebrand, took a step which no pope had ever thought of taking before him. He summoned the king to appear in person at Rome, in order to give there an account of his conduct, and clear himself, at the tribunal of the apostolic see, from the charge brought against him. This summons was sent by the archbishops of Cologne and Bamberg, come to Rome to receive the money that was there due to the king.² Henry highly resented the indignity; but his resentment died with the pope, whose death happened soon after, on the 21st of April of the present year, 1073, after a pontificate of eleven years, six months, and twenty-one days. He is highly commended by all the monkish writers for his zeal in endeavoring to extirpate simony, for the indefatigable pains he took to restrain the incontinence of the clergy, and for the many privileges, immunities, and exemptions he granted to the monks and their monasteries. He is said to have wrought some

miracles in his life time, and many after his death. Leo Ostiensis assures us, that at Monte Cassino he delivered a demoniac, by commanding the devil to quit the body he possessed, and retire to the place where no bird flies, and no human voice ever was heard. The same writer adds, that at Aquino he cured a woman of her lameness by giving her the water to drink with which he had washed his hands after the celebration of mass.¹ However, neither of these miracles, nor the holy life he is said to have led from his tender years to the hour of his death, have procured him a place in the calendar, though, perhaps, as worthy of a place there as any to whom Rome has granted that honor. He died at Rome in the Lateran palace, and was buried in that basilic.

This pope was the first that granted the use of the mitre to abbots; and Egelsinus, abbot of the monastery of St. Austin of Canterbury, was the first upon whom that mark of distinction was conferred,² but it has, since Alexander's time, been bestowed upon many. The same honor Alexander bestowed upon Uratislaus, duke of Bohemia, who was the first layman, as Gregory VII. tells him in one of his letters, allowed to wear that respectable ensign of dignity.³ The first fruits were instituted by this pope, in imitation of the Mosaic law, enjoining them to the Jews. But the quantity not being settled by the law, the Rabbies determined that it should not be under the sixtieth, nor above the fortieth part; and it has, therefore, been fixed by the church to the fortieth. Of this pope we have forty-five letters, most of them relating to the subjects of which I have spoken in the history of his life.

GREGORY VII., THE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MICHAEL DUCAS, NICEPHORAS BOTONIATES, ALEXIUS COMNENUS, *Emperors of the East.*—HENRY IV., *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1073.] Alexander being dead, Hildebrand, who was then archdeacon of the Roman church, and held in the highest esteem by the clergy and people of Rome, appointed a three days' fast to be kept before they should proceed to the election of a new pope. But while they were performing the obsequies of Alexander in the Lateran church the day after his death, that is, on

the 22d of April of the present year, the people all at once cried out with one voice, "Hildebrand is pope, St. Peter has chosen him;" and seizing him, placed him by force upon the pontifical throne.⁴ Such is the account he himself gives of his election. But others say, that this tumult was raised by his friends at his instigation, and that neither the cardinals, nor the clergy, nor the

¹ Alex. ep. 10.

² Marian. Scot. ad ann. 1075. Abbas Ursperg. ad ann. 1073. Otto Frising. t. vi. c. 34.

³ Leo Ostiens. l. iii. c. 35.

⁴ Mabill. Præfat. part. l. secul. 6. Benedict. p. 17.

⁵ Greg. vii. ep. 38.

⁶ Idem, l. i. ep. 3.

Hildebrand's election approved by the king. Is consecrated under the name of Gregory. His birth, education, employments, &c. His character. His insolent behavior to Philip of France.

chief men among the people, had any share in his election. However that be, his election was confirmed the same day by the whole body of the clergy and people, and the decree confirming it was published in the church of St. Peter ad Vincula. The elect sent the very next day after his election to acquaint the king of Germany with it, and beg him not to confirm it, as he thought himself unequal to so great a charge, and had accepted it much against his will. He added, that though he had not been able to withstand the earnest desire, or rather violence, of the Roman people, he had not suffered himself to be consecrated without the approbation and consent of the king. Hereupon Henry immediately dispatched count Eberhard to Rome, with orders to inquire upon the spot whether the election of Hildebrand was canonical; and if it was not, to cause another to be chosen in his room. The count, gained, some say, by Hildebrand or his friends, wrote to the king in his favor, who thereupon sent Gregory, bishop of Vercelli to Rome, to confirm the election by his authority, and assist, in his name, at the consecration of the new pontiff. Thus was Hildebrand solemnly ordained, first presbyter, as he was only deacon, and then bishop, on the 29th of June, the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul. At his ordination he took the name of Gregory, to honor the memory of the anti-pope Gregory VI., for whom, as he had been instructed by him in his youth, he ever retained the greatest respect and affection.¹ It is to be observed that Gregory VII. was the last pope, the decree of whose election was transmitted to the emperor or the king before his consecration, or whose consecration was performed in the presence of the imperial envoys.²

Gregory was, according to the author of his life, by birth a Tuscan, born at Soana, in the diocese of Siena.³ But in the chronicle of Verdun he is said to have been the son of a Roman citizen, and a native of Rome. Authors are no less divided with respect to his family, than to the place of his birth, some making him the son of a carpenter, while others will have him to have been descended from an ancient and illustrious family. What we know for certain concerning him before his promotion is, that he was educated at Rome; that he there lived in great intimacy with the archpriest John, who purchased the pontificate of Benedict IX., and took the name of Gregory VI., that Gregory being deposed, and by the emperor carried prisoner into Germany, he attended him thither; that upon his death he embraced a monastic life in the monastery of Cluny, and there continued till Leo IX., raised from the bishopric of Toul to the

apostolic see, finding him well acquainted with the affairs of the Roman church, as he visited that monastery on his way to Italy, took him from thence with him to Rome. By that pope he was created subdeacon, and by Nicholas II. archdeacon of the Roman church, and was by them, as well as by Victor II., and his immediate predecessor Alexander II., employed with success in several legations. He was a man of most extraordinary parts, of an unbounded ambition, of a haughty and imperious temper, of resolution and courage incapable of yielding to the greatest difficulties, perfectly acquainted with the state of the western churches, as well as with the different interests of the Christian princes. His views were as boundless as his ambition. For not satisfied with rescuing the church from all subjection to princes, he undertook to subject all princes to the church, and the church to his see, thus engrossing all temporal as well as spiritual power to himself. This undertaking he steadily pursued during the whole time of his pontificate, and with amazing success, as we shall see in the sequel.

Gregory no sooner found himself in the quiet possession of the pontifical throne, than he began to execute the vast designs he had formed, and Philip I. then king of France, was the first against whom he exerted the power which he intended to usurp over all princes. For being informed soon after his promotion, that great disorders reigned uncontrolled in that kingdom, that the churches and monasteries were plundered with impunity, and that the king himself had his share in the plunder, he wrote a very sharp letter to that prince, reproaching him therewith, and threatening him with the censures of the church, if he did not speedily redress those abuses.¹ The king, upon the receipt of this letter, ordered Alberic, one of his chamberlains, then going to Rome, to assure his holiness, that he should thenceforth have no occasion to complain of his conduct; that he should prefer none but persons of merit to the vacant sees, nor suffer the lands of the church to be held or laid waste by the laity. As the people and clergy of Maçon had unanimously chosen Landri, archdeacon of Autun, for their bishop, and the king himself had approved of his election, but would not grant him the investiture without being paid for it, the pope sent with his letter to the king, which I have just mentioned, one to the archbishop of Lyons, another to the bishop of Chalons, ordering them to let the king know, that if he did not allow the archdeacon of Autun, who had been canonically elected, to take possession of that see without fee or reward, he would proceed against him according to the rigor of the canons, and that the king

¹ Acta Vatican. apud Baron. ² Pagi ad ann. 1073.
³ Paulus Bernriedensis in ejus Vit.

⁴ Greg. ep. l. i. ep. 35.

The pope holds a council at Rome. Decrees against simony and the marriage of the clergy. Excommunicates Robert Guiscard. Summons the bishop of Constance to Rome. He sends legates into Germany to hold a council there.

should either renounce simony, or his subjects, struck with a general anathema, should refuse to obey him, if they did not choose to renounce Christianity. In his letter to Humbert, archbishop of Lyons, he commanded him to ordain the elect without delay, in spite of any opposition he might meet with, either from him or even from the king.¹ But the archbishop, and the other bishops of France, not choosing to incur the displeasure of their sovereign, the archdeacon was obliged to undertake a journey to Rome; and he was there ordained by Gregory himself.

The following year the pope, determined to oblige the clergy to observe celibacy, which several of his predecessors had attempted without success, and utterly to extirpate simony, that is, the practice of purchasing bishoprics, and other benefices, a practice that prevailed chiefly in France and Germany, assembled, with that view, a council at Rome, the first week in lent, at which were present most of the Italian bishops, and some from Germany. In that assembly the following decrees were proposed by the pope, and agreed to at his request by the bishops who composed it. 1. That they who had obtained by simony any dignity, office, or degree in the church, should be excluded from the exercise of the office thus obtained. 2. That they, who had purchased churches with money, should quit them, and no man should thenceforth presume to sell or buy any ecclesiastical dignity whatever. 3. That the married clerks should not perform any clerical office. 4. That the people should not assist at mass celebrated by them, nor at any other sacred function. 5. That they who had wives, or, as they are styled in the decree, concubines, should put them away, and none should thenceforth be ordained, who did not promise to observe continence during his whole life.² These decrees, so far as they related to the celibacy of the clergy, were by them every where strenuously opposed. They did not even scruple to call the pope a heretic, as he taught a doctrine repugnant to that of our Savior, "All men cannot receive this saying; he that is able to receive it, let him receive it;" and likewise inconsistent with the doctrine of the apostle, allowing those, "who could not contain themselves, to marry; and declaring, that it is better to marry than to burn;" whereas the pope, said they, taught, that it was better to burn than to marry. They added, that they, like other men, were of flesh and blood, and consequently liable to the same infirmities, to the same temptations; that men debarred from pleasures that were lawful and allowed by the Gospel,

would be apt to indulge themselves in such as were forbidden and unlawful; and that, if the pope obstinately insisted on the execution of his decrees, they were determined to quit the priesthood rather than their wives; and his holiness might then see where he could get angels to govern the church, since he rejected the ministry of men.¹

In the same council the pope solemnly excommunicated Robert Guiscard, duke of Apulia and Calabria, who, after reducing all the places that in the time of the Lombards were subject to the city of Benevento, had laid siege to that city itself, though it belonged to the apostolic see. Robert, however, pursued the siege, and to be revenged upon Gregory for presuming to excommunicate him, invaded the march of Ancona, and made himself master of several cities there, while his brother Richard, prince of Capua, extending his conquests to the very gates of Naples, held that city closely besieged.²

Gregory, upon the breaking up of the council, wrote to all the bishops of France and Germany to acquaint them with the decrees they had issued against simoniacs and married clerks, and ordered them to exert all their power and authority in causing them to be strictly observed in all places under their jurisdiction. Some bishops complied so far with that injunction as to cause the decrees of the council to be published throughout their dioceses, and to exhort their clergy to conform to them. But such was the opposition they every where met with, that they did not think it advisable to exert their authority, or to use any kind of compulsion. Other bishops, such of them especially as were themselves married, instead of enforcing the observance of the papal decrees, declared them repugnant both to Scripture and reason. Among these was Otho, bishop of Constance, whom the pope summoned, on that account, to Rome, as an "encourager of fornication," while the bishop maintained that vice and all manner of uncleanness, abhorred by him, to be encouraged by the pope. At the same time that Gregory wrote to Otho, citing him to Rome to give there an account of his doctrine and conduct, he absolved the clergy and people of Constance, by a letter directed to them, from all obedience to their bishop, so long as he persisted in his disobedience to God and the apostolic see.³

The pope, sensible that the decrees of the Roman council against simony and the marriage of the clergy would meet with great opposition from the German bishops, as some of them were themselves married, and most of them had purchased their bishoprics

¹ Lambert. Schafn. in Chron. ad ann. 1074.

² Leo Ostiens. l. iii. c. 44.

³ Paul. Bernried. in VII. Greg. c. 36, 37.

¹ Greg. ep. l. i. ep. 36.

² Concil. tom. x. p. 315. Marian. Scot. ad ann. 1074.

The council to be held in Germany is opposed by the king and the bishops. The pope invites the German bishops to a council at Rome. Designs to lead an army against the infidels in the East.

of the emperor or his ministers, sent the bishops of Palestrina, Ostia, Coira, and Como, with the character of his legates, into Germany, to hold a council there, and persuade those bishops to confirm the decrees of the council of Rome. The legates were received by the king at Nuremberg, and treated with all the respect that was due to their character. As that prince was then engaged in a war with the rebellious Saxons, and therefore unwilling to quarrel with the pope, he promised to concur with his holiness in redressing the abuses he so justly complained of, and to dispose, for the future, of bishoprics, and all other preferments in the church, as his holiness should direct. But as to the assembling of a council in Germany, he told the legates, that he did not think it advisable to assemble one at that juncture; and besides, that the archbishop of Mentz, who had been appointed by the popes themselves vicar of the apostolic see, had alone a right to preside at all councils held in Germany, and therefore that he could not oblige his bishops to repair to a council at which any other presided. The legates pretended the power which the popes had granted to the archbishop of Mentz, to have ceased at the death of the popes, by whom it was granted. But the German bishops, declaring all to a man that they would appear at no council unless summoned to it by the archbishop of Mentz, nor receive any decrees of a council at which he had not presided as legate of the holy see, the legates from Rome laid aside all thoughts of getting the decrees of the Roman council confirmed in Germany. The four legates were ordered by the pope to depose in the council, which they were to hold, all bishops convicted of simony. Of this the German bishops were informed, and therefore, as most of them had purchased their preferments, they agreed to defeat, and defeated accordingly, the designs of the pope and his legates in the manner we have seen. Godfrey, archbishop of Milan, had purchased that dignity of the king, and, convicted thereof, had been excommunicated by the preceding pope, and all who communicated with him. He, nevertheless, held his see, was acknowledged by the bishops of Lombardy his suffragans, and being countenanced by the king, performed all the functions of his office as lawful bishop. Gregory excommunicated him anew, and charged his legates to prevail upon the king to break off all communion with him, since the sentence thundered out against him extended to all who communicated with him. But Henry, instead of complying with the desire of the pope, told the legates that he had confirmed the election of Godfrey as agreeable to the canons, and did not at all doubt but his holiness would approve of it when better

informed, and therefore hoped that till then he would not insist upon his renouncing the communion of a prelate to whom due obedience was paid by almost all the bishops under his extensive jurisdiction.¹

The pope was not at all satisfied with the behavior of the king; but dissembling for the present, he wrote a most obliging letter to him, to thank him for the kindness and respect with which he had received his legates. By the same letter he acquainted him with his design of assembling a very numerous council at Rome, the first week in lent of the ensuing year, 1075, begged he would oblige the German bishops to repair to it, especially the bishops of Constance, Strasburg, Spire, Augsburg, and Wirtzburg, all charged with simoniacal practices. As for the affair of the archbishop of Milan, he told the king that he would order his cause to be examined anew, and would readily correct what should be found amiss in the judgment that had been given against him. He closed his letter with exhorting the king to concur with him in reforming the abuses that prevailed in the church, and were countenanced even by some whose business it was to extirpate them, especially the two reigning evils, simony and the incontinence of the clergy. This letter is dated the 7th of December, 1074.²

As Michael Ducas, emperor of the East, had written to Gregory, congratulating him upon his promotion, the pope was thereby encouraged to attempt a reconciliation between the two churches; and with that view he sent Dominic, patriarch of Grado, as his legate to Constantinople. And that is all we know of that legation. But from a letter of the pope to the emperor, it appears that he had formed a design of going, in person, into the East, at the head of an army, to relieve the Christians, most miserably oppressed by the Saracens, who had over-run all Asia, and threatened Constantinople itself. For in that letter he tells the emperor, that the Christians in the East, groaning under the insufferable yoke of the infidels, had applied to him for relief, lest the Christian religion should be totally extirpated in those unhappy countries; that deeply affected with their complaints, and the miseries they endured, he had endeavored to stir up all well-disposed Christians to relieve them, and even to lay down their own lives in defence of their brethren and the law of Jesus Christ; that the Italians, and Ultramontanes had hearkened to his exhortations, and that fifty thousand of them and upwards were preparing for this expedition, determined, if they could have him for their leader, to march, sword in hand, against the enemies of God, to the very sepulchre of our Lord. He added that the

¹ Greg. ep. 11, 12, 15.

² Idem, l. ii. ep. 30.

The pope's haughty behavior to Philip of France. Second council of Rome.

church of Constantinople divided from the Roman on the subject of the Holy Ghost, desired to be reunited with the apostolic see, and that almost all the Armenians gone astray from the catholic faith, as well as the Orientals, waited for the decision of St. Peter to settle their different opinions; circumstances, he said, that greatly encouraged him to execute the project he had formed; but, nevertheless, he would not proceed in it without his approbation, as he could not promise himself the wished-for success without his assistance.¹ Gregory wrote at the same time two other letters upon the same subject, the one addressed to all who were willing to defend the Christian faith, the other to all the faithful of St. Peter, especially the Ultramontanes: and in both he exhorts, in the name of St. Peter, such as preferred the relief of their oppressed brethren to their own ease, to concur with him in rescuing them from the tyranny of those who oppressed them. The execution of this design Gregory had greatly at heart, as appears from his letters; but Henry, being prevented, by the dangerous war he had then on his hands with the Saxons, from lending him any assistance, he thought it advisable to lay it aside. However, we shall see in the sequel, this destructive project prosecuted with great ardor by his successors, under the name of "the Crusade, or the Holy War."

As the same disorders which the pope had complained of in the letter he wrote soon after his promotion, to Philip, king of France, continued to reign in that kingdom, and the king had, besides, extorted large sums this year from some Italian merchants carrying their wares to a fair in his dominions, Gregory took from thence occasion to renew his complaints, as well as his threats, in a letter to the three archbishops, Manasses of Reims, Richard of Sens, Richard of Bourges, and to the rest of the French bishops. In that letter, dated the 20th of September, of the present year, he begins with lamenting the deplorable condition which that once so glorious and so flourishing a kingdom is in his days reduced to, the crimes, that were formerly punished there with the utmost severity, namely, perjuries, sacrileges, incests, rapines, murders, &c., being now connived at. And no wonder, says he: your king, more worthy of the name of tyrant than that of king, not daring to punish in others the crimes that he himself is guilty of, and encourages by his example. The pope here paints the king as the most wicked of men, as one who spent his whole life in the most infamous debaucheries, treating him with no more respect than he would have done the meanest of his subjects. He then exhorts the bishops to oppose his wicked measures, to represent

to him, with all the liberty that becomes men in their station, the enormity of his crimes; and if he remains hardened in his wickedness, forgetful of his own glory and the welfare of his people, to assure him that he shall not long escape the censures of the apostolic see. In the mean time he advises the bishops to separate themselves from his communion, to interdict the whole kingdom, and if he does not thereupon amend, to let the whole world know that he is determined to deliver the kingdom of France from the oppression it groans under, that is, to deprive him of his kingdom. The pope tells the bishops in the close of his letter, that if they betray any weakness on so important an occasion, he will suspend them, as the accomplices of the king in all his crimes, from every function of their office.¹ The pope wrote another letter, in the same style, dated the 13th of November, to William, count of Poitiers, exhorting him to join the bishops, and jointly with them press the king to restore to the Italian merchants the money which he had so unjustly extorted from them, to forsake the vicious habits of his youth, and reform his manners, else he would cut him off from the communion of the church, would pronounce the same sentence against all who should acknowledge or obey him as a king, and would place it upon the altar of St. Peter, that it might there be confirmed every day.² He repeated the same menaces in a letter to Manasses of Reims, dated the 8th of December of the same year.³ The Gallican bishops paid, it seems, as little regard to the menaces as to the exhortations of the pope; for it does not appear that the king corrected any of the abuses that Gregory complained of, or that he was excommunicated either by him or by them.

The pope had appointed, as has been said, a council to meet at Rome the first week in Lent, 1075; and it met accordingly on the 24th of February, consisted of fifty bishops, of a great number of abbots, presbyters and deacons; and by them were excommunicated five of the king's ministers for simony, that is, for receiving money of those who had been preferred to vacant bishoprics. Gregory well knew that they acted therein by the direction of the king, but flattered himself that the sentence pronounced against them would deter him from such practices. At the same time Liemar, archbishop of Bremen, Garnerius, bishop of Strasburg, Henry of Spire, Herman of Bamberg, William of Pavia, Cunibert of Turin, were suspended from the functions of their office, being charged with purchasing their dignities, and Dennis of Placentia, more guilty than the rest, was deposed, without hopes of being ever restored. Of these bishops some owned the sentence to be just, and

¹ Greg. I. ii. ep. 31.

² Greg. I. ii. ep. 5.

³ Ibid. ep. 28.

⁴ Ibid. ep. 32.

Decree against the marriage of the clergy confirmed by the council of Rome. Decree against investitures.

were absolved by the pope, while others, determined to keep what they had purchased, paid no kind of regard to the judgment given against them at Rome.¹

By the same council the decree against the marriage, or as they called it, the concubinage of the clergy, was confirmed, and ecclesiastics of all ranks were ordered, on pain of excommunication, to quit their wives, or renounce the ministry; the laity were forbidden to assist at any function whatever, performed by such of them as did not immediately obey that decree, and all bishops were strictly enjoined to see it, in spite of all opposition, punctually complied with in their respective dioceses. Pursuant to this order Sigefred, archbishop of Mentz, having assembled his clergy in council, acquainted them with the decree commanding them to quit their wives, or renounce their office, and at the same time let them know that, the order of his holiness being peremptory, he would spare none, who within the space of six months did not dismiss their wives, and promise to observe celibacy so long as they lived. But all who were present rising up at these words, expressed such indignation and rage against the archbishop, that, apprehending his life to be in no small danger, he thought it advisable to withdraw from the assembly, declaring that he would never again concern himself about the execution of a decree that was so universally and so strongly opposed, but would leave the pope to execute it himself, when and how he should think proper.² The decree met everywhere else with the like opposition; and at Cambay they who opposed it, carried their resentment to such a height against the party that declared for it, as to burn one alive for diverting the people from assisting at the functions performed by such of the clergy as continued to live with their wives.³

By this council was issued the famous decree, taking the nominations and investiture of bishops out of the hands of princes. Most of the western princes, if not all, claimed at this time the right of nominating all the bishops in their respective dominions, and of confirming and investing those in their bishoprics, whom the people and the clergy had elected, when their princes had left them at liberty, as they frequently did, to elect whom they pleased. This right they had enjoyed undisputed time out of mind, probably ever since the establishing of their different kingdoms upon the decay of the Roman empire, and their conversion to Christianity. Hence we find Gregory the Great, in the many letters which he wrote to the Christian kings of France in the latter

end of the sixth century, frequently complaining of those princes for bestowing bishoprics upon persons that were not equal to so great a charge, and entreating them to choose men that were. But he no where objects to their right of nomination. And truly it was but reasonable, that so great a trust should be placed in such persons only as were acceptable to the princes under whom they were to live, that is, in such as the princes themselves had elected, or whose election, when made with their permission by others, they had approved and confirmed. At this time, and for some ages before, they expressed their approbation by putting the elect in possession of the temporalities of his see, which was done by their delivering to him a pastoral staff, or a crosier, and a ring. And this was the ceremony known by the name of investiture; and the elect was not ordained till it was performed. As the corrupt practice of exacting money for the investiture, nay, and disposing of bishoprics and other ecclesiastical preferments to the best bidder, had begun to prevail among princes, Gregory, under color of redressing those abuses, but in truth to make the clergy independent upon the princes, and dependent upon himself, as Mezeray has very justly observed,¹ got the bishops of the council to pass the following decree: "If any one shall henceforth accept of a bishopric or abbey from a layman, let him not be looked upon as a bishop or abbot, nor any respect be paid to him as such. We moreover exclude him from the grace of St. Peter, and forbid him to enter the church, till he has resigned the dignity that he has got by ambition, and by disobedience, which is idolatry. And this decree extends to inferior dignities. In like manner, if any emperor, duke, marquis, count, or any other secular person whatever, shall take upon him to give the investiture of a bishopric, or of any other ecclesiastical dignity, he shall be liable to the same sentence."² This decree was a declaration of war against all Christian princes: for Gregory could not suppose that they would tamely part with a right, which they looked upon as one of the most valuable jewels of their crown, and no pope had ever yet disputed. But he thought it a point well worth contending for, well worth all the confusion civil wars, rebellions, bloodshed; that such a decree might occasion, since he would, by carrying it into execution, engross to himself the disposal of the whole wealth of the church, and thus make the clergy everywhere independent of their princes, and dependent upon him alone, as he alone could reward and prefer them. It would have been commendable in the pope and the other prelates of the church to prevent, so far as in them lay, the vice of

¹ Greg. I. ii. ep. 32.

² Lamb. Schafn. ad ann. 1075. et Marian. Scot. ad eun. ann.

³ Greg. I. iv. ep. 20.

¹ Mezeray ad ann. 1095.

² Hugo Flaviniac. in Chron. Vir dun. ad ann. 1074.

Gregory acquaints the king with the decree against investitures. The king's letter in answer to the pope's. Conspiracy against the pope.

simony, that is, the sale of bishoprics, abbey, and other church preferments, but too common at this time. But with what justice could he, or they, deprive all the princes of a right which they enjoyed by immemorial prescription, for the ill use some of them made of it? The setting of ecclesiastical benefices to sale was by all deemed simony. But many were of opinion, that when princes invested ecclesiastics in their benefices, that is, when they put them in possession of their temporalities, they might, without simony, exact a moderate share of those temporalities for the service of the state. But Gregory, not satisfied with condemning that opinion, declared it simony, heresy, and idolatry (and he might with as much reason have declared it murder, incest, or adultery,) in a prince, or any layman, to give, and in an ecclesiastic to receive investiture at his hands, whether any thing was exacted on that occasion or not. And thus was an usage which the most holy bishops, abbots, and all the other dignitaries of the church, had hitherto looked upon as quite innocent, and had, for several ages universally submitted to, without the least scruple, made by this pope a most enormous crime. The popes themselves were not, for many ages, consecrated till the decree of their election was signed by the emperor, which was a ceremony of the same nature with that of investing. And was Gregory himself, were so many of his predecessors who complied with that ceremony, all simoniacs, heretics, idolaters? It was ordained by the first council of Orange in 441, that, if any one should found and endow a church, he should have a right to nominate a clerk to officiate in it, which was putting him in possession of the revenues annexed to his office;¹ and by two of the laws of Justinian, all founders of churches and their heirs are allowed the same privilege.² If this was no simony, and Gregory himself would have hardly said that it was, it could be no simony in a prince, nor in any other layman, to nominate a proper person to the bishopric which he or his predecessors had founded, and put him in possession of the revenues with which they had endowed his see. In the sequel we shall see the popes, when they had once wrested investitures out of the hands of princes, exacting larger sums from those upon whom the smallest benefices were conferred, than ever had been done by princes; insomuch that their friends and advocates could no otherwise excuse their extortions from simony, but by maintaining what was simony in others, was no simony in the pope.

Gregory took care to acquaint the king with this decree, reproaching him at the

same time in the letter, which he wrote to him on that occasion, with still keeping and employing the ministers, whom he had excommunicated; with suffering the bishops, whom he had deposed, to continue in their sees; with neglecting to publish in his dominions the decrees of the former council of Rome against simony and the incontinence of the clergy; and, lastly, with protecting Godfrey, the usurper of the see of Milan, and communicating with the Lombard bishops his adherents, though cut off by the apostolic see from the communion of the church. In the close of his letter he forbids the king thenceforth to meddle at all with ecclesiastical preferments, to grant investitures, or dispose of vacant churches, upon any pretence whatsoever, and threatens him with excommunication if he does not comply with the decree banishing such unlawful practices from the church.¹

Henry highly resented the insolent behavior of the pope; but unwilling to quarrel with him, as he was still engaged in war with the Saxons, and then upon the point of marching against them, he dissembled his resentment, and taking no notice of the decree with respect to lay investitures, told him that he would thenceforth conform to the canons in the disposal of bishoprics and other ecclesiastical preferments; that he would cause the decrees against simony and the incontinence of the clergy to be published throughout his dominions, and punctually complied with, and that upon his return from Saxony he would send a solemn embassy to Rome to settle the points in dispute between his holiness and him to their mutual satisfaction.²

In the mean time a conspiracy was formed at Rome against the pope, and the person employed to put it in execution was Cincius, or Quintius, as others call him, the prefect, or the son of the prefect of the city; and the pope very narrowly escaped with his life. For while he was performing at Christmas the service of the night in the church of St. Mary the Greater according to custom, attended by a small number of clerks, a troop of armed men rushing unexpectedly in, with Cincius at their head, fell upon the pope, beat him most unmercifully, gave him a dangerous wound in the forehead, and dragging him by the hair out of the church, carried him to the house of Cincius, with a design, as was supposed, to convey him out of Rome. But the magistrates being immediately informed of what had happened, guards were placed by their order at the gates, trumpets were sounded in the different quarters of the city to alarm the people, who thereupon crowding from all parts to the capitol, flew from thence to the house of

¹ Concil. Araus. i. c. 9.

² Novel. 123. c. 18. & 57. c. 2.

¹ Arnulph. l. iv. c. 6.

² Paulus Bernierd. in Vit. Greg. c. 6.

The king pays no regard to the decree against investitures. The pope sends legates into Germany. He is deposed in the council of Worms.

Cincius, and surrounding it on all sides, threatened to put him and all who were in it to the sword, if he did not forthwith set the pope at liberty. Cincius, intimidated at the menaces of the enraged multitude, threw himself at the pope's feet, and upon his forgiving him, which he did very readily, only enjoining him, by way of penance, to visit the holy places at Jerusalem, he granted him his liberty. The people received him with loud shouts of joy, and at his request attended him back, covered with blood as he was, to the church from whence he was taken, to end the service he had begun the night before. In the mean time Cincius and his accomplices made their escape. But the people plundered his house, and laid it level with the ground; and he was himself condemned to a perpetual banishment.¹ Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, is supposed to have been the chief author of this attempt, flattering himself that, if Gregory could be removed out of the way, the king, whose favorite he was, would raise him to the pontifical chair in his room.

The king had hitherto carefully avoided coming to an open rupture with the pope, lest he should raise new disturbances in Germany before the Saxons were reduced. But having this year gained a complete victory over those rebels, he resolved to put a stop to the papal encroachments upon the undoubted rights of his crown. He accordingly named several bishops to the vacant sees, granted them the investiture, as he had done before, without the least regard to the decree of the late council, nay, and driving some from the sees to which they had been preferred by the pope, unknown to him, appointed others of his own nomination in their room. Gregory, no less provoked at the conduct of the king than the king was at his, wrote a long letter to him, complaining of his disobedience to the decrees of the holy see; of his disposing of bishoprics to persons utterly unknown to him; of his want of respect for the see, and the successor of the prince of the apostles. He exhorts him to correct the errors which he has been led into by wicked counsellors, to dismiss them, such of them at least as had been justly cut off from the communion of the church; to employ in their room men of piety, and to follow their advice and directions. He tells the king in the close of his letter, that laymen must not presume to dispose of ecclesiastical preferments, all lay investitures being forbidden by a decree of the late council of Rome, which, he said, all princes must receive and comply with.² The direction of this letter was, "Gregory bishop, servant of the servants of God, to king Henry, health and apostolic benediction, if he obeys the apostolic see, as becomes a Christian king."

As the king, determined to assert the indisputable rights of his crown, paid no kind of regard to the exhortations or letters of the pope, Gregory, not satisfied with writing to him, sent legates this year into Germany to summon him, in his name, to appear in person at Rome on the Monday of the second week in Lent, in order to give there an account of his conduct, and clear himself of the crimes laid to his charge. The legates added, in delivering this message, that they were ordered by his holiness to let him know, that if he did not obey the summons, and appear on the day appointed, he would on that very day be cut off with an anathema from the body of the holy apostolic church. The king, provoked beyond measure at such an extraordinary summons, and no less at the haughty behavior of the legates, drove them with ignominy from his presence, and in order to render the sentence of excommunication, with which he was threatened by the pope, ineffectual, resolved to get him deposed in a council before he pronounced it. With that view he wrote a circulatory letter to all the bishops and abbots of his dominions, to complain of the unworthy treatment he had met with from Hildebrand, and desired them to meet at Worms on Septuagesima Sunday, in order to concert jointly with him the most proper means of delivering the church from the tyranny of a man, who, in defiance of the canons, exercised a power over them that none of his predecessors ever had claimed; nay, and but too plainly showed, by his whole conduct, that he aimed at nothing less than to subject both the church and the state to his lawless and arbitrary will. The king added, that the welfare of both, and their safety as well as his own, depended upon the resolution they should take when assembled in council.¹ Theodoric, bishop of Verdun, and Engelbert, lately nominated by the king to the archbishopric of Treves, wrote likewise circulatory letters to all the bishops and princes of Germany, fraught with bitter invectives against Gregory, as one who stuck at nothing to gratify his boundless ambition.

The bishops and abbots met, in compliance with the king's invitation, at the place and time appointed, and cardinal Hugh, surnamed "the White," whom the pope had deposed for his irregular conduct but a few days before, arriving very seasonably for the king's design at that juncture, was invited by him to assist at the council. The cardinal brought with him an account or history of the pope's life, from his tender years to the time of his promotion to the pontifical dignity; and scarce is there a crime, which in that piece he is not said to have committed, either before or after his election. He was even charged with magic, and with invoking

¹ Pautus Bernried. ubi sup.

² Greg. l. iiii. ep. 10.

¹ Lambert Schafn. ad ann. 1076.

The bishops of Lombardy confirm the sentence of the council of Worms. The king and council write to the pope. Their letters delivered to him. The king excommunicated and deposed in a council at Rome.

the devil. This piece was read in the council, and likewise letters, which the cardinal produced, as written by the cardinals, the senate and the people of Rome, complaining to the king of the pope, and demanding his deposition. But the zeal which the people all showed for his safety on occasion of the attempt of Cincius, incline me to believe those letters to have been forged. Be that as it will, the council declared, that "Hildebrand, who styled himself Gregory VII., was no pope; that he had not, nor had ever had, the power of loosening and binding." This sentence was readily signed by all the bishops but Adelbert of Wirtzburg, and Heriman of Metz, thinking that no bishop, much less the Roman pontiff, should be condemned without being heard, or without proper accusers and competent witnesses. But William, bishop of Utrecht, having satisfied them that they must sign the condemnation of Gregory or renounce their allegiance to the king, they acquiesced, and signed it with the rest.¹

The sentence of the council of Worms was, by the king's order, immediately communicated to the bishops of Lombardy, and of the march of Ancona, who thereupon assembling at Pavia, not only confirmed it, but swore upon the Gospel that they would no longer acknowledge Gregory for Pope. The bishops met at Worms wrote a letter to the pope, before they parted, to acquaint him with the judgment they had given against him, as well as the motives that had induced them to give it, and order him to quit the see, which he had usurped in defiance of the received laws of the church, and resign a dignity to which he had no kind of right. The king wrote at the same time two letters, much to the same purpose, the one to Gregory himself, the other to the clergy and people of Rome. In his letter to the pope he reproached him with pride, ambition, simony, perjury, usurpation, and all the other crimes that were laid to his charge in the council, and commanded him to descend from the throne, to which he had raised himself by the most unlawful and wicked means. In his letter to the clergy and people of Rome he dwelt chiefly upon the haughty and imperious behavior of Gregory, upon his treating not only his fellow bishops, but the greatest princes of the earth as his slaves or vassals, and requiring them to pay a blind obedience to his command, as if all power, temporal as well as spiritual, were lodged in or derived from him. He therefore exhorted them to join him in delivering the church from the slavery which it was threatened with, and they could not avoid, if Hildebrand was suffered any longer to enjoy and exercise his usurped power.²

With these letters, and that from the bishops of the council of Worms, Roland, clerk of the church of Parma, was dispatched to Rome, but ordered to wait there till the opening of the council, which the pope had appointed to meet the first week in Lent, and then to deliver them in the presence of all the bishops who composed it. In compliance with that order, Roland, arriving at Rome some days before the assembling of the council, continued there, without discovering even to any of the king's friends what business he was charged with, or by whom he was sent. But no sooner did the bishops meet, than entering the council, he delivered the letters into the pope's own hand, adding aloud, so as to be heard by the whole assembly, "the king my master, and with him all the Ultramontane and Italian bishops, command you instantly to quit the see of St. Peter, which you have usurped, and the government of the Roman church." Then turning to the Roman clergy, "you are summoned," said he, "to appear before the king on Whitsunday next, to receive a pope and a father from his hand, since this is not a pope but a ravenous wolf." At these words John, bishop of Porto, starting up, cried out aloud, "Seize him;" while the other bishops, more zealous than he, encouraged the prefect, who was present with a band of the Roman militia, to dispatch him; which they would have done, had not the pope interposed while they were rushing upon him with their drawn swords.¹ Gregory was so far master of himself as to receive that message without betraying the least concern or resentment. He only declared, addressing himself to the assembly, that nothing should ever deter him from correcting the scandalous abuses that prevailed in the church, by whomsoever patronized, and that he was ready even to suffer martyrdom, and shed the last drop of his blood in so good a cause. The bishops, applauding his firmness and constancy, assured him, all to a man, that they would stand by him, not only at the expense of their dignities, but, if necessary, of their lives.²

The next day the pope caused the king's letter, and that of the assembly of Worms, to be read in full council, and having, after an inflaming speech against the king and the bishops of that assembly, desired all who were present, and had the honor of the apostolic see at heart, to assist him with their advice at so critical a juncture, they all cried out with one voice, "you have been chosen, most holy father, by us and by heaven to govern the church in these perilous times; exert therefore the power that heaven has put into your hands for her de-

¹ Lambert. Schafn. ubi supra.

² Idem ibid. Paul Bernried. in Vit. Greg. c. 67.

¹ Paul Bernried. in Vit. Greg. c. 67

² Paul Bernried. ibid.

The sentence pronounced by the pope. Several bishops excommunicated with the king. Some adhere to the pope and some to the king. Gregory claims the power of deposing princes.

fence; suffer not the blasphemers, the usurper, the tyrant, the apostate (meaning the king) to insult her with impunity; let the sentence you pronounce against him be such as may for ever deter others from treading in his footsteps." Gregory, thus encouraged by the bishops of his party, rose up, and having commanded silence, thundered out, with great solemnity, the sentence of excommunication against the king in the following words addressed to St. Peter: "Blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, hear me your servant, whom you have nourished from his infancy, and have delivered this day from the hands of the wicked, who hate me because I am faithful to you. You are my witness, you and our Lady the mother of God, and your brother St. Paul, that your holy Roman church placed me against my will in your see, and that I had rather died an exile than raised myself to it by unlawful means, or the favor of men. But being by your grace placed in it, I persuade myself that it pleases you that I should rule the Christian people committed to your care, and exert the power that God has given to me, as holding your place, the power of binding and loosening in heaven and on earth. In this persuasion it is, that for the honor and defence of your church, on the part of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and by your power and authority, I forbid king Henry, the son of the emperor Henry, who with an unheard of pride has insulted your church, to meddle henceforth with the government of the Teutonic kingdom, or of Italy. I absolve all Christians from the oath of allegiance, which they have taken, or shall take to him, and forbid any one to serve him as a king. For he, who attempts to lessen the honor of your church, deserves to forfeit his own. And because he has refused to obey, as becomes a Christian, and has not returned to the Lord, whom he has forsaken, by communicating with excommunicated persons, but despised the counsels which I gave him for his welfare, and endeavored to raise divisions in your church, I now anathematize him in your name, that all nations may know, that thou art Peter, that upon this rock the Son of the living God has built his church, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Here Gregory forbids in the name of St. Peter, what that apostle had expressly commanded, namely, obedience to princes, and even to tyrants and persecutors of the Christian name. For Nero, that monster of wickedness, and bloody persecutor, was king or emperor, when he commanded the faithful to "submit themselves to every ordinance of man, whether it be to the king," &c. At the same time the following bishops were excommunicated by name, namely, Sigefrid

archbishop of Mentz, William bishop of Utrecht, and Rubert bishop of Bamberg, who had distinguished themselves above the rest in the council of Worms. The other bishops, who had assisted at that assembly, and wickedly conspired against the apostolic see, were all summoned to Rome to plead their cause there, on pain of having the same sentence pronounced against them, if they did not personally appear at the appointed time, that is, at the festival of St. Peter.¹ With the German bishops those of Lombardy, who had confirmed the sentence, were all cut off from the communion of the church, and threatened with an anathema, if they did not, within a limited time, repent of their wickedness, and return to their duty.

When the council broke up, Gregory took care to acquaint the whole world with the decree, excommunicating and deposing the king, by a letter addressed to all the faithful, to which that decree was annexed. Upon its being published in Germany, several princes, whom the king had disoblged, begun to cabal and form parties against him, not doubting but they should be supported, let them attempt what they would, by the pope. Several bishops, even some who had assisted at the council of Worms, withdrew from his communion as soon as they heard that he was excommunicated by the pope in a council, and that they themselves would incur the same sentence if they communicated with him. However, the bishops of Lombardy, and with them Guibert archbishop of Ravenna, declared openly for the king, nay, and assembling at Pavia, confirmed the judgment given at Worms. Thus was all Germany, and great part of Italy, divided into two opposite parties, some zealously espousing the cause of the pope, and others maintaining no less zealously the cause of the king.

As the bishops who adhered to the king maintained that the power of excommunicating, vested in the pope, did not extend over sovereign princes, Herman, bishop of Metz proposed that question in a letter to Gregory, who immediately answered it, claiming in his letter the power of deposing as well as excommunicating princes. "As our Savior," says he, "did not except kings when he granted to St. Peter, and in him to his successors, the power of binding and loosening, why may not kings be bound and loosened, be excommunicated and absolved by him and his successors, as well as the meanest of their subjects?" The words of our Savior have been understood by the popes as spoken only to St. Peter, and in him only to them. But the fathers understand them, as I have frequently shown, as addressed to all the apostles, and in them to all bishops: and from thence it evidently fol-

¹ Paul. Bernried. in Vit. Greg. c. 70.

¹ Lambert. ad ann. 1076.

Gregory's letter to the Germans. A powerful league formed in Germany against the king. The German lords assemble at Tribur.

low, that, by virtue of the words of our Saviour, the pope has no other power over princes than what is common with him to all other bishops. As for the power he claims of deposing princes, and divesting them of their dominions, he alleges the example of pope Zachary, who, he says, deposed king Childeric, and a bull of pope Gregory the Great, granting certain privileges to a hospital at Autun, with this clause, "If any king, priest, judge, or any secular person whatsoever, shall transgress this our constitution, let him be deprived of his power, honor, and dignity." But that pope Zachary did not depose Childeric, I have shown in the life of that pope; and as to the clause "on pain of forfeiting their dignity," it is now generally supposed to have been added after that pope's time. It is certain, at least, that by no pope were princes more respected than by Gregory the Great, nor more readily obeyed as his lords and masters; for thus he frequently styled them. In the same letter the pope tells Herman, that he has empowered some bishops to absolve such lords or bishops as shall separate themselves from the communion of the king, but that he has reserved the absolution of the king himself to the apostolic see. This letter is dated the 25th of August of the present year 1076, and was written at Tivoli.¹

Gregory wrote a few days after, a long letter to all the bishops, lords, and faithful of the Teutonic kingdom, to justify his conduct with respect to the king, which had given offence, even to his friends. In that letter he enumerates the many disorders that reigned in the church, and were countenanced by the king; complains of his selling bishoprics and abbeys to persons, who had nothing else to recommend them but their money; insomuch as there was scarcely a bishop in all his dominions who had not been simoniacally preferred to that dignity; charges him with having led, from his youth, a life unbecoming a prince, and even a Christian; enlarges on the great pains he has taken to reclaim him from his wicked ways, on the ungrateful return he had made for the kindness he had shown him, on his obliging almost all the bishops of Italy, and most of the bishops of Germany, to rebel against the apostolic see, and thus raising, as far as in him lies, a dangerous schism in the church. For all these crimes he has cut him off, he says, as a rotten member, from the body of the faithful, and deprived him of the power which he had so much abused. He closed his letter with exhorting those, to whom it was addressed, to join him against the enemies of St. Peter and his church, and declaring all excommunicated who, siding with the king, countenanced him in his wickedness.²

This letter, and another the pope wrote soon after, encouraging the faithful of St. Peter to join against the avowed enemy of that apostle and his church, had the wished-for effect; and a very powerful league was formed in Germany in favor of Gregory. The leading men in that league were Rudolph duke of Suabia, Guelf duke of Bavaria, Berthold duke of Carinthia, Adelberton bishop of Wirtzburg, and Adelbert bishop of Worms. The pope, encouraged by so powerful a confederacy, began to think of causing another to be raised to the throne in the room of Henry; and he wrote accordingly a third letter to the princes, bishops, and people of Germany, empowering them to choose another king, if Henry did not repent of his wickedness, and render himself, by a sincere repentance, worthy of being replaced on the throne, which he had deservedly forfeited by his disobedience to and contempt of the apostolic see.¹ Upon the receipt of that letter, the princes of the empire who sided with the pope, and some bishops, had a conference at Ulm; and it was there resolved, that a general diet should be convened at Tribur, near Mentz, on the twenty-sixth of the ensuing October, in order to deliberate about the most proper means of preventing the evils, which the disagreement between the pope and the king might produce, and maintaining the peace of the empire. This resolution they notified to the pope, and to all the German lords, who thereupon met in great numbers at the place and time appointed. The pope, highly approving the resolution they had taken, sent two bishops, namely, Sigehard, patriarch of Aquileia, and Altman, bishop of Padua, to assist at the diet in his name, with a strict charge to acquaint him with every thing that passed in it, and suffer no one to be chosen in the room of the deposed king without the knowledge and consent of the apostolic see. Most of the German lords had, it seems, been ill used by the king, and by them he was painted in the diet as a monster of wickedness, as one who paid no kind of regard to the laws, human or divine; they charged him, in particular, with having banished from his court all persons of birth and probity, and raised to the first dignities men of the meanest extraction, and even plotted with them to extirpate the nobility; with employing his arms against his own subjects, while the barbarians enjoyed a profound peace; and made, unmolested, daily incursions into the empire; with applying the revenues of churches and monasteries to profane uses, maintaining therewith numerous armies and building strongholds, not to awe the enemies of the empire, but to enslave a free people; with oppressing the poor, the widows, and orphans, and treating his subjects in general more like a

¹ Greg. l. iv. ep. 2. ² Paul. Bern. in Vit. Greg. c. 80.

¹ Paul. Bern. in Vit. Greg. c. 82.

Hard conditions which the king is forced to submit to. He goes to Italy.

tyrant than the father of his people. They concluded that the only remedy against so many evils was to choose another king, one capable of restoring good order, and saving the state, by that means, from imminent ruin.

In the mean time the king, advancing with the few friends who still stood by him, to Oppenheim, a little above Tribur, on the opposite side of the Rhine, sent frequent messages from thence to the diet, promising to redress the evils they complained of, to satisfy those whom he had any ways injured, and thenceforth to employ the power that God had put into his hands, in procuring the happiness of his subjects and the welfare of the state. He added that, if they questioned his sincerity, he was ready to confirm his promise upon oath, and even to give hostages for the performance. The lords of the diet answered, that they had been too often deceived by him to trust to his oaths or promises; that, as he was excommunicated, they could not correspond with him, and that being by the pope absolved from their oaths of allegiance, and even forbidden, on pain of excommunication, to acknowledge him for king, they were determined to choose another in his room. As the German lords had brought along with them, for their own defence, many of their vassals, well armed, some of them were for crossing the Rhine, and falling upon the king, who was only attended by his guards and a small number of friends. But the lords of Suabia and Saxony thought it more advisable to refer the decision of the dispute between them and the king to a general diet of the whole empire, at which the pope should be present in person, and, in the meantime, oblige the king to resign all power and authority. This expedient was approved and readily agreed to by the rest of the lords of the diet; and deputies were immediately sent to let the king know that, notwithstanding the ill treatment they had met with from him, they would not take upon them to judge or condemn him, but would leave him to be judged, to be condemned or acquitted by the pope, in a general assembly of all the princes of the empire; that they had agreed the assembly should be convened in the city of Augsburg, at the Purification of the blessed Virgin, that is, on the 2d of February; that the pope should be invited to it, and that his holiness, after hearing both sides, should pronounce the definitive sentence for or against him. They added, that if he did not obtain absolution before the anniversary of his excommunication, that is, before the day on which he was excommunicated, he should be forever excluded from the throne. The deputies were ordered to insist upon his declaring whether he agreed to these terms, and if he agreed to them, to require him, in their name, to satisfy them of his sincerity, by forthwith dismissing all

the excommunicated persons about him, by withdrawing his garrison from Worms, and restoring the bishop of that city to his see. To these terms they added others still harder; namely, that he should disband his army, and retire to Spire with the bishop of Verdun, and such other bishops or ministers as had not been excommunicated by the pope; that he should lead there a private life, divesting himself of all the ensigns of royalty; that he should not at all meddle with public affairs, nor enter the church. To these terms, shameful and hard as they were, the king was obliged to submit; and he accordingly dismissed, without delay, the archbishop of Cologne, and with him the bishops of Bamberg, Strasburg, Bale, Spire, Lausanne, Ceitz, Osnaburg, and all who, by adhering to him, had, on that account, been excommunicated by the pope. He complied with the other terms, in like manner, and quitting the marks of his dignity, left the administration of public affairs to the lords of the empire.

As the king had nothing so much at heart as to be absolved from the excommunication, his friends being afraid to lend him any assistance so long as he continued under that sentence, and his enemies availing themselves of it to stir up the people against him, he resolved to procure his absolution, at any rate, before the meeting of the assembly at Augsburg. Being therefore informed that the pope had left Rome, and was coming into Germany, in order to assist at that assembly, he set out in great haste from Spire, with his wife and his son, yet an infant, to meet him and obtain absolution, if by any means he could, before he entered Germany, where he apprehended his enemies would leave nothing unattempted to divert him from granting it. As he undertook that journey in the depth of winter, with a very small retinue, and was obliged to pass through Burgundy, and from thence to cross the Alps into Italy, all the other roads being guarded by his enemies, he underwent such hardships as no prince, perhaps, had ever undergone before him. On his arrival in Savoy, count Amadeus, lord of that country, received and entertained him suitably to his rank, but would not allow him to pass, though nearly related to him, till he had yielded to him a rich and fruitful province bordering upon his dominions. As the winter was extremely severe, so severe that the Rhine continued frozen over from the beginning of November to the first of April, the king and his retinue found themselves often in imminent danger, as they crossed the Alps, of being buried in the snow, or falling down the precipices, the roads being very slippery, and scarce passable on account of the ice. The queen and her female attendants were placed upon hides, and thus drawn over the frozen snow by their

The reception of the king in Italy. The pope retires to Canusium. Several excommunicated bishops apply to him and are absolved. The king sends deputies to acquaint the pope with his arrival, and sue for absolution. The pope's answer to the deputies.

guides, natives of the country. Some of the king's train perished in this passage, and others lost, by the excessive cold, the use of their limbs. But the king himself arrived safe in Italy; and no sooner was his arrival known there, than the counts and bishops of Lombardy, highly dissatisfied with the pope, repaired to him from all parts, treated him with all the respect that was due to his dignity, acknowledged him, notwithstanding his being deposed by the pope, for their lawful sovereign, and encouraging him to revenge the base treatment he had met with from Hildebrand, who called himself pope, offered to assist him in so just an undertaking both with men, as well as with money.

In the mean time Gregory had got as far as Lombardy in his way to Augsburg, attended by the famous countess Mathilda. She was the daughter of Boniface, marquis of Tuscany, by the countess Beatrix, descended from a sister of the emperor Otho II. Mathilda married Geoffrey the younger, duke of Lower Lorraine, but leaving her husband, she spent, with his consent, most of her time in Italy, where she was possessed of very large territories, having succeeded her father, who died without male issue, in the dukedom of Tuscany, which he had greatly extended, and left in a most flourishing condition. She was nearly related to the king, but nevertheless declared from the beginning for the pope; and being become this year her own mistress by the death of her husband, she devoted herself entirely to Gregory, transacted nothing without consulting him, followed in every thing his directions, and never parting from him, accompanied him wherever he went. Her intimacy with Gregory, and the extraordinary regard he, on all occasions, showed for her, gave occasion to many scandalous reports, that were industriously propagated by the pope's enemies, especially the ecclesiastics, of whom he exacted the strictest celibacy. Their attachment for each other was not, perhaps, criminal, but it is allowed, even by those who most admire this pope, to have been, at least on his side, as he had so many enemies, very imprudent. Be that as it will, the pope no sooner heard of the arrival of the king, and the reception he had met with from his Italian subjects, than he retired, by the advice of Mathilda, to Canusium, a strong-hold in the diocese of Reggio that belonged to her, it being publicly reported that the king was come to depose the pope, and cause another to be chosen in his room. While the pope continued in that fortress, well guarded by the troops of Mathilda, many German bishops, as well as laymen, who had been excommunicated for acknowledging the king, and communicating with him after he had been deposed and excommunicated, repaired to him barefooted and

in hair cloth, confessing their fault, and beseeching his holiness to forgive and absolve them. Gregory told them that pardon would not be refused to such as sincerely repented of their sin, but that their long disobedience required a long and severe penance. They all answered with one voice, that they were ready to undergo what penance soever his holiness should think fit to impose upon them; and the penance he thereupon enjoined them was, that the bishops should be shut up separately in little cells; that during their confinement there they should not be suffered to speak to any one; that they should daily fast till the evening, and be then allowed a spare meal. Penances were likewise imposed upon the laymen suited to their strength and different ages, but of what nature they were history does not inform us. The pope having thus tried them for some days, and being fully satisfied of their sincerity, sent for them, and after a slight reprimand absolved them, but upon condition that they should not communicate with the king till he had satisfied the holy see. He allowed them, however, to speak to him in order to reclaim him.

In the mean time the king, instead of putting himself at the head of the troops, which the Italian lords had assembled to assist him in the war they advised him to declare against the pope, repaired, with a small retinue, to a place in the neighborhood of Canusium, and from thence sent deputies to the pope, to acquaint him with his arrival in Italy, and at the same time entreat his holiness to absolve him from the excommunication, since he had for that purpose undertaken so long and so difficult a journey in so severe a season. The deputies added, that it was not out of any zeal for religion, but merely out of spite and envy, that the German lords accused him, and therefore begged his holiness would not give ear to their accusations. The pope answered, that it was against the laws of the church to try a person accused in the absence of his accusers; that if the king was conscious to himself of his own innocence, he needed not be afraid to appear at Augsburg at the appointed time, and that he would there give judgment, after hearing both sides, according to the laws of the church, without suffering himself to be biased to either side by affection or hatred. The deputies replied that the king, their master, did not decline the judgment of his holiness, whom he knew to be a most uncorrupt and impartial judge; but as the year of his excommunication was near expiring, and the lords were determined to exclude him forever from the throne, if he was not absolved within the year, he only begged to be absolved, being ready to give what satisfaction soever his holiness should require, and willing not only to an-

The king treated with the utmost indignity. Upon what terms absolved. The pope takes the sacrament as a proof of his innocence.

swer his accusers at the time and place he should appoint, but to keep the crown or resign it, as he should by him be found guilty or innocent of the crimes laid to his charge. The king could offer no more; but the pope, still pretending to question his sincerity, could not be prevailed upon to grant the absolution he so earnestly sued for, till the countess Mathilda, Hugh, abbot of Cluny, and some of the first princes of Italy, interposing in his favor, took upon them to answer for his performing what he had promised. The pope yielded at last to their prayers and entreaties, but upon condition that the king should deliver up to him his diadem, with all the other ensigns of royalty, and own himself unworthy of the name of king, and of the honor that was due to that dignity. To this condition the deputies objected, as too hard, and only calculated to drive the king to despair; and being therein seconded by the countess Mathilda and the other mediators, the pope was, in the end, with much ado, prevailed upon by them to admit the king to his presence. "If he is truly penitent," he said, "let him come, and by his obedience atone for his long disobedience to the decrees of the apostolic see." This answer was no sooner communicated to the king than he flew to Canusium, but upon his arrival at the first gate of the castle, (for it was surrounded by a triple wall,) he was told by the guards that he must dismiss all his attendants, and enter it alone. He did so, not without some reluctance, as he thus put it in the power of his avowed enemy to keep him prisoner and dispose of him as he pleased. The first gate being shut, he was required at the second to divest himself of all ensigns of royalty, to put on, in their stead, a coarse woollen tunic, and to wait barefooted in that garb, in the month of January, till it should please the pope to command the third gate to be opened, in order to admit him to his presence. In that condition he returned, and was forced to wait three whole days, fasting from morning to night, and imploring the mercy of God and the pope. The hard-hearted pope showed not the whole time the least mark of compassion; but the persons of distinction, who were with him, greatly affected with the sufferings of the king, and touched with pity in seeing so great a prince reduced to so deplorable a state, began to complain of the unparalleled severity of Gregory, more becoming, they said, a tyrant than an apostolical father or judge. Hereupon the countess Mathilda, interposing anew, and freely acquainting the pope with what was said of him even by his friends, prevailed upon him to suffer the king to appear before him the fourth day, when, after several complaints on both sides, Gregory absolved him upon the following conditions:

1. That he should appear at the time and the place which the pope should appoint, to answer, in a general diet of the German lords, the charge brought against him, and should own the pope for his judge.
2. That he should stand to his judgment, should keep or resign the crown as he should by him be found guilty or innocent, and should never seek to revenge himself upon his accusers.
3. That till judgment was given and his cause was finally determined, he should lay aside all badges of royalty, should not meddle, upon any pretence whatever, with public affairs, and should levy no money upon the people but what was necessary for the support of his family.
4. That all who had taken an oath of allegiance to him, should be absolved from that oath before God as well as before men.
5. That he should for ever remove from his presence Robert, bishop of Bamberg, Udalric of Cosheim, and all evil counsellors together with them.
6. That if he should clear himself of the crimes laid to his charge and remain king, he should be ever obedient and submissive to the pope, and concur with him, to the utmost of his power, in reforming the abuses that custom had introduced, against the laws of the church, into his kingdom. Lastly, if he failed in any of these conditions, his absolution should be null, he should be deemed guilty of the crimes laid to his charge as if he had owned them, should never again be heard, and the lords of the kingdom, absolved from their oaths, should be at full liberty to elect another king in his room. As the day on which the king had been excommunicated the year before was at hand, he was glad to submit to those terms, hard as they were, in order to obtain absolution. He signed them accordingly, and promised upon oath to observe them, especially to stand to the judgment of the pope, and to keep or lay down the crown as by him he should be judged worthy or unworthy to wear it. The pope, not satisfied with the king's oath, required the countess Mathilda, and the rest who had interposed in his favor, to swear upon relics that he should perform all he had promised. This request was readily complied with by all but the abbot of Cluny, who, being forbidden by the rules of his monastery to take an oath, only engaged his word for the king's faithfully observing the terms which he had agreed to. Hereupon Henry obtained, in the end, the dear-bought absolution, on the twenty-fifth of January of the present year 1077.

When that ceremony was over, the pope celebrated mass, and desiring the king, and all who were present, to approach the altar after consecration, he took the consecrated host in his hand, and turning to the king addressed him thus: "I long ago received letters from you and from those of your

The king declines the proof of the pope's innocence. The Lombard lords highly provoked at the mean submission of the king. He resolves to break the treaty made with the pope. A diet appointed to meet at Forcheim.

party, charging me with having raised myself to the apostolic see by simony, and having polluted my life, before as well as after my episcopacy, with other crimes, for which I ought, according to the canons, to have been for ever excluded from holy orders: and though I could disprove these calumnies with the testimony of those who very well know what life I have led from my infancy, and of those who were the authors of my promotion to the episcopal dignity; yet that I may not be thought to rely more upon the judgment of men than upon that of God, and that no room may be left for the least suspicion of scandal, let the body of our Lord, which I am going to take, be this day a proof of my innocence; let God absolve me by his judgment if I am innocent, and strike me suddenly dead, if I am guilty." Having spoken this, he took part of the host, the people congratulating him with loud shouts of joy upon his innocence so incontestably proved. But the pope, having commanded and obtained silence, addressed the king anew with the following words: "Do, my son, if you please, what you have seen me do. The German lords accuse you daily to us of many enormous crimes, for which they say you ought not only to be removed from the administration of all public affairs, but excluded for ever from the communion of the church, and even from human society. As I wish you well, and you have implored the protection of the apostolic see in your distress, do what I advise you. If you are conscious to yourself of your own innocence, and know that you are falsely and maliciously accused, deliver the church from that scandal, and yourself from all perplexity, as the issue of human judgments is very uncertain. Take the other part of the host, that your innocence thus proved may silence your enemies, that I may become your warmest friend, and the German lords being reconciled with you by my means, you may be replaced on the throne, and the wished-for tranquillity restored to the state." The king, no less astonished than perplexed at such an unexpected proposal, deliberated some time with the lords and bishops about him, and then, not caring to undergo such a trial, he declined it, saying, that his enemies would pay no kind of regard to any thing he should do in their absence, and therefore desired the pope to leave the affair undetermined till the time of the general diet.¹

In the mean while the Lombard lords, who had encouraged the king to revenge the injustice the pope had done him, and had offered to assist him in so just an undertaking to the utmost of their power, hearing of the

treatment he had met with from the pope at Canusium, and the terms he had agreed to, began to complain as loudly of him as of the pope himself. They reproached him with meanness, treachery, and cowardice, in forsaking his best friends, and acting in direct opposition to their unanimous opinion and advice, in order to be absolved from the excommunication of a man, whom the bishops of Italy had excommunicated as guilty of simony, of murders, adulteries, and many other crimes. So great was the indignation the king's mean behavior raised in most of the Lombard lords, that they even resolved no longer to acknowledge him for their king, but to place his son, yet an infant, on the throne; to carry him to Rome, and cause him to be there crowned emperor by the pope whom they should choose in the room of the usurper Hildebrand. The king strove to appease them, by representing to them the necessity he was under of being absolved within a limited time, which, he said, the pope had availed himself of, to trample upon him in the manner he had done. But finding that many of the Lombard lords daily forsook him, and that such as continued with him threatened to leave him, if he did not break the shameful treaty he had made with the pope, he was in the end prevailed upon to break it; and he recalled accordingly the bishops, as well as the laymen, whom the pope had obliged him to dismiss, declared that he would not appear at the diet appointed to meet at Augsburg, and inveighing, with great bitterness, against the pope in an assembly of the Lombard lords, exhorted them to revenge, under his command, the injuries they had received, as well as he. from the usurper of the apostolic see. By this speech the king regained the affection of all the Lombards, his army was daily reinforced with new troops flocking to him from all quarters, and he soon found himself in a condition to face any force that the pope's friends in Italy could bring against him.

The pope continued all this while with the countess Mathilda at Canusium, not thinking it safe to venture out, and much less to undertake his intended journey into Germany, in order to assist at the diet of Augsburg. The German lords therefore appointed a diet to assemble at Forcheim, in the bishopric of Bamberg, on the 13th of March, in order to deliberate about the election of a new king; since Henry had, by a manifest breach of the treaty made with the pope, prevented the meeting of a diet at Augsburg, and thereby forfeited his crown. This their design they immediately communicated to the pope, desiring him to send legates to assist at that assembly in his name, if he could not conveniently be present at it in person. Upon that intelligence the pope dispatched a cardinal, named Gregory, to

¹ Lambert. Schafn. Domnizo in Vit. Mathild. Paulus Bernried. in Vit. Greg. & Greg. lib. iv. ep. 12.

Henry declines appearing at the diet. Rudolph, duke of Suabia, chosen king. Gregory not the author of his election. The pope enters into an alliance with Robert Guiscard and the Normans.

acquaint the king with the resolution of the German lords, and press him to repair to Forcheim at the time appointed, that his cause might be there finally determined by the judgment of the apostolic see. The king answered, that as he had never been in Italy since his accession to the crown, he had so many affairs to settle there, that he could not possibly leave the country so soon; that his Italian subjects, who had long wished to see him, would think themselves neglected and despised, should he continue so short a time with them; and, besides, that the time fixed for the meeting of the assembly was so near that he could not be present at it, though nothing detained him, upon so short a notice.

This answer convinced the pope that the king was determined not to stand to the terms of the agreement; and he therefore sent Bernard, cardinal deacon of the Roman church, and Bernard abbot of a monastery of six hundred monks at Marseilles, with the character of his legates, to acquaint the German lords therewith, and assist at the diet in his name, as he could not assist at it in person, all the passes being guarded night and day by the king's troops. The assembly met soon after their arrival, and the pope's letters being read, whereby he exhorted all, who had the welfare of the state at heart, to join in such measures as should seem to them the most expedient at so critical a juncture, and the most proper to procure it, they resolved to proceed, without further delay, to the election of a new king, and they elected accordingly, with one consent, Rudolph duke of Suabia, but upon condition that his son should not succeed him, unless he was chosen by the people. The kingdom of Germany, as we may observe here by the way, was not quite hereditary, the nobles, bishops, and people being free to elect which of the deceased king's sons they judged the most worthy of the crown, though, generally speaking, they chose the eldest; and thus was the kingdom of Germany hereditary, the election being confined to the royal family, and yet elective, since the people might choose which of the king's sons they liked best. But in the present diet at Forcheim it was decreed, that the election should no longer be restrained to the royal family, and the electors should elect whomsoever they thought the most worthy of, and the best qualified for, so great a trust. Rudolph, thus elected, was consecrated by the archbishops of Mentz and Magdeburg in the presence of the pope's legates, and all the lords of the assembly, who acknowledging him for their lawful sovereign, took an oath of allegiance to him as such.¹

Some modern writers will have Gregory to have been the chief author of the election and promotion of Rudolph, and to have

confirmed to him the royal dignity, as soon as he heard that the German lords had chosen him. But Gregory himself solemnly declares in one of his letters that Rudolph was chosen unknown to him. "The ultramontane bishops and princes," says he, "hearing that he (the king) did not perform what he had promised, and despairing of his amendment, chose without my advice, I call upon you Peter and Paul to witness it, duke Rudolph for their king, who immediately gave me notice of his election, assuring me that he had been forced to undertake the government, but was ready to obey me in all things."¹ It plainly appears, from a letter which the pope wrote to his two legates in Germany, as soon as he heard of the election of Rudolph, that he himself was at a loss to determine which of the two kings had the better title to the crown. For in that letter he orders the legates to procure from both a safe conduct for him, that he may come into Germany and determine upon the spot which of the two had justice on his side. He adds, if either of the kings shall oppose this our resolution, and refuse us a free passage into Germany, we command you to cut him off, by the authority of St. Peter, from the communion of the church, and to withstand him, if necessary, even at the expense of your lives, remembering that it is idolatry not to obey the apostolic see; and that the blessed Gregory decreed that kings, who presumed to transgress its commands, should forfeit their dignity. Acknowledge him, therefore, for lawful king, who shall humbly obey our commands, assist him to the utmost of your power; and command, in our name, the bishops, abbots, clerks, and laymen, dwelling in these parts, to serve and obey him as their lawful sovereign.² This letter is dated the last of May, 1077.

In the mean time Gregory, sensible that the disagreement between him and the king would end in an open rupture, and that the forces of Mathilda alone were not capable of making head against those of the king, left Canusium, and returning to Rome, undertook from thence a journey to Apulia, with a design to gain Robert Guiscard and the Normans over to his party. Robert met the pope at Aquino, and a treaty was there concluded between them upon the following terms, namely, that the pope should absolve Robert from the excommunication which he had incurred, by laying siege to Benevento, and grant him the investiture of the dukedoms of Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily, leaving his claim to Salerno, Amalfi, and part of the march of Fermo, which Robert had seized, unjustly as the pope pretended, for the present undetermined; and that Robert should, on his side, swear fealty to Gregory and the apostolic see; that he should assist him to the utmost of his power, to hold,

¹ Lambert Schafn. Paul. Bernried. in Vit. Greg. c. 93.

¹ Greg. l. vii. ep. 14.

² Idem, l. iv. ep. 23.

Fourth council of Rome—Several bishops excommunicated and deposed ;—[Year of Christ, 1078.] Rudolph defeated by Henry, and he, in his turn, by Rudolph. Fifth council of Rome—Berengarius abjures his doctrine concerning the eucharist.

acquire, and defend the rights of St. Peter, should protect him against all his enemies, and should, upon his death, if he survived him, declare for the person who should be legally chosen by the cardinals, the clergy, and the people of Rome. This treaty was signed and sworn to by Robert, and the other Norman chiefs. Anna Comnena, Guillelmus Apuliensis, and Richardus, monk of Cluny, who flourished about the middle of the following century, write, that Gregory promised, on this occasion, to confer the imperial dignity upon Robert, or his son Boemund, and that this was one of the articles of the treaty.¹

From Apulia Gregory returned to Rome, and there in a council, consisting of about an hundred bishops, which he had appointed to meet the first week in Lent of the present year 1078, he excommunicated and deposed Tetald, archbishop of Milan, preferred by the king to that see while his predecessor was still living, and with him Arnold, bishop of Cremona, convicted of simony, Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, striving to withdraw himself from all subjection to the apostolic see, and Roland, who had been rewarded with the bishopric of Trevigi for notifying to the pope the decree issued by the council of Worms against him, and commanding him, in their name, to quit the see he had usurped.² By the same council all ordinations made by excommunicated persons were declared null, and excommunications were thundered out against those who detain or plunder, or anyways injure, such as are shipwrecked. As to the affairs of Germany, it was resolved that legates should be sent thither to convene an assembly of all the prelates and lords of the kingdom, in order to determine, jointly with them, which of the contending parties had justice on their side. This resolution the pope immediately communicated to the German lords and bishops, inviting them to assist at that assembly, as they tendered the peace and welfare of the church as well as the state, and declaring those cut off from the communion of the church who should oppose or prevent their meeting at the time and place his legates should appoint. "If any one," says he, "shall attempt to prevent our legates from executing this our resolution, be he king, archbishop, bishop, duke, count, or marquis, we bind and anathematize him; not only in his soul but likewise in his body, and by our apostolic authority deprive his arms of victory." Thus Gregory; as if victories were at his disposal as well as kingdoms.³

In the mean time Henry, leaving Italy,

returned with the troops he had levied there to Germany, and meeting Rudolph, engaged him, put his army to flight, and, improving the victory, made himself master of Suabia and Bavaria, that had declared for his rival. In this battle several persons of distinction on the side of Rudolph were slain or made prisoners. Among the latter were Bernard, archdeacon of the Roman church, Sigefrid, archbishop of Mentz, and Adelbert, bishop of Worms. But Henry was soon after defeated in his turn by Rudolph, and obliged to quit the countries he had just recovered. We are told that in this engagement most of the German as well as the Italian lords, who adhered to Henry, were either killed or taken, and that the archbishop of Magdeburg was the only person of any note who fell on the side of Rudolph.¹

While the two competitors were thus contending in the field for the crown, Gregory assembled another council, the fifth of his pontificate, at Rome, in the beginning of November of the present year 1078. At this council appeared ambassadors both from Henry and from Rudolph, sent to swear, in their name, that no violence should be offered to the legates of the apostolic see, but that they should be suffered to hold unmolested the intended congress.² And that oath they took accordingly, in the presence of the pope and the council.

As the famous Berengarius still continued to deny the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, and daily gained over many to his opinion, he was summoned to the present council, and required to give an account of his belief with respect to that mystery. He had solemnly abjured his doctrine, as has been related above, in a council held by pope Nicholas II. in 1059. But being threatened by the present council with excommunication, as an incorrigible heretic, in maintaining and propagating a doctrine repugnant to that of the fathers, and condemned by the church, he owned his error, begged pardon of the council, and to satisfy them of his sincerity, made in their presence the following confession of faith: "I confess the bread in the eucharist to be, after consecration, the true body of Christ that was born of the Virgin Mary, that sits at the right hand of the Father; and the wine, after consecration, to be the true blood that flowed from the side of our Lord; and what I pronounce with my mouth I believe in my heart. So help me God, and these his holy Gospels." The fathers of the council were not all satisfied with this confession; and Berengarius was therefore ordered to continue at Rome till the meeting of a more numerous council, which was to be held the following year,

¹ Anna Comnena, l. i. p. 32. Guill. Apul. l. iv. p. 31. Richard. apud Ptolemeum, Lucent. ad ann. 1054.

² Concil. l. x. p. 299.

³ Idem ibid. et Greg. l. v. ep. 15, 16.

¹ Chronograph. Magdeburg. Bertold. in Chron. ad ann. 1078.

² Paulus Bernried. in Vit. Greg. c. 102.

Sixth council of Rome—Berengarius again abjures his doctrine concerning the eucharist;—[Year of Christ, 1079.] Embassadors from Henry and Rudolph assist at this council. Both promise to stand to the judgment of the apostolic see.

when his doctrine as well as his present confession should be more leisurely examined.¹

The council met in the month of February of the following year, 1069, and the question being proposed, whether Christ was “substantially” or only “figuratively” present in the eucharist, the greater part of the bishops, says the historian, in all one hundred and fifty, who composed that assembly, maintained the bread to be substantially converted, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, and the words of the minister, for the redemption of mankind. Some, struck with blindness, continues the historian, pretended the eucharist to be but a type. But they, yielding before the third session, agreed with the rest; and Berengarius, the author of that error, owning it to be so, made the following confession of faith in the presence of the council: “I, Berengarius, believe in my heart, and confess with my mouth, that the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar, are changed substantially by the mystery of the sacred prayer and the words of our Redeemer, into the true, real, and vivifying flesh, and into the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that after consecration it is the true body of Christ that was born of the Virgin Mary, that was offered on the cross for the salvation of the world, and sits at the right hand of the Father; and the true blood of Christ that flowed from his side, and not merely a type, but in property of nature, and in real substance, as is set forth in this writing, which I have read, and you have heard. Such is my belief, and henceforth I will teach nothing contrary to this, my confession. So help me God, and these his holy Gospels.”² This confession being approved by all who were present at the council, the pope forbade Berengarius on the part of God, and his holy apostles Peter and Paul, ever to dispute concerning the mystery of the body and blood of our Lord, or to teach any thing relating to it, unless it were to reclaim those whom he had led astray.³ This command he promised to obey; and thereupon Gregory, not questioning his sincerity, wrote the following letter in his favor: “Gregory, servant of the servants of God, to all the faithful of St. Peter, health and apostolical benediction. We think it incumbent upon us to let you know that we have anathematized, on the part of God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul, all who shall any ways presume to injure Berengarius, son of the Roman church, either in his person or his possessions, or call him a heretic. He has stayed long with us, as long as we please; and now we send

him home attended by our trusty Fulco.” However, Berengarius returning the following year to France, publicly retracted both the confessions he had made at Rome, declaring that he had signed them out of fear, being threatened with immediate death if he did not yield. Tortures, racks, and death, are arguments that few have courage or constancy enough to resist!

To this council, as well as to the former, ambassadors were sent by Henry, and by Rudolph, to answer the accusations that their enemies might bring against them. Those from Rudolph complained of the devastations committed by Henry in all the countries through which he passed, of his sacrilegiously plundering churches and monasteries, putting some bishops in irons and murdering others, and treating all as rebels who did not obey him as king, though he had forfeited his kingdom, and all right to the crown, by his disobedience to the decrees of the apostolic see. Hereupon most of the bishops, without so much as hearing the ambassadors of the king, were for excommunicating him anew, as well as all who adhered to him, and declaring Rudolph the sole lawful king of Germany. But the ambassadors promising upon oath, in their master’s name, that about the feast of the Ascension proper persons should be sent to conduct the legates of the apostolic see into Germany, that no kind of violence should be offered them in going or returning, and that the king would submit to their judgment, and concur with them in settling the affairs of the church, as well as the state, as they should direct, the pope was prevailed upon to suspend the sentence of excommunication, and leave the whole to be determined by his legates in the ensuing congress.¹ The ambassadors of Rudolph took the same oath in his name, and the pope, upon the breaking up of the council, named Peter, cardinal bishop of Albano, and Altman, bishop of Padua, to assist at the congress as his legates, enjoining them to determine nothing without consulting the holy see. At the same time Gregory wrote a circulatory letter, addressed to all the faithful of the Saxon and Teutonic kingdoms, commanding them to forbear all hostilities, since the contending parties had agreed to stand to the judgment of his legates.²

It was at this time in most places customary for archbishops to make, at their consecration, a promise or profession of canonical obedience to the pope; that is, of such obedience as was enjoined by the canons. The like profession of obedience was made by all bishops to their metropolitans, and by all metropolitans to their primates. But Gregory, who had nothing less in view than to subject all bishops to him-

¹ Anonymus Chifflet. & Bertold. ad ann. 1078.

² Hugo Flavin. in Chron. Viridun. p. 214. Bertold. in Chron. ad ann. 1079. Regist. Gregorian. l. vi. post epist. 17.

³ Hugo Flavin. ubi supra.

¹ Paul. Bern. ubi supra. ² Idem. Bertold in Chron.

Oath taken in the council of Rome by the archbishop of Aquileia. The pope requires the king of England to pay him homage. The king's answer. Pays no regard to the pope's menaces. The pope forbids divine service in the Slavonian language ;—[Year of Christ, 1080.]

self and his successors, as absolute monarchs of the church, changed that promise into an oath of allegiance, much the same with that which emperors and other sovereign princes imposed upon their feudatories and vassals. Thus not satisfied with the usual promise of canonical obedience, he obliged Henry, the new archbishop of Aquileia, to take the following oath in the present council: "I shall from this time forward be faithful to St. Peter, to pope Gregory, and his successors, that shall be chosen by a majority of the cardinals. I shall neither advise nor assist in taking away their life, in dismembering, deposing, nor imprisoning them. I shall come to their synods when summoned by their nuncios or their letters, and send deputies if I cannot come in person, and shall obey the canons of such synods. I shall assist in maintaining and defending the Roman papacy and the regalia of St. Peter, so far as is consistent with my order. I shall not disclose the counsels which the popes themselves or their nuncios shall communicate to me. I shall treat honorably and assist their legates coming from or going to Rome. I shall not knowingly communicate with those whom they have excommunicated by name. I shall assist the Roman church, when required, with a military force. All this I shall faithfully observe, unless exempted from that observance by a dispensation from the pope."¹ Could a more full and formal allegiance be sworn by any subject to his prince!

As the payment of the money that was yearly remitted to Rome by the kings of England under the name of Peter-pence, had been, in great measure, neglected during the conqueror's three years' absence in Normandy, Gregory no sooner heard of his return to England, than he sent over Hubert, subdeacon of the Roman church, in the quality of legate, to complain of that neglect to the king, and at the same time require him to take an oath of fealty to him. The pope's design was to improve that charity, for it was but a charity or pension, into a tribute. But the king, in a letter which he wrote this year to the pope, returned a proper answer to so insolent a demand. "Your legate," said he, "has required me to promise fealty to you and your successors, and desired me to see that the money which my predecessors used to send to the Roman church be more punctually remitted. Of these requests I have granted the one and refused the other. I would not, nor ever will I pay homage, because I never promised it; and I do not find that my predecessors ever paid it to yours. As for the money, it was not collected with due care, during the three years I staid in France. But now that

I am returned to my kingdom, I send you by your legate what has been collected, and shall send you the rest by archbishop Lanfranc's legates."¹ This resolute answer was highly resented by the pope; and being at the same time informed both by his legate and the archbishop of Lanfranc, that the king would not permit any of his bishops to go to Rome, though summoned thither by the apostolic see, he recalled his legate, ordering him, in the letter he wrote to him on that occasion, to let the king know that he valued not his money without the honor; that his forbidding archbishops and bishops to visit the tombs of the apostles was a thing quite unprecedented, and what no king before him, not even pagan kings, had ever been so impudent or irreverent as to have attempted; that he had overlooked many things which deserved correction, and that if the king did not alter his conduct, he should be made sensible that he had provoked the wrath of St. Peter. In the same letter he requires his legate to invite, and command by the authority of St. Peter, two English and two Norman bishops out of each archbishopric, to repair to Rome, in order to assist at the council which he had appointed to meet next Lent.² This letter is dated the 23d of September, 1079. The legate left England soon after, but the king, paying no kind of regard to the pope's menaces, kept to the resolution he had taken; and no English nor Norman bishops were allowed, during his reign, to go to Rome, though frequently summoned, and even threatened with suspension if they did not comply with the summons.

We have a remarkable letter written by Gregory in the beginning of January of the following year, 1080, in answer to one he had received from Vratislaus, duke of Bohemia, desiring leave to have divine service performed in the Slavonian tongue, that is, in the language of the country. That letter the pope answered in the following words. "As you desire us to allow divine service to be performed among you in the Slavonian tongue, know that I can by no means grant you your request, it being manifest to all who will but reflect, that it has pleased the Almighty that the Scripture should be withheld from some, and not understood by all, lest it should fall into contempt, or lead the unlearned into error. And it must not be alledged that all were allowed, in the primitive times, to read the Scriptures, it being well known that in those early times the church connived at many things, which the holy fathers disapproved and corrected when the Christian religion was firmly established. We therefore cannot grant, but absolutely forbid, by the authority of Almighty

¹ Apud Baron. ad ann. 1079.

¹ Apud Lanfranc, ep. 7.

² Greg. l. vii. ep. 1.

Divine service in the Slavonian language allowed by other popes. Seventh council of Rome under Gregory—Decree against lay investitures confirmed. Henry anew excommunicated and deposed. The pope deposed in the council of Brixen.

God and his blessed apostle Peter, what you ask, and command you to oppose to the utmost of your power, all who require it."¹ What can be more contradictory to the command of our Savior, "search the Scriptures,"² or to the whole fourteenth chapter of St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians? Gregory did not, it seems, know that two of his predecessors, Hadrian II. and John VIII., granted to the Moravians what he could not grant to the Bohemians, permission to perform the divine service in their native language, the Slavonian;³ nay, St. Cyril, the apostle of the Moravians, obtained a decree of Hadrian II. forbidding any bishops or presbyters to be ordained in Moravia, who did not understand the language of the country, and therefore could not perform the functions of his office so as to edify the people.⁴ The permission granted to the Moravians by these two popes was confirmed to them, notwithstanding the decree of Gregory, by Innocent IV. in 1248.⁵

Gregory held, according to custom, a council in Lent the present year, 1080. It was the seventh he had held, and of all the most numerous. In this council the sentence of excommunication and deposition pronounced two years before against Tetald of Milan, Guibert of Ravenna, Roland of Trevisi, and several other bishops, was confirmed, and a new decree was issued forbidding laymen, whether emperors, kings, dukes, marquises, or counts, to grant investitures of bishoprics, or abbeys, or of any ecclesiastical dignity whatever, on pain of excommunication, and declaring all who accepted investitures from them excommunicated, till they resigned the dignities to which they had, by such wicked means, been preferred. As Henry, repenting the promise he had made of standing to the judgment of the pope's legates, instead of sending ambassadors to attend them into Germany, kept the passes all guarded to prevent their assisting at the intended assembly or diet, Gregory excommunicated and deposed him anew in the present council: "I excommunicate and anathematize," were the words of the sentence, "Henry, whom they call king, and all his abettors: I again deprive him of the kingdom of Germany and Italy; divest him of all royal power and authority, forbid all Christians to obey him as king, and absolve all who have sworn, or shall swear allegiance to him, from their oath. May the said Henry and his abettors have no strength in battle; may he never gain a victory so long as he lives. As the Germans have chosen Rudolph for their king, to him I give and grant that kingdom, and to all who shall steadily adhere to him, I promise absolution from their

sins, and all blessings in this, and in the life to come." The pope in this sentence addresses himself all along to the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, and closes it thus: "now therefore, blessed apostles, make it known to all the world, that if you can bind and unbind in heaven, you can take away and give away upon earth, empires, kingdoms, principalities, dukedoms, marquises, earldoms, and the possessions of all men according to their deserts. For you have often taken from the unworthy, and given to the worthy, patriarchates, primacies, archbishoprics, bishoprics. If you judge spiritual matters, what power must we allow you to be vested with over temporal affairs! If you are to judge the angels far above the proudest princes upon earth, how great must your authority be over their slaves! Let the kings, therefore, and princes of the earth now learn how boundless and uncontrolled is your power! Let them dread for the future to disobey the commands of your church. Let your vengeance light without delay upon Henry, that all may know he falls, not by chance, but by your power. May God confound him, 'that his spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.'"¹ Thus did Gregory encourage the subjects of a Christian prince to rebellion, on the part of the apostles, who had strongly recommended subjection and obedience to the worst even of heathenish princes, the sworn enemies and persecutors of the Christian name. The pope having thus deposed Henry, and confirmed the election of Rudolph, sent a crown of gold to the new king, or rather usurper, with the following inscription, to let him know that he acknowledged him for king.

"*Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rudolpho.*"²

The decree excommunicating and deposing the king, is dated the 7th of March, 1080.

As the king found himself, at this time, at the head of a powerful army, and had lately gained considerable advantages over the usurper of his crown, he resolved, as soon as he was informed of what had been passed in the council of Rome, to keep thenceforth no measures with the pope, as the pope kept none with him. He accordingly appointed a council to meet at Mentz, in order to advise with the bishops of his party concerning the measures he should pursue at so critical a juncture. Nineteen German bishops met at the place and time appointed, the last day of May. But as no Italian bishops assisted at this council, it was adjourned to a place nearer Italy; and the city of Brixen, in Tyrol, was the place they chose. Thirty bishops assembled there on the 25th of June of the present year, with

¹ Greg. l. vii. ep. 11.

² John v. 39.

³ See p. 292.

⁴ Vita Cyril, p. 22.

⁵ Oderic. Raynald. ad ann. 1248.

¹ Paul. Bernried. c. 107.

² Otto Frisingen. de gestis Freder. I. l. i. c. 7. Gotfrid. Viterb. Chron. parte 17.

Guibert chosen in the room of Gregory. The king acquaints the pope with the decree of his deposition, and also writes to the people of Rome. The pope's letter to the bishops of Apulia.

almost all the Italian and many German princes, all highly provoked at the unprecedented proceedings and insupportable tyranny, as they justly styled it, of the pope. At this council the king was present in person; and it was by all, to a man, agreed that Gregory should be deposed, and another chosen in his room. The decree of his deposition was drawn up; and he was there charged with having raised himself by tyranny to the pontifical chair; with over-setting the hierarchy, and making himself sole monarch of the church; with encouraging sedition and rebellion, sowing discord among friends, persecuting a peaceable king, excommunicating and deposing him, and placing a perjured rebel on his throne. In the same decree they call Gregory a false monk, a necromancer, a soothsayer, an interpreter of dreams, one possessed with a pythical spirit, one who taught evil instead of good, falsehood instead of truth, a disciple of the heretic Berengarius, a heretic, an infidel. They closed the decree with the following words: "We therefore declare, by the authority of Almighty God, the said Hildebrand divested of the pontifical dignity; and if he does not quit it of his own accord, let him be condemned forever."¹ Gregory being thus deposed, the bishops of the council elected, with one consent, Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, in his room, who took the name of Clement III. The new pope appeared in the council soon after his election, in the pontifical robes, and all the bishops prostrating themselves, together with the king, before him, kissed his foot, and thus acknowledged him for lawful pope.²

The king himself chose to notify to the pope his deposition, and he wrote the following letter to acquaint him with it. "Henry, king by divine ordination, and not by usurpation, to Hildebrand, no longer pope, but a false monk. You deserve to be thus saluted, after introducing, as you have done, the utmost confusion into the church, and amongst all orders of men. You have trampled upon the archbishops and bishops, and treated the anointed of the Lord as your vassals and slaves, &c. All this we have borne out of the regard that is due to the apostolic see; but you, ascribing it to fear, have presumed to set yourself up against the royal dignity, and threaten to take it from us, as if we had received it from you, and not from God, who called us to the throne, but never called you to the chair; you owe your dignity to fraud, to craft, and to money; your money procured you friends, and your friends opened you the way to the chair of peace with the sword; being thus raised to the chair, you have made it your business to sow discord, to disturb the public tranquillity, to counte-

nance disobedience in those whom all are bound to obey. You have not even spared me, though I have been, unworthy as I am, anointed king, and am, according to the doctrine taught by the fathers, to be judged only by God, and can only forfeit my kingdom by apostatizing from the faith. The holy bishops of old did not take upon them to depose the apostate emperor, Julian, but left him to be judged and deposed by God, who alone could judge and depose him. Peter, who was a true pope, commanded all men to "fear God, and honor the king;" but you do neither, and your not honoring me can only proceed from not fearing God. St. Paul anathematized even an angel from heaven who should preach any other gospel. We therefore command you, struck with this anathema, and condemned by the judgment of all our bishops, to quit the see you have unjustly usurped; let another be raised to the throne of St. Peter, who will not disguise his wicked attempts with the mask of religion, but teach the sound doctrine of that holy apostle. I, Henry, by the grace of God king, command you, with all my bishops, to come down from the throne. 'Descende, descende,' come down, come down."¹

The king wrote at the same time to the clergy and people of Rome to acquaint them with the deposition of the monk Hildebrand, requiring them to drive him by force from the usurped see, if he did not quit it of his own accord, and to receive and acknowledge for lawful pope the person, whom he and his bishops had placed, with one consent, on the throne in his room. In that letter he forbids the Romans to shed the wretched man's blood, as life will be more painful than death to a man of his ambition and temper.²

What answer Gregory returned to the king's letter history does not inform us, nor whether he returned any; but we have a letter of his to the bishops of Apulia and Calabria, dated the 21st of July of the present year 1080, wherein he tells them, that his enemies, and the enemies of the church universal, had set up for their leader and antichrist, a perjured rebel to the Roman church, named Guibert, one who had plundered the church of Ravenna, and was by all good men abhorred for his wickedness; that none had assisted at that assembly of satan but men of the most infamous characters, whose ordination was null or heretical, and that he did not at all doubt but by the prayers of St. Peter, who overcame Simon the Magician, he should soon defeat the wicked attempts of the new Simon and all his abettors; nay, it is said, that to encourage the rebels he assured them that a false king was to die that year, that his death would happen before the festival of St.

¹ Centius Camerarius in Censuali. c. 3. et Baron. ad ann. 1080.

² Centius, *ibid.*

¹ Apud Baron. ad ann. 1080.

² Idem *ibid.*

Rudolph killed. Gregory resolves to set up another king. The pope's letter to the abbot of Monte Cassino. Robert Guiscard renews his oath to assist the pope. Eighth council of Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1081.]

Peter.¹ By a false king, the pope, no doubt, meant Henry; but his prophecy was fulfilled in Rudolph, who fell in a battle fought near Mersburg on the 15th of June of the present year.² Of this battle we have very different accounts, but it is agreed on all hands, that Rudolph being obliged to retire on account of his wounds, his men, missing him and believing he was killed, betook themselves to a precipitate flight, and left Henry master of the field. Rudolph was carried to Mersburg, where he died of his wounds, expressing great concern at his having failed in the allegiance which he had sworn to Henry his master and lord. As the bishops and others about him strove to comfort him in his last moments, he showed them his bloody arm (for his hand was cut off,) saying, I have justly forfeited the hand, with which I promised allegiance to my lawful sovereign, and my life with my hand; but the pope obliged me to break the promise I had solemnly made, and usurp the dignity, to which I had no kind of right; you see to what end such an attempt has brought me; and they, whose counsels I have followed, may hereafter have occasion to repent their having put me upon it.³

The news of the defeat and death of Rudolph threw the Romans, and such of the Italians as adhered to Grégory, into the utmost confusion, and they were all for his being reconciled with the king upon the best terms he could procure, in order to prevent the spilling of more Christian blood, and the dreadful calamities attending so destructive a war. They represented to him that most of the German and all the Lombard lords had declared for the king; that the countess Mathilda was the only person he could rely on in Italy, but as she was not able to withstand alone the whole force of the Teutonic kingdom, she would be soon reduced to the necessity of either coming to an agreement with the king or losing her dominions; and that his holiness, thus left to the mercy of a provoked prince, would in the end be obliged to submit to such terms as he should be pleased to impose upon him. Thus Gregory's friends; but he, quite unaffected with the dangers to which he exposed them and even his favorite countess Mathilda, nor discouraged in the least with the death of the king whom he had set up, resolved, without the least hesitation, to set up another in his room. And he wrote accordingly to Altman, bishop of Passaw, and to William, abbot of Hirsange, both men of great interest in Germany, and zealously attached to his see, exhorting them to exert their utmost endea-

vers in keeping those who had declared for the late king, especially Guelph, duke of Bavaria, steady in their obedience to the apostolic see; to inform him what succors they can supply him with or procure for him, and to persuade the German lords to proceed to the election of a new king. He advises them to delay for some time the election, rather than to suffer one to be elected who is not duly qualified for so high a station, or is not, for want of zeal or abilities, capable of maintaining the rights and privileges of the church; and he sends them the form of the oath, which they must require the person, whom they should choose, to take; and it is as follows: "from this time I shall be faithful to the blessed apostle Peter, and to his vicar the blessed Gregory now living. Whatever he shall command me to do with these words, 'by true obedience,' I shall faithfully perform as becomes a Christian. As to the disposing of churches, of lands, or of revenues, that have been granted to St. Peter by the emperor Constantine, by Charles, or any men or women, I shall agree with the pope concerning them, so as not to incur the guilt of sacrilege, but shall pay due honor to God and St. Peter, and shall become a soldier of that apostle and his vicar." To require this oath, was requiring a person, who should take it, to acknowledge himself a vassal of St. Peter and the blessed pope Gregory.

The pope wrote at the same time to Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, ordering him to remind Robert Guiscard of the oath he had taken to defend the regalia of St. Peter, and engage him to perform what he had promised, should his assistance be wanted.² The countess Mathilda had informed the pope that a treaty of marriage was on foot between the king's son and the duke's daughter, which gave his holiness no small concern, as he apprehended that Robert might think himself bound by that treaty to declare for the king, or at least to stand neuter. He therefore enjoined the abbot in his letter to sound the present disposition of the Norman prince, and let him know whether he might be safely relied on. What answer Desiderius returned to this letter we know not, but from Guillelmus Apuliensis, it appears that Gregory went at this time in person into Apulia; that he had an interview with the duke at Benevento, and that the duke there renewed the oath he had taken in 1077 to assist the pope, by whomsoever attacked, and maintain, to the utmost of his power, the rights of his see.³

Gregory, thinking he had now nothing to fear from the king, assembled the following year, 1081, a council at Rome in the beginning of Lent; and in that council, the eighth

¹ Hist. Saxon.

² If the pope believed that what he foretold would come to pass, he must be looked upon as a false prophet, and as an impostor if he did not believe it.—(See Bayle Dict. Art. Greg. VII.)

³ Hemoldus Chron. Sclavor. l. i. c. 29.

¹ Greg. l. viii. ep. 3.

² Idem, l. viii. ep. 4.

³ Guill. Apul. l. 4.

Henry excommunicated again. He marches into Italy, and defeats Mathilda, and besieges Rome. A new king chosen by the Saxons;—[Year of Christ, 1052.] Henry reduces the Leonine city. The ninth council of Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1053.]

of his pontificate, he deposed and excommunicated anew the king, and all who, by adhering to him and serving him as king, encouraged him in his wicked rebellion against God and St. Peter. In the same council the sentence of excommunication was again thundered out, with dreadful anathemas, against the anti-pope Guibert, and such as received or owned him as pope.¹ In the mean time Henry, having settled, after the late victory, his German affairs, set out with his army for Italy, determined to revenge the base treatment he had met with from Gregory, to drive him from Rome, and place Guibert, chosen by all the Lombard and most of the German bishops, on the pontifical throne. He was joined, upon his entering Italy, by most of the Italian princes, no less provoked against Gregory than the king himself, as they saw a war kindled, by his wild pretensions and obstinacy, in the bowels of their country. The king met not with the least opposition till he approached Rome, when the countess Mathilda unexpectedly appeared at the head of a considerable army, and offered him battle. A battle was accordingly fought, and the troops of Mathilda giving way at the first onset, she was obliged to save herself by a precipitate flight. She was possessed of more extensive territories than any other sovereign, besides the Normans, in all Italy, divided at this time into numberless principalities. The dukedom of Tuscany, the cities of Mantua, Parma, Reggio, Placentia, Ferrara, Modena, part of Umbria, of the duchy of Spoleti, of the march of Ancona, and all the country from Viterbo to Orvieto, now known by the name of the patrimony of St. Peter, were subject to her. But her subjects were not, it seems, hearty in the cause; nay, they looked upon her, as we read in one of the pope's letters,² as a mad woman, "pro insana habent," for espousing the cause of the apostolic see against so powerful a prince.

The king, having thus put the army of Mathilda to the rout, approached Rome, and encamping in the fields of Nero, as they are called, on the opposite banks of the Tiber, he sent parties from thence to lay waste the neighboring country, as the Romans refused to open the gates to him. But as his Germans could not bear the heat of the climate, and summer approached, he thought it advisable to put off the siege to a more favorable season, and return to Lombardy. The following year he again laid siege to Rome; but the Romans defending the place with great resolution and vigor during the winter and spring, he was again obliged by the heat of the season to abandon the enterprize and return to Lombardy. However, he left garrisons in the neigh-

boring castles to harrass the Romans, and block up the city; and the anti-pope Clement remained at Tivoli with a body of troops to scour the country, and intercept the provisions that might be conveyed into the city.¹

In the mean time the Saxons, encouraged by the pope, chose count Herman, a native of Lorraine, in the room of Rudolph; and he was anointed king by Sigefrid, archbishop of Mentz, on St. Stephen's day, the twenty-sixth of December of the present year. Henry no sooner heard of this new election than he marched back to Rome, driving, in all the countries through which he passed, the bishops who acknowledged Gregory from their sees, and the abbots from their abbeys. As he approached Rome, the citizens, already reduced to great straits for want of provisions, earnestly entreated the pope to hearken to an accommodation with the king, and prevent the calamities with which they were threatened, as the city must sooner or later fall into his hands. The king was not averse to an accommodation, and to convince the pope of his sincerity, he set at liberty Otto, bishop of Ostia, and afterwards pope, under the name of Urban II., whom he had arrested. He even offered to acknowledge Gregory for lawful pope, and to accept from him the imperial crown, provided he absolved him from the excommunication, and suffered him quietly to enjoy the power which he held of God alone, from whom alone he had received it. Gregory answered in general terms, that he was ready to absolve him, and even crown him emperor; but as he had offended in many things, he must first give full satisfaction to God and the church. The king, not satisfied with this answer, laid siege to the Leonine city, and having made himself master of the place, notwithstanding the vigorous resistance he met with, began to batter the walls of Rome on that side.

In this extremity, the Romans, throwing themselves at the pope's feet, and representing the great hardships they had already suffered for adhering to him, and the much greater they were likely to suffer, prevailed upon him to assemble a council, in order to settle the points in dispute between him and the king by the advice of the bishops, who should assist at that assembly. To this Henry, willing to come to an agreement with the pope upon reasonable terms, readily consented, and forbearing all hostilities, promised, upon oath, to let the bishops pass unmolested. The council met in the Lateran church on the 20th of November, and consisted chiefly of the archbishops, bishops and abbots, of Campania and Apulia, the only bishops in Italy that sided at this time with the pope; but as Gregory would

¹ Concil. tom. x. p. 398. ² Greg. l. viii. ep. 3.

¹ Donnizo Vit. Greg. Hugo Flavin. in Chron. ad ann. 1051.

Rome taken by the king;—[Year of Christ, 1034;]—who is crowned emperor by Guibert. The pope, besieged in the castle of St. Angelo, is delivered by Robert Guiscard. Gregory leaves Rome and retires to Salerno. Assembly of Berbac;—[Year of Christ, 1035.] Assembly of Quintilineburg.

hearken to no terms that the king could agree to, consistently with his dignity, the council broke up the third day; and it was with much ado that the bishops prevailed upon him not to excommunicate the king a third time, though then master of the Leonine city, and under the very walls of Rome, at the head of a powerful and victorious army.

The king allowed the bishops, who had assisted at the council, to return unmolested to their sees. But, provoked beyond measure at the obstinacy of the pope, upon their departure he invested the city on all sides, and began to batter the walls with great fury. But finding he could not easily master the place by force, he had recourse to bribery, and a large sum of money being sent him at this very time by Alexius Comneus, emperor of the East, to make war upon Robert Guiscard, with that money he bribed some of the leading men in Rome, and was by them admitted into the city; but the pope had time to save himself by retiring to the strong castle of St. Angelo. The king entered Rome on the 21st of March, attended by Guibert, whom he caused to be enthroned the very next day, in the Lateran palace, and to be consecrated the following Sunday, in the church of St. Peter, by the bishops of Modena and Arezzo. On Easter-day, which in the present year, 1034, fell on the 31st of March, Clement (the name Guibert took at his election,) crowned Henry emperor, with the approbation of the Romans, who thenceforth acknowledged him for emperor.¹

In the mean time, Robert Guiscard, hearing that the emperor was master of Rome, that he had placed Guibert on the pontifical chair, and was actually besieging the castle of St. Angelo, whither Gregory had retired, put himself, without delay, at the head of a choice body of troops, and marching with all possible expedition to his relief, arrived in a few days in the neighborhood of Rome. At his approach the emperor, who had sent the best part of his troops into Lombardy, to oppose the countess Mathilda, thought it advisable to retire. The Romans, however, who had declared against the pope, shut their gates against the Normans. But Robert, having driven them from the walls, made himself, in a very short time, master of the city, and setting it on fire in several places, marched, without opposition, to the castle of St. Angelo, took the pope from thence, and carried him in triumph to the Lateran palace.²

Gregory, thus set at liberty, held a council, the tenth and last of his pontificate, in the Lateran church; and in that council he again excommunicated the emperor, Guibert the anti-pope, and all who adhered to the one or

the other. This sentence he caused to be published in France by Peter, bishop of Albano, and in Germany by Otho, bishop of Porto, his two legates. As the Romans were now greatly incensed against the pope, whom they looked upon as the author of the many calamities they had suffered, and there was no room to doubt but the emperor, who had gained some new advantages over the rebels in Germany, would soon return to the siege of Rome, it was thought advisable by duke Robert, as well as by Gregory himself, that he should leave that city, and retire with the duke to Salerno. They left Rome accordingly together, and upon their departure, the Romans, no longer awed either by the pope or the Normans, declared for the emperor.

In the mean time Otho, the pope's legate in Germany, spared no pains to stir up the people against the emperor, and strengthen the party of the usurper Herman. With that view he assembled a council at a place in Thuringia, called Berbac, consisting chiefly of such of the German bishops as sided with Herman. In that assembly, Gebehard, archbishop of Saltzburg, was for having it defined that the pope was vested with a power over all the princes of the earth, and might therefore lawfully not only excommunicate, but depose them, and give their kingdoms to others, if they did not obey the decrees of the apostolic see. But Wicelin, who had been lately preferred by the emperor to the see of Mentz, in the room of Sigefrid, maintaining that our Savior had granted no temporal power to St. Peter, and consequently that the pope, as his successor, could claim none, warm debates arose between the bishops of the opposite parties, which obliged the legates to dismiss the assembly.¹

The same year another council was assembled by the legate at Quintilineburg, an abbey in the neighborhood of Halberstad, in Saxony. As this assembly was entirely composed of bishops who adhered to the pope, it was there determined that all were to acquiesce in the judgment of the pope with respect to temporal as well as spiritual matters, and that all men were to be judged by him, and he by no man. This determination was opposed by a clerk of the church of Bamberg, named Gumbert, maintaining that the primacy, or the power claimed by the pope, and often exercised, was an usurpation. But he was driven out of the council, and the decree, subjecting all men, whether princes, kings, or emperors, to the judgment of the apostolic see, passed without opposition, and the contrary opinion was at the same time condemned as heretical. Several other decrees were issued

¹ Centius Camer. ad ann. 1034. Abbas Ursperg. Henrici Epist. apud Dacher. tom. ix. Specileg. Bertold, &c.

² Sigebert. Bertold. Centius Camerarius, &c.

¹ Bertold. Uspergens. ad ann. 1035.

Council of Mentz. Death of Gregory. His character. The dictatus, or maxims, of Gregory.

by this council, relating to the invalidity of ordinations conferred by excommunicated persons, to the marriages of priests, which were strictly forbidden, to the observance of Lent, during which fast all were ordered to abstain from eggs, cheese, &c., and lastly, sentence of excommunication was thundered out, with lighted torches, against the anti-pope Guibert, and eleven other bishops, who were all, by name, suspended from the functions of their office, and, with their accomplices, cut off from the communion of the church, till they resigned the dignities to which they had been unlawfully preferred; that is, nominated by the emperor. This decree was signed by Herman, their king; by the archbishops of Saltzburg and Magdeburg, and twelve other bishops.¹

The emperor no sooner heard of the decrees of this council than he appointed one to meet at Mentz, inviting all the bishops of his party to assist at it, and retort the unjust anathemas upon those who had thundered them out against them. At this council were present two Roman presbyters, with the character of legates from pope Clement III. the archbishops of Mentz, of Cologne, of Bremen, twenty bishops from Germany, and many from France and from Italy; and by them Hildebrand, who styled himself pope, Otho his legate, and the fourteen bishops of the council of Quintineburg were deposed, excommunicated, and anathematized, as traitors and rebels, and all forbidden, on pain of excommunication, to communicate with them, or with their accomplices. The same sentence was pronounced against Herman, and all who acknowledged or served him as king.²

While these things passed in Germany, Gregory ended a life which his boundless ambition had filled with troubles, especially after his promotion to the pontifical throne. He died at Salerno on the 25th of May of the present year 1085, having held the see twelve years one month and three days. There is no small disagreement amongst the cotemporary writers with respect to his last sentiments concerning his quarrel with Henry. Sigebert writes, that sincerely repenting, in his last moments, what he had done, he absolved that prince, with his last breath, from the excommunication which he had so often and with so much solemnity thundered out against him, and all his followers.³ But the author of his life, who wrote soon after his death, assures us, that being asked, when past all hopes of recovery, whether he would show, before his departure, any indulgences to those whom he had excommunicated, he answered, I absolve and bless all who firmly believe that I have such a power, except Henry, whom they call king; the usurper of the apostolic see, Gui-

bert, and the chief persons, who have encouraged and supported them in their wickedness with their assistance or counsels.¹ The same writer tells us, that the holy pontiff comforted himself in his last illness, saying, "I die in exile because I have loved justice and hated iniquity;" and that lifting up his eyes to heaven before he expired, thither, he said, "I am going, and shall incessantly recommend you," addressing himself to the bishops and cardinals who were present, "To the protection and favor of the Almighty."² Indeed, his obstinately maintaining, to the last, what he had done to be just, suits the inflexible, haughty, and vindictive temper of Gregory, better than his humbly owning he had erred. Being consulted by the cardinals about his successor, and desired to name the person whom he thought the most capable and best qualified to oppose the wicked attempts of the anti-pope, he recommended three, leaving them at full liberty to choose which of the three they pleased, namely, Desiderius abbot of Monte Cassino, Otho archbishop of Ostia, and Hugh archbishop of Lyons; and the first two were accordingly chosen the one after the other.

Gregory was, to do him justice, a man of most extraordinary parts, of most uncommon abilities both natural and acquired, and would have had, at least, as good a claim to the surname of Great, as either Gregory or Leo, had he not, led by an ambition the world never heard of before, grossly misapplied those great talents to the most wicked purposes; to the establishing of an uncontrolled tyranny over mankind, of making himself the sole lord spiritual and temporal over the whole earth, and becoming by that means the sole disposer, not only of all ecclesiastical dignities and preferments, but of empires, states, and kingdoms. That he had nothing less in his view, sufficiently appears from his whole conduct, from his letters, and from a famous piece intitled "Dictatus Papæ," containing his maxims. It is to be met with after the fifty-fifth letter of the second book of Gregory's letters, and the reader will there find the following propositions, in all twenty-seven.

1. The Roman church was founded by none but our Lord.

2. The Roman pontiff alone should of right be styled universal bishop.

3. He alone can depose and restore bishops.

4. The pope's legate, though of an inferior rank, is in councils to take place of all bishops, and can pronounce sentence of deposition against them.

5. The pope can depose absent bishops.

6. No man ought to live in the same house with persons excommunicated by him.

¹ Bertold. ubi supra. ² Uspergen. & Bertold. ibid.

³ Sigebert ad ann. 1085.

¹ Paul. Bernried. Vit Greg. c. 110.

² Idem ibid. c. 108.

The power of deposing princes first claimed by Gregory. That claim repugnant to the example of Christ. No temporal power granted by Christ to his apostles.

7. The pope alone can make new laws, can establish new churches, can divide rich bishoprics, and unite poor ones.

8. He alone can wear the imperial ornaments.

9. All princes are to kiss his foot, and to pay that mark of distinction to him alone.

10. His name alone ought to be commemorated in the churches.

11. There is no name in the world but his; that is, as some understand it, he alone is to be styled pope. The name of pope, formerly common to all bishops, was appropriated, as father Paul observes, by Gregory VII. to the Roman pontiff.¹

12. It is lawful for him to depose emperors.

13. He can translate bishops from one see to another when thought necessary.

14. He can ordain a clerk in any church whatever.

15. A clerk ordained by him must not be preferred to a higher degree by any other bishop.

16. No general council is to be assembled without his order.

17. No book is to be deemed canonical but by his authority.

18. His judgment no man can reverse, but he can reverse all other judgments.

19. He is to be judged by no man.

20. No man shall presume to condemn the person that appeals to the apostolic see.

21. The greater causes of all churches ought to be brought before the apostolic see.

22. The Roman church never has erred, nor will she ever err according to Scripture.

23. The Roman pontiff canonically elected, becomes undoubtedly holy by the merits of St. Peter, according to the testimony of St. Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, and many of the fathers, as is related in the decrees of pope Symmachus.

24. With his leave an inferior may accuse his superior.

25. He can depose and restore bishops without assembling a synod.

26. He is not to be deemed a catholic who does not agree with the Roman church.

27. The pope can absolve subjects from the oath of allegiance which they have taken to a bad prince.

Some writers, I know, question the genuineness of that piece; but it is admitted as genuine by Baronius, by Panvinius, by the learned De Marca, and several other able critics, and the sentiments it contains are to be met with in most of Gregory's letters.

Gregory VII. was the first pope that claimed the power of deposing princes, of absolving their subjects from their oaths of allegiance, and disposing, as sovereign lord over the whole earth, of empires, kingdoms, and states at his pleasure. That such a power was vested in the bishops of Rome

was unknown to the world, nay, and to those bishops themselves, till the time of this pope; that is, for the space of near eleven hundred years. Hence the opinion ascertaining that power in the pope has, from its author, been branded not only by protestant, but by many Roman catholic writers, with the name of the Hildebrandine heresy. And truly no heresy, perhaps, ever was broached more repugnant to the example set by our Savior to his church, to the doctrine taught by his apostles, by the fathers, nay, by the popes themselves, and to the practice of the church in all preceding ages.

And in the first place, Christ as man, as founder and head of the church, disclaimed all temporal power, telling Pilate that he was indeed king, but that his "kingdom was not of this world;" that he "was born and came into the world," not to establish a temporal kingdom, but "to bear witness unto the truth," and thus found a spiritual kingdom. Hence he fled when the Jews would have made him king; and being asked by one to speak to his brother that he would divide the inheritance with him, he answered, "man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?"² Which was as much as to say, I came not into this world to concern myself with temporal affairs: apply to those whose province that is. From these passages it is manifest that Christ (as man, as founder and head of the church) disavowed all temporal power, and consequently that his vicars and ministers act in direct opposition to the example he has set them, in claiming or exercising any in that character. The pope pretends to be Christ's vicar upon earth; and what can be more absurd, as well as impious, than that he, as such, should claim what Christ himself ever disclaimed; that he should exercise the most extensive power that ever was known upon earth, when Christ declined exercising any whatever; that he should pretend to interpose as supreme judge in disputes about empires and kingdoms, when Christ thought it foreign to his divine ministry to interpose as judge in a private quarrel between two brothers concerning an inheritance!

But though Christ exercised no temporal power himself, says Bellarmine, he vested the prince of the apostles St. Peter, and in him his successors in his see, with all temporal as well as spiritual power, leaving both him and them at full liberty to exert it when thought expedient or necessary for the good of his church. But of such a monarchy we meet with no traces in Scripture; nay, from Scripture it is manifest that no other than spiritual power was by Christ imparted to the apostles, namely—1. The power of preaching the Gospel all over the world, and baptizing those who believed. 2. The

¹ Benefices and Revenues, p. 58.

² John 18 : 34, 36, 37.

³ Luke 12 : 13, 14.

The power of loosening and binding no other than that of remitting or retaining sins, and common to all the apostles. All, without distinction, subject to the higher powers. Princes owned by the popes themselves for their lords.

power of "binding and loosening," or of "remitting sins or retaining them." 3. The power of consecrating or celebrating the eucharist. 4. The power of excluding those from the church who did not hear the church, or treating them as heathens and publicans, with whom the Jews never conversed. These are all different branches of spiritual power; and no mention is made in Scripture of any other communicated by our Savior to St. Peter in particular, or to the apostles in general: no other that was to pass from them to their successors; for the power of working miracles, of healing the sick, &c., was but a temporary power, and died with them.

The power of loosening and binding, say the sticklers for the papal monarchy, was not confined to spiritual, but extended to temporal matters, even to the absolving of subjects from the oaths they had taken to wicked princes, to the deposing of such princes, and giving their dominions to others. Thus was the power of "loosening and binding" understood by Gregory, and he therefore addressed the two apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, when he deposed the emperor Henry in the following words; "Go therefore most holy princes of the apostles, and what I have said confirm by your authority, that all men may know you can bind and loosen: you can take away and give upon earth empires and kingdoms." Thus Gregory. But the power of "loosening and binding" granted to the apostles in these words, "whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," was understood by the apostle St. John as only relating to the remitting or retaining of sins; and he thus explains it, "whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained;"² and thus were these words, "whatsoever ye shall," &c., understood and expounded by the fathers, all to a man, as has been shown by several Roman catholic, as well as protestant writers. Add to this, that according to the fathers, no power was given to St. Peter that was not common with him to the rest of the apostles;³ nay, the power of "loosening and binding" that was promised to him in these words, "and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven;"⁴ the power, I say, that was promised in these words to St. Peter, was granted in as full a manner, and in the same terms to all the apostles; "Verily I

say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."¹ If the power therefore of "loosening and binding" includes the deposing, or any other temporal power whatever, such a power was granted to all the apostles as well as to St. Peter, and to all their successors as well as his; and the successors of the other apostles, that is, all bishops may, by virtue of that power, depose kings, absolve their subjects from their oaths, dispose of kingdoms and empires, as well as the successors of St. Peter, the bishops of Rome. This the popes will not allow; and it is therefore incumbent upon them and the assertors of the temporal monarchy, which they claim as the successors of St. Peter, to show where any power whatever was granted to that apostle, distinct from that which was vested by our Savior in all the apostles.

The doctrine of pope Gregory, with respect to the deposing, or to any other temporal power whatever over princes, is not more repugnant to the example of our Savior, than it is to the doctrine taught by his apostles, nay and by the popes themselves in the preceding ages. Thus St. Paul teaches and commands subjection to "the higher powers:" "Let every soul," says that apostle, "be subject unto the higher powers.² Ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake:"³ and in his epistle to Titus, "Put them in mind," says he, "to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, &c."⁴ Here the faithful are taught and commanded to be subject to the "higher powers, to principalities, and magistrates;" and none are excepted, no, not even the "Prince of the apostles;" nay, he too requires and enjoins subjection and obedience to "every ordinance of man" in terms no less expressive than those of St. Paul: "Submit yourselves," says he, "to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors, or to them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, &c."⁵ I shall leave the assertors of the papal monarchy to reconcile the "subjection to the higher powers, to principalities and magistrates," so strictly required by the two "Princes of the apostles," as an indispensable duty incumbent upon all Christians, with the pope's pretending to be free from all subjection; nay, and to "subject" all princes to himself as supreme lord, both temporal and spiritual over them, as well as their principalities, states, and kingdoms.

The popes, before Gregory, looked upon the emperors as supreme lords in temporals;

¹ Mat. 18 : 18.

² John 20 : 23.

³ See Cypr. de Unit. Eccles. Hier. in Jovin. i. 14. Aug. ep. 165. Chrys. in Gal. 2 : 8. Orig. in Mat. 16. Ambros. in Psal. 38. & de Dig. sac. &c.

⁴ Mat. 16 : 19.

¹ Mat. 18 : 18.

² Paul. ad Rom. 13 : 1.

³ Paul. ibid. 13 : 5.

⁴ Tit. 3 : 1.

⁵ Pet. 1 Ep. 2 : 13, 14, 15.

Obedience and subjection even to wicked princes recommended by the fathers as a duty. The deposing power unknown to the world till the time of Gregory VII.

as superior to all men in worldly power; as holding their power of God alone; as accountable to none but to God for their actions; and thought themselves, and all ecclesiastics as well as laymen, bound to obey their ordinances. "You are vested with a dignity above all men," said pope Agapetus to the emperor Justinian; "you have none upon earth above you; impose therefore upon yourself the necessity of observing the laws, as no power upon earth can force you to it."¹ "As your power," said pope Gelasius to the emperor Anastasius, "has been given you by God, even the ministers of religion and the prelates of the church must obey you in worldly affairs."² In like manner does pope Symmachus express himself in expounding the words of king David, "Against thee alone have I sinned."³ "David," says he, "was king; and knowing that, as such, he was liable to be punished for his sin by none but by God, he said, against thee alone, &c. Others sin against God and the king, but the king has none above him to punish him for his sin, and he therefore sins against God alone."⁴ Would Symmachus have writ thus if he had known himself to be vested with the power of deposing kings; that is, of inflicting the greatest punishment that can be inflicted on a king? Gregory the Great thought himself bound to obey the commands of the emperor, even when to him they appeared unjust, and inconsistent with the laws of the church. Thus, being commanded by the emperor Mauritius to publish a law forbidding those who served in the army to embrace a monastic life, he first caused that law to be published in different parts of the world in compliance with the emperor's order, and then remonstrated against it, thus complying, as he expresses himself, with the duty he owed to his lord the emperor, and yet not neglecting that which he owed to God, as he apprehended the law to be displeasing to him.⁵ In a letter which he wrote to Theodore, the emperor's physician, he complains of Mauritius for not allowing his soldiers to serve God, who had raised him to the throne, and vested him with a power over the priesthood as well as the soldiers.⁶ From these passages, and many more might be alledged to the same purpose out of the writings of other popes, it is manifest, that the best among them knew of no temporal power above that of sovereign princes, but thought themselves no less bound, than the meanest of their subjects, to obey their commands, even when they appeared to them repugnant to the laws of the church.

The same unreserved obedience to the

"higher powers," to kings and princes, even to wicked, pagan, or heretical kings and princes, was recommended by the fathers of the church as an indispensable duty incumbent upon all Christians without distinction; and the reason they alledged why the same obedience ought to be yielded to bad as to good princes, to the persecutors as to the defenders of the Christian religion, was, "because all power is of God; and therefore, whosoever resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God:" adding the charge given to servants by St. Peter: "Servants, be subject to your masters with all fear, not only to the good and gentle, but also to the froward;"⁷ and from thence concluding, that as it is not lawful for servants to withdraw their obedience and subjection to their froward masters, so neither is it lawful for Christians to withdraw their obedience and subjection to the "powers ordained of God," even when they persecute the church instead of defending it.² They knew not, it seems, that the pope was supreme lord over all the princes of the earth, and that he could, by his apostolic authority, depose them, and bestow their dominions upon whom he pleased, else they would have applied to him, instead of declaring, as they did when persecuted by the pagan or Arian princes, that they had no resource but in sighs, tears, and patience.³

That Gregory VII. was the first pope that ever exercised, or pretended to exercise, the deposing power, or indeed any other temporal power over princes, evidently appears from all the contemporary writers. For though some of them, adhering to the pope, strove to justify the sentence he pronounced against the emperor, all agree in this, that no such sentence had ever been pronounced by any pope before, and that it struck with its novelty the whole Christian world. "I read and read again the Gestes of the Roman kings and emperors," says Otho Frisingensis, "but do not find that any of them besides the present (meaning Henry IV.) ever was divested by the Roman pontiffs of his kingdom:"⁴ and Sigebert, "the popes used no other but the spiritual sword, till the time of Gregory, the last of that name, who first employed and taught other popes to employ the sword of war."⁵ Gregory VII. was the last of that name when Sigebert wrote this epistle or apology, that is, in 1103. Waltram, bishop of Hamburg, in his apology for the emperor, written in 1093, calls the decree against that prince a "new and wicked attempt," and in two books proves it to be repugnant to Scripture and tradition, re-

¹ Pet. 1 Ep. 18.

² See Dupin. de Antiq. Eccles. Discip. Dissert. vii. p. 433, et seq.

³ Nazian. orat. in Julian. Ambros. in orat. ad Auxilient. &c.

⁴ Otho Frising. in Frag.

⁵ Sigebert. in ep. pro Leodegar.

¹ Agap. in Parœn. ad Justin. Num. 1, 21, 27.

² Gelas. ep. 8.

³ Psal. 51: 4.

⁴ Inno. iii. in Psal. 51.

⁵ Greg. I. ii. ep. 62.

⁶ Greg. I. ii. ep. 64.

Instances alleged by Gregory to support his claim to the deposing power foreign to the purpose. His reasons inconclusive.

proaching the bishops, who stood by Gregory, with acting contrary to the express command of God and the practice of the church in all ages.¹ Eberhard archbishop of Salzburg, in a speech, which he made in the diet at Ratisbon, in the time of Frederic II. calls "Hildebrand the founder of the empire of antichrist, and the first that, under color of religion, began the wicked war, which has been," says he, "not less wickedly carried on by his successors." The power therefore claimed by Gregory was till his time utterly unknown to the whole Christian world; nay and to the popes themselves, else, as many of them quarreled with, and some were persecuted and even deposed by princes, they would, upon such provocation, have exerted their power, and deposed them in their turn. But even the most daring among them contented themselves with excommunications, censures, and interdicts: and hence the opinion, vesting any temporal power in the pope over sovereign princes, or their states and dominions, was branded by Sigebert, and very deservedly, with the name of the Hildebrandine heresy.² And truly no heresy ever arose in the church more pernicious to the peace, tranquillity, and welfare of mankind, none that ever occasioned more conspiracies, insurrections, rebellions, massacres, assassinations; which must all be placed to the account of Gregory, the first author of that seditious and impious doctrine.

Nothing can more plainly show, that the opinion, ascribing to the pope the deposing or any other power over princes in temporal affairs, is destitute of all foundation, than the instances and reasons, upon which it is founded by Gregory himself, the first that claimed it. The first instance he produces is that of king Childeric, whom he supposes to have been deposed by pope Zachary. But nothing is more certain in history than that Childeric was deposed by the lords of the kingdom for his incapacity, and not by the pope on account of any crime cognizable by his see, as I have hinted above, and proved from the contemporary writers in the life of that pope. The other instance alleged by Gregory is that of St. Ambrose excommunicating, as he says, the emperor Theodosius. But first, that bishop pronounced no sentence of excommunication against the emperor: he only ordered the doors to be shut when he offered to enter the church, nor would he allow him to enter it till he had performed due penance for the unjust and cruel slaughter of the people of Thessalonica. In the second place Ambrose did not attempt to divest him of his power, or absolve his subjects from their oaths of allegiance; so that this instance is

quite foreign to the purpose. Lastly, had he done so, it would follow from thence, that the deposing power was vested in other bishops, at least in the bishop of Milan as well as in the bishop of Rome, which the advocates for the papal supremacy will not allow. The third instance is that of a privilege, supposed to have been granted by Gregory the Great, with this clause, "If any king, priest, judge, or any secular person whatever, shall knowingly transgress this our constitution, let him be deprived of his power, honor, and dignity." But that privilege is now generally looked upon as a mere forgery, foisted into that pope's letters after his time. For in one of his letters it is said to have been granted to an hospital,¹ in another to St. Mary's at Autun,² and in a third to St. Martin's in the suburbs of that city.³ Besides, the style is thought by the best judges to be very different from that of all Gregory's other writings; and even they, who allow that piece to be genuine, understand the words of the clause as only imprecating, "may he be deprived of his power," &c; for those words extend to priests as well as to kings, and consequently to the popes themselves; and we cannot suppose that Gregory declared them also to be deprived of their dignity in case they transgressed that privilege.

To these instances the pope adds the following reasons. 1. The apostolic see has received of our Savior the power of judging spiritual matters, and consequently that of judging temporal concerns, which is a power of an inferior degree. 2. When our Savior said to St. Peter, "feed my sheep," when he granted him the power of loosing and binding, he did not except kings. 3. The episcopal dignity is of divine institution; the royal is the invention of men, and owes its origin to pride and ambition. As bishops therefore are above kings, as well as above all other men, they may judge them as well as all other men. Thus reasons Gregory, and very absurdly, since, allowing all he says to be true, we could not conclude from thence any power to have been granted to St. Peter and his successors that was not granted to the other apostles, and in them to all their successors. For he speaks of the episcopal dignity in general; and from its being superior to that of kings, argues a power in bishops, and consequently in all bishops, of judging kings. The apostles had no power, either spiritual or temporal, but what was communicated to them by our Savior; and from Scripture it appears that he communicated to them the one and not the other, the spiritual and not the temporal, which he himself always disclaimed. I have shown above, that the power of "loosing and bind-

¹ Waltram. Apol. pro Henr.

² Sigebert. ad ann. 1058.

¹ Greg. epist. lib. ii. ep. 10.

² Idem, epist. 11.

³ Idem, epist. 12.

The doctrine taught and practised by Gregory heretical. Gregory lays claim to most kingdoms in Europe. To Spain.

ing," was no other than that of remitting or retaining sins, and that such a power was granted in as full a manner to all the apostles as it was to St. Peter. By the power of "feeding the sheep" of Christ was understood, by all the expounders of the Scripture till Gregory's time, the power of instructing and teaching; and that power was by our Savior imparted to all his apostles in the following words; "all power is given to me in heaven and on earth; go therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them, and teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I command you;"¹ and, "go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature."² The apostles, says Chrysostom, explaining these passages, "were all in common entrusted with the whole world, and had the care of all nations."³ It is true, as Gregory observes, that when Christ said to St. Peter, "feed my sheep," he did not except kings, the apostle being commissioned by those words to feed, that is, "to teach every creature," and consequently kings as well as their subjects. To feed and command, to be shepherd and sovereign, were synonymous terms, as Gregory understood them. But St. Peter himself understood them in a very different sense. For, in his second epistle general, he requires the overseers to "feed the flock of God," but forbids them to assume any power over them, "neither as being lords," says he, "over God's heritage." In short, the words "feed my sheep" were understood, till Gregory's days, by the whole church as only relating to spiritual matters; and Bellarmine himself has not been able to produce one single writer that understood them, before that pope's time, in any other sense. What the pope adds, namely, that the royal power owes its origin to pride and ambition, is false and repugnant to the doctrine of St. Paul, teaching, that "there is no power but of God," and that "the powers that be are ordained of God."⁴

Such are the foundations upon which Gregory built the most extensive monarchy that ever was known upon earth, namely, false facts, false reasonings, and false interpretations of Scripture; and he might as well have found the pope, as did Innocent III., vested with such an extraordinary power in the first chapter of Genesis, where it is said that God made two great lights, as in any of the passages he has produced. And now to conclude; as the opinion ascribing to the pope the deposing, or any other temporal power whatever over princes, far from having any foundation in Scripture, in reason, in history, is evidently repugnant to the example set by Christ to his church, to the doctrine taught and often recommended

to all Christians without exception, by his apostles, by the fathers, by the popes themselves, and to the practice of the church in all ages till the time of this Gregory; and has besides occasioned more rebellions against the "powers ordained of God," more slaughter and bloodshed than any heresy we read of in history; may it not, ought it not to be looked upon as the very worst heresy that ever arose from the times of the apostles to this day? Should a man teach adultery, incest, murder, &c. to be lawful, he would be deemed a heretic by Christians of all denominations, these crimes being expressly forbidden and declared unlawful in Scripture. And is not he who teaches perjury, rebellion, assassinations, &c. to be lawful, though no less expressly forbidden in Scripture than the crimes I have mentioned, nay, who commands them as duties, when conducive to the support of his usurped power, to be branded with the name of heretic? The doctrine taught by Gregory was greedily embraced, and frequently practised by his successors, deposing kings, absolving their subjects from their allegiance, encouraging rebellions, &c., as we shall see in the sequel; and this doctrine they still hold, as is manifest from their allowing its author a place in their calendar, and their worshipping him as a saint. If his doctrine be an error, it is one of a very high nature, of most dangerous consequence, implies great arrogance, injustice, pride, and ambition, tends to involve every Christian kingdom upon earth in civil wars, rebellions, conspiracies, &c. And how can they who see it in that light, as many Roman catholics do, and must consequently look upon the pope as a tyrant and an usurper, nevertheless communicate with him?

Gregory, not satisfied with the power of pulling down and setting up princes, kings, and emperors, at pleasure, as king of kings, monarch of the world, and sole lord, both spiritual and temporal, over the whole earth, claimed the sovereignty of all the kingdoms of Europe, as having once belonged to St. Peter, whose right was unalienable. Thus, being informed in the very beginning of his pontificate, that count Evulus, a man of great wealth and power, had formed a design of recovering the countries which the Moors had seized in Spain, and was levying forces with that view, he sent cardinal Hugh, surnamed the White, to let him know that Spain belonged to St. Peter before it was conquered by the Moors; that though the infidels had subdued that country, and held it for a long course of years, the rights of St. Peter still subsisted, there being no prescription against that apostle or his church, and that he, as supreme lord of the whole kingdom, not only approved of the count's design, but granted him all the places he should recover from the barbarians, upon condition that he held them of St. Peter and

¹ Mat. 28: 19.

² Mark. 16: 15. Luke 24: 47.

³ Chrys. Oper. l. viii. p. 115

⁴ Romans 13: 1, 2.

To France, Hungary, and the islands of Corsica and Sardinia.

his see. In the letter which he wrote at this time, addressed to all who were disposed to join in driving the Saracens out of Spain, he forbids any to enter that country who is not resolved to hold of St. Peter what acquisitions he may make, as he had rather it should remain in the hands of the infidels than that the holy Roman and universal church should be robbed of her undoubted right by her own children;¹ that is, he had rather the Christians in Spain should continue under the oppressive yoke of those infidels, than be rescued from it by a prince who did not pay homage, as a vassal, to the apostolic see. This letter, dated the last of April, 1073, and, consequently, written a few days after his election, shows what sentiments Gregory brought with him to the pontifical chair. Four years after, he wrote again to the kings and princes of Spain, renewing his claim to their respective kingdoms and principalities, as having belonged to his see when the Saracens seized them, and requiring those who held them, to pay the tribute they owed to St. Peter as their sovereign lord.²

As to France, Gregory pretended that formerly each house in that kingdom paid at least a penny a year to St. Peter, as their father and pastor, and that this sum was, by order of Charlemagne, collected yearly at Puy, in Velai, at Aix-la-Chapelle, and at St. Giles. For this custom he quotes a statute of that emperor, lodged, as he says, in the archives of St. Peter's church. But as that statute is to be found no where else, it is universally looked upon as a forgery, and by some even thought to have been forged by Gregory himself. However, he ordered his legates in France to exact that sum, and insist upon its being paid by all as a token of their subjection to St. Peter and his see.³

Solomon, king of Hungary, being driven from the throne by Geisa his cousin, had recourse to the emperor, whose sister he had married, and was by him restored to his kingdom, upon condition that he should hold it of him as his feudatory. This Gregory no sooner understood, than he wrote to Solomon, claiming the kingdom of Hungary as belonging to St. Peter, to whom he pretended it had been given by Stephen, the first Christian king of the country. "The elders of your country," said he in his letter to the king, "will inform you, that the kingdom of Hungary is the property of the holy Roman church, sanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ proprium est; that king Stephen, upon his conversion, offered it to St. Peter, and that the emperor Henry of holy memory, (meaning Henry III.), having conquered the country, sent the lance and the crown, the ensigns of royalty, to the body of St. Peter. If it therefore be true that you have agreed

to hold your kingdom of the king of the Germans, and not of St. Peter, you will soon feel the effects of the apostle's just indignation; for we, who are his servants and ministers, cannot tamely suffer the honor that is due to him to be taken from him and given to others."¹ Solomon was again driven out by Geisa, which Gregory construed into a judgment for the injustice he had done to St. Peter, telling the usurper that the prince of the apostles had given the kingdom to him, as Solomon had forfeited all right to it by rebelling against the holy Roman church, and paying that homage to the king of Germany which was due to none but her and her founder.² Geisa, thus countenanced by the pope in his usurpation, held the kingdom of Hungary to the hour of his death, which happened in 1077. He was succeeded by Ladislaus, who, to avoid the disturbances which he was sensible the pope would raise and foment amongst his subjects, if he held not his kingdom of him, immediately acknowledged himself for his vassal, declaring that he owed his power to God, and under him to none but St. Peter, whose commands he should ever readily obey, when signified to him by his successors in the apostolic see.

The two islands of Corsica and Sardinia he claimed as the patrimony of St. Peter, pretending that they had been formerly given, nobody knows when nor by whom, to the apostolic see. Hence he no sooner heard that the Christians had gained considerable advantages in Corsica over the Saracens, and recovered great part of that island, than he sent a legate to govern the countries which they had recovered, as the demesnes of his see, to encourage them in so laudable an undertaking, and assure them that he would assist them, to the utmost of his power, with men as well as with money, till they had reduced the whole island, provided they engaged to restore it to the lawful owner, St. Peter.³ As to Sardinia, he wrote to Orzoch, the chief judge, that island being then governed by judges, to let him know that his island had once belonged to St. Peter, as well as the neighboring island of Corsica; that the Normans, the Tuscans, the Lombards, and even some ultramontane princes, had applied to him for leave to invade it, offering to yield one half of the country to him, and to pay homage for the other; but that he had not hearkened, nor would he hearken, to any proposals of that nature till he knew how they were disposed towards the holy see, and what reception his legate, the bearer of this letter, should meet with.⁴ Here Gregory claims the sovereignty of the island, and threatens to let loose the Normans, the Tuscans, the Lombards, and with them the ultramontane

¹ Greg. l. i. ep. 7.
² Idem, viii. ep. 25.

³ Idem, l. iv. ep. 28.

⁴ Greg. lib. ii. ep. 13.
⁵ Idem, l. v. ep. 24.

⁶ Idem, ep. 2.
⁷ Idem, l. viii. ep. 10.

Gregory lays claim to Dalmatia, Russia, Denmark, Poland, Saxony, and England. He claims the same power over all bishops as over all princes, and exercises it in France.

nations against the natives, if they did not own him for their sovereign. Baronius tells us, that from many ancient monuments it appears that Sardinia was under the dominion of the apostolic see.¹ But not one monument has been able to produce prior to Gregory's time, nor can he name one pope that claimed either of those islands before him.

Gregory, claiming the power of setting up as well as pulling down kings, in order to subject Dalmatia to his see, conferred the title of king upon Demetrius, duke of that country, obliging him, on that occasion, to swear allegiance to him and his successors in the see of St. Peter. That oath the pope's legate required upon delivering to the duke, in the pope's name, a standard, a sword, a scepter, and a royal diadem. The new king at the same time promised to pay yearly, on Easter-day, two hundred pieces of silver to the holy pope Gregory, and his successors lawfully elected, as supreme lords of the kingdom of Dalmatia; to assist them, when required, to the utmost of his power; to receive, entertain, and obey their legates; to reveal no secrets that they should trust him with; but to behave on all occasions as became a true son of the holy Roman church, and a faithful vassal of the apostolic see.²

Demetrius was at this time king of Russia, and his son coming to Rome to visit the tombs of the apostles, Gregory made him partner with his father in the kingdom, requiring him, on that occasion, to take an oath of fealty to St. Peter and his successors. This step the pope pretended to have taken at the request of the son, who, he said, had applied to him, being desirous to receive the kingdom from St. Peter, and to hold it as a gift of that apostle. The pope added in his letter to the king that he had complied with the request of his son, not doubting but it would be approved by him and all the lords of his kingdom, since the prince of the apostles would thenceforth look upon their country and defend it as his own.³ From some of Gregory's letters it appears that Sueno, king of Denmark, had promised to subject his kingdom to the apostolic see. But we do not find that this promise ever was fulfilled, either by him or his son and successor. Gregory, in one of his letters to Sueno, speaks of a province in Italy possessed by heretics, which he offers to him, as if he had a right to dispose of the property of heretics, and invites him to conquer it.⁴ Who these heretics were, or where they dwelt, history does not inform us. The Polanders had, from the time of their conversion, sent yearly a present in money to St. Peter, namely, a hundred marks of silver; and this sum, originally a charity, Gregory exacted under the name of tribute,

due to him and his successors as sovereign lords of the country.¹ As for Saxony, he pretended the whole country to have been given by Charlemagne to St. Peter, as soon as he conquered it.² But such a donation was never heard of till Gregory's time. I have spoken above of his claim to the kingdom of England, and the resolute answer William the Conqueror returned to his legate. In Italy, the Normans, masters of Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily, the dukes of Benevento, Capua, and Aversa, and almost all the other princes, the country being divided into many small independent principalities, were obliged to acknowledge themselves vassals of the apostolic see, and swear allegiance to the pope, in order to prevent their dominions from being invaded by their more powerful neighbors, whom Gregory never failed, when occasion offered, to stir up against them, till he brought them into subjection to him and his see.

Gregory pretending that all power, spiritual as well as temporal, centered in him, claimed and exercised the same supreme, unlimited, uncontrollable authority over bishops and the other ministers of the church in spiritual matters, as he did over emperors and kings in temporal concerns. In his letters innumerable instances occur of bishops summoned to Rome from all parts, to give an account of their conduct, and there either condemned and deposed, or absolved and confirmed in their sees. He sent, in like manner, legates *a Latere* into France, Germany, and Spain, with full powers to assemble councils, to summon the bishops to assist at them, to suspend, and even to depose such of them as did not comply with that summons. Thus Hugh, bishop of Die, having in 1078 appointed, as the pope's legate, a council to meet at Autun, suspended the archbishops of Reims, Besançon, Sens, Bourges, and Tours, and excommunicated the bishops of Paris and Chartres for not obeying the summons, and they were all obliged to travel to Rome in order to be absolved by the pope; and by him they were accordingly absolved, but upon condition that, returning to France, they asked pardon of the legate.³ The legate held several other councils in France, namely, at Poitiers, at Avignon, at Meaux, suspending, excommunicating, and deposing such of the clergy as he found guilty of concubinage or simony; that is, such as were married, or had received the investiture of benefices from laymen. Manasses, archbishop of Reims, was the only person in all France who had courage enough to oppose the arbitrary proceedings of the pope's legate. But he was deposed in a council held at Lions in the beginning of the year 1080; and the sentence pronounced by the legate in that assembly was confirm-

¹ Bar. ad ann. 1073.

² Greg. l. ii. ep. 74.

³ Idem, ad ann. 1076.

⁴ Idem, l. ii. ep. 51.

¹ Greg. l. ii. ep. 7.

² Idem, l. viii. ep. 25.

³ Greg. l. ix. ep. 15, 16. & l. v. ep. 17.

Gregory exercises the same power over all bishops as over all princes in Spain, Germany, and all countries but England. He is canonized.

firmed by the pope, who wrote immediately to the clergy and people of Reims, to the suffragans of that metropolis, and to the king, requiring them no longer to acknowledge Manasses for bishop of Reims, but to drive him from that see, and choose, or cause another to be chosen in his room.¹ In his letter to the king, Philip, the first of that name, he commands him on the part of St. Peter, and begs him on his own, to show no marks of favor to Manasses, once bishop of Reims, but deposed for his enormous wickedness by the judgment of the apostolic see. However, we find Manasses still in possession of that see in 1109, that is, twenty-four years after the death of Gregory.²

The pope exerted, by his legates, a no less despotic power over the Bishops of Spain, Germany, and all other countries, except England; where his legates were allowed to assemble no councils, nor to exercise any kind of jurisdiction whatever. The king would not even suffer any of the English, nor indeed of his Norman bishops, to go to Rome, though summoned thither by the pope, to receive their palls, or to assist at his councils, as appears from several of Gregory's letters. For in one he complains of William, the new archbishop of Rouen, for not applying to him either for his confirmation or for the pall;³ in another he reproaches the Norman bishops, in general, with disobedience to the commands of his legates, in refusing to assist at their synods, though invited by them, and ordered, in his name, to attend; and adds, that he had not seen the face of one Norman bishop since his advancement to the pontifical throne.⁴ In 1081 he wrote a threatening letter to Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, wherein he tells him, that though he had been frequently invited to Rome, upon matters that nearly concerned the faith and religion, he had, out of pride or contempt, declined complying with that invitation; that he had not alledged, nor so much as pretended to alledge, any canonical impediment; that he had been too long suffered thus to go on abusing his patience; but if he did not appear at Rome by the feast of All saints next ensuing, and thus atone for his past disobedience, he should be excluded from the protection and favor of St. Peter, and suspended from all the functions of the episcopal office.⁵ But Lanfranc chose rather to obey the king than the pope, who, indeed, continued to complain of the conduct of the archbishop; but, unwilling to quarrel with the king, contented himself with menaces only: nay, his legate in France, Hugh bishop of Die, having suspended several of the Norman bishops for not assisting at his councils, Gregory im-

mediately ordered him to absolve them; directing him, at the same time, to do nothing, for the future, that might exasperate the king of England, without a particular order from him.¹ Thus did the Norman and English bishops, by the wise and resolute conduct of their king, enjoy their ancient privileges and former liberty, while all the bishops around them were forced, through the bigotry, neglect, or incapacity of their princes, to submit to Gregory's unjust usurpations.

Gregory has been styled by some, and very justly, the founder of the papal grandeur. For by him it was first happily discovered, that God's command, enjoining "every soul to be subject to the higher powers," did not extend to the successors of St. Peter; but, on the contrary, that our Savior, by these words, "feed my sheep," made that apostle, and those who were to succeed him in the see of Rome, supreme lords and monarchs of the whole earth in temporals as well as in spirituals: vesting them, as such, with an unlimited power of pulling down princes, kings, and emperors, if they disobeyed their commands, and setting others up, at pleasure, in their room. Such extravagant notions, utterly unknown to all Gregory's predecessors, as well as to the rest of mankind, would, one would imagine, have been universally looked upon, even by his successors, as the ravings of a man quite mad with ambition; like those of the madman at Athens, who had persuaded himself that all the power and wealth in the world were his own. But instead of that, the succeeding popes have not only adopted those very notions, but honored Gregory, by whom they were first broached, with a place in the calendar, and yearly celebrate his festival on the 25th of May, the day of his death, under the title of St. Gregory VII. pope and confessor. Pope Anastasius, the fourth of that name, raised to the see in 1322, ordered him to be painted in a church at Rome among the other saints, which pope Gregory XIII. looked upon as a kind of canonization, and therefore caused his name to be inserted in the Roman Martyrology in 1584. However, he was nowhere publicly worshipped as a saint till the year 1609, when Paul V. by a special bull, permitted John de Guevara, archbishop of Salerno, and his chapter, to solemnize his festival. Leave was afterwards granted by Alexander VII. and Clement XI. to several communities to honor him as a saint. But Benedict XIII. ordered him to be acknowledged for a saint by the whole church; and by his appointment a prayer and a legend were composed to be every where used on his anniversary. But as he is commended in the legend for his invincible constancy

¹ Greg. l. viii. ep. 17, 18, 19, 20.

² Nichol. Successor. l. i. c. 26.

³ Greg. Epist. l. vii. ep. 2.

⁴ Idem ibid. ep. 20.

⁵ Idem, l. ix. ep. 1.

¹ Greg. Epist. l. ix. ep. 5.

Gregory's writings. Victor chosen;—[Year of Christ, 1086.]

and firmness in opposing the wicked attempts of the emperor Henry (that is, for maintaining his undoubted right of granting investitures), for his resolution and intrepidity in cutting him off from the communion of the church, depriving him of his kingdom, and absolving his subjects from their allegiance, that piece has been forbidden in most Catholic kingdoms as a seditious libel, calculated to encourage perjury, sedition, and rebellion.¹ To worship as a saint the pope, who had claimed, and had been sainted for exerting, the deposing power, would be acknowledging that power in his see.²

As to the writings of Gregory, 359 of his letters have reached our times, and are divided into nine books, containing those he wrote from the time of his election, in April, 1073, to 1082. Mention is made by some of a tenth book, which is no more to be met with; and the eleventh, as they call it, has but one letter and the fragment of another. The commentary upon the seven penitential Psalms, commonly ascribed to Gregory the Great, is thought by some to be the work of Gregory VII., several passages in that piece being levelled against an emperor, said there to have revived simony in the church, to be the author of a dangerous schism, to have wickedly attempted to enslave the church, and subject even the apostolic see to his empire. All this they understand of the emperor Henry IV., and probably the author

of the commentary meant him. But as that work is written in a very different style from that of Gregory VII., we can from thence only conclude it to have been composed, as in all likelihood it was, in that pope's time. We know of no emperor in the days of Gregory the Great, that attempted to enslave the church, &c., nor indeed had the church yet begun to claim any exemption from the secular or civil power; a plain proof that the piece in question must be the performance of a writer that lived in much later times. A commentary in manuscript, written by Gregory VII., upon the gospel of St. Matthew, is said to be lodged in the library of the archbishop of Canterbury, at Lambeth.

Gregory was buried at Salerno, where he died, and there his relics are worshiped to this day in the cathedral dedicated to St. Matthew, whose body is supposed to have been discovered in that city in 1080. Marsilius Columna, preferred to the archiepiscopal see of Salerno in 1574, assures us that he saw with his own eyes, and touched with his own hands, "proprîis oculis inspeximus, proprîisque manibus contrectavimus," the remains of the holy pontiff Gregory, quite entire, with all his pontifical ornaments yet fresh, though near five hundred years had elapsed since he was buried;¹ which might be true, were Gregory in a very different place from that in which he is supposed to be by those who worship him.

VICTOR III., THE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ALEXIS COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East.*—HENRY IV., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1086.] Gregory, being in his last illness, consulted about his successor by the cardinals who attended him, recommended three persons to their choice, namely, Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, and presbyter cardinal of the Roman church; Otho, bishop of Ostia; and Hugh, his legate in France, whom he had transferred from the see of Die to the archiepiscopal see of Lyons, all three men of his own principles, as well as temper, and therefore judged by

him the best qualified to complete the work which he had begun—that of subjecting the temporal to the spiritual power, and the one and the other to the apostolic see. As by naming Desiderius in the first place, he seemed to prefer him to the other two, the cardinals met at Rome soon after his death, with a design to raise him, in compliance with the recommendation of the deceased pope, to the pontifical throne. But Desiderius, finding that the cardinals and the rest of the clergy, as well as the leading men in Rome, were resolved to choose him, and even force him to acquiesce in their choice, he privately left Rome and returned to his monastery. The cardinals, determined to choose him and no other, earnestly entreated him to return, but could not prevail upon him to quit his monastery till the month of May of the following year, 1086, when the

¹ See a piece entitled, "Avocat du Diable."

² In the church of St. Severino at Naples, Gregory is to be seen painted among the other popes of the Benedictine order, holding a crozier or pastoral staff in his left, and a huge scourge in his right hand, lifted up in a lashing posture, with imperial and royal scepters and diadems under his feet, to show that he was the scourge of princes, and, in a manner, trampled upon emperors and kings: and lest his thus treating the higher powers should be thought inconsistent with true sanctity, over his head are written in large capitals these words, "Sanctus Gregorius VII." But it is not at all likely that princes ever will be brought to allow him that title, or suffer such a saint to be worshiped in their dominions.

¹ Marsil. Colum. de Vit. Gest. & Translat. Math. Apost.

Victor declines the pontificate, but is prevailed upon to accept it;—[Year of Christ, 1087.] Hugh, archbishop of Lions, declares against him. Victor supported by the countess Mathilda. He sends a fleet against the Saracens of Africa.

cardinals being all summoned to Rome, in order to proceed to the election of a new pope, he was in the end persuaded by the prince of Salerno, and by Roger, duke of Apulia and Calabria, who had lately succeeded his father, Robert Guiscard, in that dukedom, to comply with that summons. Upon his arrival, the cardinals, the clergy, and the people met in great numbers, and proclaimed Desiderius pope, as having been chosen by Gregory, his predecessor, of blessed memory, they carried him by force to the church of St. Lucia, to acknowledge him there with the usual ceremonies. But, still opposing his election, he would not suffer them to clothe him with the pontifical robes; and the fourth day after he was chosen he left Rome, quitted at Terracina the red cope, one of the ensigns of the pontifical dignity, which they had forced upon him, and again withdrew to Monte Cassino. He was thus elected and owned for lawful pope, under the name of Victor III., on Whitsunday, which, in 1086, fell on the 24th of May. He continued at Monte Cassino, protesting against his election as null, since he had not consented to it. But a council, consisting of the bishops of Campania, Apulia, and Calabria, meeting the following year, 1087, at Capua, to redress some abuses that prevailed in those parts, Desiderius repaired to it, and meeting there duke Roger, with the princes of Capua and Salerno, he was, at last, in a manner, forced to yield to their entreaties, joined to the tears of all the bishops of that assembly, representing to him, in the most pathetic terms, the distressed condition of the church, and the dangers to which he exposed it, by his obstinate and ill-timed resistance. He resumed the cope, and appearing in the council with the other ensigns of his dignity, he allowed them to acknowledge him for lawful pope. This happened on Palm Sunday, the 21st of March. From Capua the pope returned to Monte Cassino, and having kept his Easter there, set out from thence for Rome, attended by the princes of Capua and Salerno. Upon his arrival in that city, he found the church of St. Peter possessed by his rival, Guibert. But he being soon driven from thence by the forces which the two princes had brought with them, Victor was consecrated in that basilic on the 9th of May, 1087, two years, wanting a few days, after the death of Gregory. Thus far, Leo Ostiensis, an eye-witness of what he writes.¹

Victor, having spent eight days at Rome, left that city and returned to Monte Cassino. Hugh, archbishop of Lions, had approved of the election of Victor, as well as the other cardinals of that party. But having, upon his long resistance, conceived hopes that he

never would accept the offered dignity, and consequently that he himself would, in all likelihood, be chosen, as he had been recommended by Gregory, he was so provoked at his disappointment, when Victor consented to his promotion, that he declared against him, pretending that he had discovered many things relating to his conduct, which he was ignorant of when he approved his election. In a letter, which he wrote to the countess Mathilda, he charged Victor in particular with favoring the emperor, with disapproving the decrees and censuring the conduct of Gregory, and even with encouraging the emperor under-hand to march to Rome, and lay waste the lands of the holy Roman church.¹ But the countess, whom Hugh flattered himself he should thus gain over to his party, coming to Rome at the head of her army, declared for Victor, drove his rival Guibert from all the places he held beyond the Tiber; and, having recovered the church of St. Peter, which he had retaken upon the pope's return to Monte Cassino, she invited his holiness back to Rome, assuring him that she was resolved to support him to the utmost of her power against all his enemies; and, at the same time expressing great desire to see him. Victor complied with the invitation, and was, on his arrival, received by the countess and her army with all possible marks of respect and esteem. At her request he celebrated mass in St. Peter's, at which she assisted, with all the chief officers of her army, who, on this occasion, received the papal benediction. The countess, having had several conferences with the pope, left Rome, in order to stop the progress of the emperor's arms in Lombardy. She was no sooner gone than the partisans of Guibert made themselves masters of the church of St. Peter, and most of the places which she had taken from them, which obliged Victor to quit Rome anew, and return to Monte Cassino.²

As the Saracens from Africa made frequent descents upon the coast of Italy, committing everywhere dreadful ravages, and carrying multitudes of people into captivity, Victor, touched with compassion, applied to the Italian princes; and having prevailed upon them to enter into a league against the common enemy, a numerous army was raised, and sent by the pope to Africa with the standard of St. Peter, and remission of all the sins they had committed till the day of their embarkation. Upon their landing in Africa they committed as dreadful ravages there as the Saracens had done in Italy, put an hundred thousand of them to the sword, laid their chief city in ashes, and returned home loaded with an immense booty. We

¹ Leo Ostien. l. iii. c. 65—67

¹ Chron. Virdun. tom. Concil. x.

² Chron. Cassin.

are told that it was known at Rome they had gained a complete victory over the Saracens, the very day on which the battle was fought; which plainly shows, says the historian, that the expedition was pleasing to God; that is, that God was pleased with the massacre of so many thousands. Of this expedition mention is made by Bertholdus, and the glorious success that attended it is by him chiefly ascribed to the people of Genoa and Pisa, both states being at this time in a very flourishing condition, and powerful at sea. That writer adds, that they obliged the pagan king to take shelter in a strong-hold, which they attacked with such fury, that the king, fearing he should fall into their hands, agreed to acknowledge himself a vassal and tributary to the pope.²

Victor, soon after his return to Monte Cassino, appointed a council to meet at Benevento; but it consisted only of the bishops of Apulia, Calabria, and the neighboring countries. However, the pope assisted, and presided at it in person. In that council the pope, after a most furious invective against Guibert, as the forerunner of anti-Christ, as a ravenous wolf let loose against the flock of Christ, cursed, excommunicated, and anathematized him anew. In the next place the pope, having acquainted the bishops of the assembly with the behavior of Hugh, archbishop of Lyons, who, he said, had not acknowledged him, for no other reason but because he had accepted the pontifical dignity, which the other panted after, he forbade them to communicate with him, or with Richard, abbot of Marseilles, and cardinal, who had joined him for the same reason, and jointly with him endeavored to divide the church with a new schism. Lastly, Victor, to show himself a worthy successor of Gregory, renewed in this council the decrees that pope had made against lay investitures, and the following decree was issued: "If any one shall henceforth receive a bishopric or abbey from the hand of a layman, let him not be looked upon as a bishop or an abbot, nor revered as such. We deprive him of the protection of St. Peter, and forbid him to enter the church, till he has resigned the place which he has accepted, and could not accept without being guilty of ambition and disobedience, which is idolatry. And this decree extends to all inferior dignities and preferments in the church. If any emperor, king, duke, prince, or count, or any other secular person whatever, shall presume to dispose of any ecclesiastical dignity, we include him in the same sentence; and they too are included, who communicate with such bishops, abbots, and clerks. Let no man receive the communion from any but a catholic. If no catholic priest is to be found,

it is better to be deprived of the visible communion, and communicate invisibly with God, than to be separated from him by receiving it from a heretic."¹ The pope here supposes the receiving of any ecclesiastical preferment from a layman to be simony and heresy.

While the council was sitting the pope was taken dangerously ill; and he thereupon returned in great haste to Monte Cassino, attended by several cardinals and all the bishops of the council. As his illness increased, he ordered the monks to assemble in the chapter-house, and having caused himself to be carried thither, he appointed Oderisius, monk of that monastery, and deacon of the Roman church, abbot in his room, forbade him and the abbots who should succeed him, to alienate any lands, houses, or tenements, belonging to the monastery, on pain of excommunication, and commanded all the monasteries under the jurisdiction of Monte Cassino to entertain, once a year, at dinner, all the monks of that monastery. The next day he called together the bishops and cardinals, and after a pathetic speech upon the distracted state of the church, he warmly recommended to them Otto, or Otho, bishop of Ostia, for his successor, as one whom Gregory himself had nominated to succeed him. The pope then taking Otto, as he was present, by the hand, and presenting him to the other cardinals and bishops, said, "Receive him in my room, and place him in the Roman see."² He then ordered his grave to be dug in the chapter-house, and died, three days after, on the sixteenth of September, 1087, having held the see from the time of his election, one year, and from his consecration five months and seven days.²

Hugh of Flavigni, who was no friend to this pope, writes, that he was struck by the hand of God while he was celebrating mass in St. Peter's; and that to atone for his ambition in usurping the apostolic see, he resigned his dignity before he died, and ordered the monks of Monte Cassino to bury him as abbot, and not as pope.³ But this story is of a piece with that of Trithemius, ascribing Victor's death to poison, which he says the emperor caused to be mixed with the wine of the sacrament.⁴ He died, according to Sigebert,⁵ of a flux, and, as we learn from his epitaph, in one of the chapels of Monte Cassino, in the sixtieth year of his age. He was descended from the illustrious family of the dukes of Benevento, embraced a monastic life in the monastery of Cava, in 1050, succeeded pope Stephen IX. as abbot of the monastery of Monte Cassino in 1058, and was created a cardinal by pope Nicholas II., in 1059. He is honored by

¹ Leo Ost. l. iii. c. 67.

² Berthold. in Chron. ad ann. 1089.

³ Leo Ost. l. iii. c. 71.

² Idem *ibid.*

⁴ Hugo Flavin. in Chron. Virdun.

⁵ Trithem. de Viris illust. l. iv. c. 13.

⁶ Sigebert in Chron. ad ann. 1086.

Election of Urban;—[Year of Christ, 1088.] His birth, education, &c. His circulatory letters.

the Benedictines as a saint, and his relics are worshipped to this day in the magnificent chapel of St. Bartharius, at Monte Cassino. Victor had adopted all the maxims of Gregory, and would have proved, had he lived longer, a no less dangerous enemy to the emperor.

Victor wrote, while he was abbot, four books of dialogues upon the miracles of St. Benedict, and the other monks of Monte

Cassino.¹ The three first books have reached our times,² but the fourth is supposed to be lost; and, as far as we can judge from the three that are still extant, we have no reason to grieve for the loss of the fourth. He wrote very many letters, says Petrus Diaconus, after his promotion, to Philip, king of France, and to Hugh, abbot of Cluny.³ But those letters have all undergone the same fate as his Fourth Book of Dialogues.

URBAN II., THE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ALEXIOUS COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East*.—HENRY IV., *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 1088.] Victor's death was no sooner known than the Romans, who had sided with him against Guibert, and the countess Mathilda, apprehending the dangerous consequences of a long vacancy, dispatched messengers to all the bishops of their party, pressing them to meet, as soon as they possibly could, in what place they should judge the most proper, it not being safe for them to come to Rome, and to proceed, without delay, to the election of a new pope. Hereupon it was agreed by the cardinals who had attended the deceased pope at Monte Cassino, and by Oderisius, abbot of that monastery, that they should assemble at Terracina, in Campania, the first week in Lent of the following year, 1088. This resolution they notified to all the bishops and abbots of Apulia, Calabria, Campania, and likewise to the clergy and people of Rome, desiring the bishops who could not attend in person, to send deputies, with a power, in writing, to agree, in their name, to the resolutions that should be taken by the assembly for the good of the church. They met at the time and place appointed, John, bishop of Porto, representing the clergy, and Benedict, prefect of Rome, the laity of that city. The bishops and abbots were in all forty, and it was agreed, at their first meeting, that they should spend three days in prayer and fasting, beseeching the Almighty to direct them in their choice. They met again on Sunday, the 12th of March, when Otto was unanimously chosen, and placed on the bishop's throne, amidst the loud acclamations of all who were present. They named him Urban II., and after his election he said solemn mass in the church of St. Peter and St. Cesarius, where he was elected.¹

That Otto, or, as some call him, Otho and Odo, was born in the province of Reims, is agreed on all hands, but whether at Chatillon on the Marne, or at Lageri, or in the city

of Reims, is uncertain, some calling him a native of one of these places, and some of another. He is said by all writers, who speak of him, to have been brought up in the church of Reims under the famous Bruno, founder of the order of Carthusians, and at that time chancellor of that church. He was afterwards made a canon of the church of Reims; but tired of the world he soon embraced a monastic life in the monastery of Cluny, and was there appointed prior by the famous abbot St. Odo. In 1078, Gregory VII., who had been acquainted with him while he lived in that monastery, called him to Rome, raised him soon after to the see of Ostia, and sent him, as a man of his own principles and temper, into Germany, to foment and improve the misunderstanding that then subsisted between the emperor and his German subjects.

Urban wrote soon after his election circulatory letters, addressed to all the faithful, to acquaint them with his promotion, and at the same time to let them know, that he was resolved strictly to observe all the regulations, and inviolably adhere to all the decrees of his predecessor Gregory. These letters have not reached us, the register of Urban's letters being lost; but express mention is made of them by Ordericus Vitalis, who tells us, that Urban wrote letters and sent legates into all the parts of the world; that Henry, prince of the Germans, was the only one that adhered to Guibert; that the French, the English, and all other nations upon the earth acknowledged Urban.⁴ But that writer was certainly misinformed with respect to the English, nothing being more certain, than that neither of the pretenders to the papacy was owned in England till several years after, as I shall have occasion to relate in the sequel.

¹ Petrus Diacon. c. 18.

² Bibliothec. Patrum, tom. 18.

³ Idem ibid.

⁴ Orderic. l. viii.

¹ Petrus Diacon. in Chron. Cassin. l. iv. c. 2.

Urban appoints the archbishop of Toledo primate of all Spain. Council of Rome ;—[Year of Christ, 1089.]
Council of Melfi. The marriage of Mathilda. The emperor reduces several places in Italy ;—[Year of Christ, 1090.]

The pope wrote in the month of October of the present year to Alphonsus son of Idelphonsus V. king of Leon and Castile, on the following occasion. That prince having in 1085 recovered, after a long siege, the city of Toledo from the Moors, who had held it, says the pope in his letter, for the space of 370 years, he appointed all the lords, bishops, and abbots of his kingdom to meet there, in order to choose a bishop capable of restoring the Christian religion to its ancient splendor in that metropolis. By that assembly was unanimously chosen Bernard, a monk of the Benedictine order, a man held by all in great esteem for the sanctity of his life and his learning. The king, pleased with the election, endowed the church, says the historian, very richly, and in 1088 sent the archbishop to Rome for the pall, entreating his holiness, in the letter he wrote to him on that occasion, not only to grant him the pall, but to appoint him primate of all Spain and Gothic Gaul. The pope received the archbishop with all possible marks of distinction, gave him the pall when he was first introduced to him, and a few days after issued a bull, restoring to the see of Toledo all the privileges that it had ever enjoyed, declaring Bernard primate of all Spain and Gothic Gaul, and commanding all the bishops in those parts to consult and obey him as such.¹ This bull is dated Anagni 1088, the first year of lord Urban's pontificate. This bull the archbishops of Taracon and Narbonne rejected as surreptitious, maintaining that the archbishops of Toledo had never exercised any sort of jurisdiction in the other provinces of Spain, as they were supposed to have done in that bull. But the pope, resolved to gratify the king, in order to put a stop at once to that dispute, declared Bernard his legate, vesting him with the legatine power over all the provinces of Spain, and that of Narbonne.² The primacy, granted by Urban to Bernard, was confirmed by seven popes to that bishop's successors in the see of Toledo, but it has ever been disputed by the Spanish bishops and the archbishops of Narbonne.³

The following year 1089 Urban assembled a council at Rome, said to have consisted of one hundred and fifteen bishops; and by that council Guibert was excommunicated, and with him the emperor, and all who adhered to the one or the other. Thus were all the bishops of Germany but five, cut off from the communion of the church; for at this time all but five, namely, those of Wirezburg, Passau, Worms, Constance, and Metz, adhered to Guibert and the emperor. As these excommunications produced great confusion in Germany, and furnished the malecontents with a plausible pretence to

take up arms against their sovereign, many of Henry's friends advised him to come to an agreement with the new pope, and forsaking Guibert to acknowledge him. The emperor was not averse to a reconciliation; but the bishops of his party were all to a man against it, sensible that, as they had received their bishoprics from him, the pope would insist on their resigning them; and thus were all thoughts of a reconciliation laid aside.

The pope, upon the breaking up of the council at Rome, left that city, not thinking himself safe there, and after a short stay at Terracina, went from thence to Melfi, in Apulia, where he held a council, at which were present seventy bishops, twelve abbots, Roger, duke of Apulia and Calabria, and all the Norman lords. By this council the decrees of Gregory against lay investitures, and the marriage of the clergy, were confirmed; and it was, besides, decreed that none should be admitted to orders who had been twice married; that no subdeacon should be ordained under fourteen years of age, no deacon under twenty, and no priest under thirty; that no person of servile condition should be received among the clergy; that abbots should exact no money of those who take the monastic habit; that laymen might make the wives, or, as they are called, the concubines, of the clergy, slaves; and that the sons of the clergy should not be admitted into the sacred order, unless they embraced a monastic life.¹ In this council the pope invested Roger, the son of Robert Guiscard, in the dukedom of Apulia and Calabria, by delivering to him the standard of St. Peter, after he had sworn allegiance to his lord, Urban, and to his successors, canonically elected.² From Melfi the pope repaired to Bari, and there, at the request of duke Roger, and his brother Boamund, consecrated Elias, lately preferred to that see.

As the emperor's party gained daily new strength, the pope, to strengthen his, proposed to Guelph, duke of Bavaria, a marriage between his son, named likewise Guelph, and the countess Mathilda. As the countess possessed large territories in Italy, the duke readily agreed to the proposal, and so did Mathilda, though she was then forty years of age, merely to gratify the pope, and engage the duke of Bavaria in his interest; for we are told that she lived with her husband as with a brother.³ The emperor no sooner heard of this marriage, than marching into Italy, he attacked and reduced several strong-holds belonging to the countess in Lombardy, and the city of Mantua among the rest, after an eleven months' siege. As many were killed on both sides in this war, Godfrey, who had succeeded Anselm in the

¹ Roderic. l. vi. c. 23.

² Concil. tom. x. p. 459.

³ See Marca Dissert. de Primatibus, Num. 125.

¹ Concil. l. x. p. 478.

² Romuald. Salern. in Chron.

³ Bertold. ad ann. 1089.

Guibert recalled to Rome. Council of Benevento;—[Year of Christ, 1091.] Council of Troia;—[Year of Christ, 1093.] Conrad rebels against the emperor, his father.

bishopric of Lucca, applied to Urban to know how he should deal with those who had killed excommunicated persons, what penance he should impose upon them, or whether he should impose any. The pope answered that they were to be judged according to their intention; and that he did not hold those to be guilty of murder who, burning with zeal for their catholic mother against her enemies, had happened to kill some of them; but nevertheless that some penance should be enjoined them, in compliance with the discipline of the church, that they may thus atone for their frailty in case they had not been actuated by zeal alone;¹ which was declaring that any man might, with a safe conscience, put those to death whom the pope had excommunicated, provided he was, or thought he was, prompted to it by zeal for the church. To this hellish principle are owing so many massacres and the extirpation of whole nations. The reduction of Mantua encouraged the emperor's friends in Rome; and they took by surprise the castle of St. Angelo, recalled Guibert, and put him again in possession of St. Peter's church and the Lateran palace.

In the meantime Urban, continuing in Apulia, under the protection of duke Roger and the other Norman princes, held a council at Benevento, on the 28th of March, 1091. By this assembly the anathemas against Guibert and all his accomplices were repeated, and the following regulations were made relating to the discipline of the church, namely, that for the future none should be elected bishops who were not in holy orders, that is, who were not priests or deacons; that as to subdeacons, they should be elected very rarely, and never consecrated without the approbation of the pope, as well as the approbation of the metropolitan; that no layman should eat flesh after Ash-Wednesday; that the faithful, laymen as well as clerks, women as well as men, should, on that day, have their heads sprinkled with ashes, a ceremony that is observed to this day; that no marriages should be celebrated from Septuagesima till after the octave of pentecost, nor from Advent till after the octave of the epiphany.²

From Benevento Urban repaired to Salerno, where he consecrated the church of the Holy Trinity, and from Salerno to Troia in Apulia, in which city he held a council, consisting of about one hundred bishops; and by them marriages within the forbidden degrees were declared null, and they, who had contracted such marriages, were allowed, if young, to marry again;³ which is contrary to the doctrine now taught and practised in the church of Rome.

In the mean time the emperor pursued, with great success, the war in Lombardy, against the united forces of the countess Mathilda and the duke of Bavaria, defeated them in the field, and reduced the whole country beyond the Po. But being obliged to return to Germany, where new disturbances were raised by the friends and emissaries of the pope, he left his son Conrad to carry on his conquests in Lombardy till his return. But he was scarce gone, when the young prince, gained by the artful insinuations of Mathilda, rebelled against his father, and taking upon him the title of king of Italy, was crowned, according to custom, at Milan by Anselm, archbishop of that city.¹ Conrad is said by most of the contemporary writers to have been instigated to this unnatural and highly criminal rebellion, not by the pope, but by the countess. However that be, it is certain, that the pope approved, if he did not advise it. For upon the archbishop's refusing to crown him till he was absolved by the pope from the excommunication which he had incurred by siding with his father, he applied to Urban, and was by him immediately absolved;² which was evidently consenting to his rebellion, nay, and rewarding it with the kingdom of Italy. Dodechinus and Helmoldus, two writers who lived near those times, but were both avowed enemies to the emperor, to excuse the rebellion of his son tell us, that the emperor, having conceived an irreconcilable aversion to the empress Adalais, called also Praxedes, ordered several of the lords of his court, and among the rest his son Conrad, whom he had by his first wife Bertha, to ravish her; and that upon his refusing to obey so wicked a command, the unnatural father gave out that he was not his son, but the son of a Suabian lord, whom he greatly resembled. This affront, say those writers, so provoked the young prince, that, in order to revenge it, he took up arms against his father, and joined his enemies.³ We read in other writers, that the emperor obliged some to commit, by force, the crime of adultery with the empress, hoping he should, by that means, procure a divorce, and from the acts of the council of Placentia in 1095, it appears that Adalais applied to the bishops of that assembly for absolution from the impudicities which she had involuntarily committed. But none, even of the emperor's most inveterate enemies, besides the two I have mentioned, take any notice of his commanding his son to offer any violence to the empress, which they would not have passed over in silence had it been true. To this crime Aventinus probably alluded, when he wrote, that the emperor's enemies had charged him with crimes that were not so much as known by name to the French

¹ Ivo, part xx. c. 64.

² Concil. t. x. p. 484.

³ Gratian 35. Quest. v. c. 4. Magist. Sent. c. 41.

¹ Auct. Anon. Vit. Henrici.

² Dodechin in Chron.

³ Dodechin. et Helmold. ad ann. 1093.

Advantages gained over the emperor in Italy. Diet of Ulm. Urban returns to Rome. Recovers the Lateran palace. Philip, king of France, excommunicated by the pope's legate.

and Germans, and could only be met with in the lives of the Cæsars written by Suetonius.¹

The party of Urban and Mathilda being greatly strengthened by the rebellion of Conrad, whom many of the Italian lords readily joined, they recovered, jointly with the forces of the duke of Bavaria, Milan, Cremona, Lodi, Placentia, and most other places that the emperor had taken. The people of Toul and Metz drove out the bishops, whom the emperor had preferred to those sees. In Germany several lords followed the duke of Bavaria, and declaring against the emperor, appointed a diet to meet at Ulm, in order to consult together about the measures they should pursue against the schismatics and rebels to the holy apostolic see. To this assembly the pope dispatched Gebehard, bishop of Constans, with the character of his legate. In this diet, which is said to have been very numerous, it was agreed, that they should in all things obey the legate, and act according to his directions.²

As the affairs of the emperor daily declined, the friends of Urban in Rome drove out Guibert, recalled him, received him with all possible marks of joy, and put him again in possession of the church of St. Peter, where he celebrated mass on Christmas-day, 1093. But Guibert's party still held the castle of St. Angelo and the Lateran palace, and the pope was obliged to lie concealed in the house of a Roman nobleman named Frangipane. In the mean time Geoffrey, lately chosen abbot of the Trinity at Vendome, hearing that the pope was reduced to great straits for want of money, set out for Rome in disguise, taking with him a considerable sum to lay at his holiness's feet. He had the good luck to reach Rome undiscovered; and being introduced to the pope in the night, he found him not only quite destitute of money, but overwhelmed with debt. The arrival of the abbot proved very seasonable; for the money he brought with him not only served to supply all the pope's wants, but to recover the Lateran palace, which Guibert had held ever since the year 1084. Guibert, upon his leaving Rome, had committed the custody of the Lateran palace to one Ferruchius, who, betraying the trust reposed in him, sent privately one of his friends to let the pope know that he would deliver up the palace to him for a certain sum of money. As his demand did not exceed the sum that the abbot had supplied him with, he hearkened to the proposal, paid the money, and got possession of the palace, where he was immediately placed in the pontifical chair; and the abbot was the first who kissed his foot after his enthronation³ As the castle of St. Angelo was still in the hands of Guibert's friends,

Urban was easily prevailed upon by the countess Mathilda to leave Rome, and repair to Lombardy, in order to encourage, with his presence, those who had declared for him in those parts. He passed the summer in Lombardy with the countess, and retiring as winter approached to Tuscany, that belonged to her, he kept his Christmas there, not caring to come to Rome, so long as the castle of St. Angelo was held by the friends of Guibert.

In the mean time some of the Gallican bishops, and Ivo of Chartres among the rest, wrote to Urban, begging he would interpose his authority, and remove the scandals which their king, Philip, had given, by his new marriage, to the whole nation. Philip had, under color of consanguinity, dismissed his lawful wife Bertha, by whom he had Lewis, who afterwards succeeded him in the kingdom, and married Bertrada, who leaving Fulco, count of Anjou, her lawful husband, had taken refuge in his court, apprehending, says Ordericus, that the count would, in a short time, treat her as he had treated his two former wives.¹ This marriage gave great offence to the bishops, and the pope was no sooner informed of it than he wrote to them, commanding them to represent to the king the enormity of his crime, and at the same time to let him know that unless he dismissed Bertrada, and recalled Bertha, he would proceed against him according to the rigor of the canons. But the bishops not being able to prevail upon him to part with Bertrada, who is said to have excelled in beauty all the women at that time in France, the pope, who had received Hugh, archbishop of Lions, into favor, though excommunicated by his predecessor, reinstated him in the legatine dignity, which he had enjoyed in France under Gregory, and ordered him to inquire into the king's marriage and divorce, and to proceed in that affair as was directed by the canons. Hugh no sooner found himself restored to his former dignity, than assembling a council at Autun on the sixteenth of October of the present year 1094, he first renewed the excommunication against the emperor, against Guibert, and all who adhered to the one or the other; and then, after exhorting the bishops to join him in vindicating the honor of God and his church, he thundered out the sentence of excommunication against the king for taking, in his lawful wife's life-time, another woman to his bed as his wife.² Hereupon the king sent immediately deputies to Rome to assure the pope, upon oath, that though he had not dismissed Bertrada, who had fled for shelter to his court, he had no longer any criminal commerce with her, and therefore to beg that his holiness would revoke the sentence

¹ Aventin. l. v.

² Bertold. in Chron.

³ Goffrid. ep. viii. ad Paschal II.

¹ Orderic. l. viii. p. 699.

² Concil. t. x. p. 463.

Council of Placentia;—[Year of Christ, 1095.] Canons of this council. Interview of the pope and Conrad. Urban owned in England.

which his legate had too rashly pronounced against him. The pope, pleased with the submission of the king, and probably apprehending he might, if provoked, declare for his rival, suspended the sentence for the present, that he might have time to satisfy him, by his conduct, of the sincerity of his repentance.

As the pope daily gained ground, he appointed a council to meet at Placentia, in the midst of his enemies, inviting to it all the bishops of Italy, Germany, and France. The council met at the time appointed, namely, on the first of March, 1095, and is said to have consisted of two hundred bishops, of near four thousand other ecclesiastics, and thirty thousand laymen, insomuch that no church being large enough to contain such a multitude, they were obliged to meet in the open fields. The empress Adalais was not ashamed to appear before this numerous assembly, and owning that, at the command of her husband, she had been ravished by several persons, begged the pope and the council to absolve her from the sins which she had committed against her will. Absolution was readily granted to her by the pope and all the bishops of the council; and she thereupon withdrew, and returning to Germany retired to a monastery, where she spent the remaining part of her life.¹ Her complaints and the tears she shed made so deep an impression upon the minds of several of the emperor's friends, that they forsook him. Philip, king of France, had promised to assist at this council; but not caring to have the affair of his divorce brought before so numerous an assembly, he sent ambassadors to excuse his not attending it in person, pretending that he had set out for that purpose, but had been prevented from pursuing his journey by some unforeseen affairs of the utmost importance. The ambassadors begged, in the king's name, and obtained, that the sentence pronounced against him by the legate and the council of Autun, might not take place till Whit-Sunday. Hugh, archbishop of Lyons, legate of the apostolic see in France, was summoned, as well as all the other Gallican bishops, to the council. But of that summons he took no kind of notice, we know not why, and he was, on that account, suspended by the pope and the bishops of the council from all the functions of his office. Alexius Comnenus, emperor of Constantinople, sent a solemn embassy to the pope and the other bishops of the council, to represent to them the deplorable condition which the Christian religion was reduced to by the infidels in the East, and implore their assistance against the common enemy. The pope warmly espoused the cause of those unhappy persecuted Christians; and several of the great

lords, who were present, promised, upon his applying to them, to go in person to their relief.

By this council the doctrine of Berengarius was condemned anew, and it was defined that the bread and wine in the eucharist were, by consecration, changed truly and substantially into the body and blood of our Lord; the marriage of all in holy orders was declared unlawful, and the faithful were strictly forbidden to be present at any functions performed by such of the clergy as had not parted with their concubines, that is, their wives; orders conferred by Guibert, or by bishops whom the pope had excommunicated by name, were declared null, and the usual anathemas were thundered out, with lighted candles, against Guibert, usurper of the apostolic see, and all who supported him in his wicked usurpation.¹

Upon the breaking up of the council, the pope from Placentia set out for France, not caring to return to Rome so long as his enemies were masters of the castle of St. Angelo. As he approached Cremona, he was met by the emperor's son, Conrad, and attended by him, as his equerry, into the city. Urban received him with all possible marks of esteem and affection, acknowledged him king of Italy, and exacted of him, as such, an oath of allegiance to the apostolic see. The pope at the same time promised to maintain him in possession of the kingdom, and assist him, to the utmost of his power, in obtaining the imperial crown, but upon condition that he should give up the investitures.² From Cremona the pope pursued his journey to France, and Conrad repaired to Pisa, to receive there the daughter of Roger, duke of Sicily, whom his friends had obliged him to marry, in order to engage, by that alliance, the assistance and protection of the Norman princes against his father.

The English nation had not yet acknowledged either of the pretenders to the papal chair, but they were brought this year by the art and address of Urban to own him. This event is thus related by Eadmer, who lived at this time, and was secretary to archbishop Anselm, whose life he wrote. That prelate being preferred to the see of Canterbury in 1093, applied the following year to the king, William Rufus, for leave to go to Rome, to receive the pall of the pope. The king asked, "of which of the popes;" and upon Anselm's answering, "of Urban," the king told him that Urban was not owned for pope in England; that by the laws of the kingdom no one could go to Rome, or acknowledge any pope without the king's leave, and that to deprive him of that right was to deprive him of his crown. Anselm replied, that while he was abbot of Bec, he had acknowledged Urban for lawful pope,

¹ Dodechin. ad ann. 1093.

² Concil. t. x. p. 503.

³ Bertold. in Chron.

Urban in France. Council of Clermont. Philip of France excommunicated. Canons of this council.

and never would depart from the obedience he owed him. Your subjection to Urban, replied the king, is inconsistent with that which you owe to me as my subject. The archbishop boldly answered, that if his subjection to the pope was inconsistent with that which he owed to him as his subject, he would rather leave England, than withhold, for one single moment, his obedience to St. Peter and his vicar. The king was already highly dissatisfied, on other accounts, with the archbishop's conduct; and being provoked, beyond measure, at his present haughty and insolent behavior, he resolved to rid himself of a man of his turbulent and inflexible temper. In order to that he sent privately two of his chaplains to Rome, charging them to get the pope, if by any means they could, to send the pall, not to the archbishop, but to him. The two envoys applied to Urban, who, upon their acquainting him with the king's request, and assuring him, at the same time, that if it were complied with, the king would cause him to be owned by the whole kingdom, readily promised to send over the pall to be disposed of as the king should think good. The pall was accordingly sent by Walter, bishop of Albano, who, coming to England with the envoys, avoided seeing the archbishops as he passed through Canterbury, and went straight to the king, who immediately granted him an audience. In that audience the legate, who was a man of great address, taking no notice of the pall, nor speaking a single word in favor of the archbishop, assured the king that his holiness was disposed to grant him his request, and ready to gratify him in every thing else that lay in his power, provided he owned him, and caused him to be owned by all his subjects for lawful pope. The king did so, not doubting but the legate would faithfully perform what he had promised in the pope's name, and that the pall would be delivered to him with full power to dispose of it to whom he pleased. But, instead of that, the legate, having obtained all he wanted, undertook to reconcile the king to the archbishop; and in that too he succeeded, the king restoring, in appearance, the archbishop to his favor, lest the world should know that he had been so grossly imposed upon. He begged that, at least, the pall might be delivered to him, and that the archbishop might receive it from his hands. But he could not obtain even that favor of the legate, pretending that he was charged by the pope to deliver it to him with his own hand; and he went accordingly to Canterbury, and there delivered it to him with more pomp and solemnity than usual.¹

We left Urban on his journey from Cremona to France. He arrived at Puy in Velay about the middle of August, celebrated

there the festival of the Assumption of the Virgin Mary, and appointed a council to meet at Clermont, in Auvergne, on the 18th of November of the present year. In the mean time he visited several places, namely, Chaisedieu, Tarrascon, Avignon, Maçon on the Soane, and Cluny. As he had been prior of the monastery of Cluny he continued there till the meeting of the council, consecrated the high altar, confirmed all the privileges granted to that monastery by his predecessors, and added some new ones to them.

As the time appointed for the council to meet drew near, the pope, leaving Cluny, repaired to Clermont. There the bishops all met for the first time on Sunday, the 18th of November, and assisted in a body at divine service. The next day they assembled again, when the council was opened by the pope, who presided at it in person. It consisted of twelve archbishops, eighty bishops, and ninety abbots, besides an infinite number of the inferior clergy and laymen, who were allowed to be present. The pope had invited all the bishops in the West to this council. But none came to it from Lorraine, Germany, or Hungary, the bishops in those parts being unwilling to disoblige the emperor, who did not acknowledge Urban. Neither does it appear that any went from England, the king being, probably, too much provoked at the late conduct of the pope and his legate to grant them leave; and they could not go out of the kingdom without his permission. As Philip, king of France, had not yet dismissed Bertrada, the sentence of excommunication was pronounced against both by the pope in the present council. But we do not find, that the king was less respected or obeyed while under that sentence, than he was before. Fulco, the husband of Bertrada, was so incensed against the king for detaining her, that he caused the instrument of a donation, which he made this year to the monastery of St. Sergius in the city of Anjou, to be closed with these words; "This donation was made in the year of our Lord 1095, in the third Indiction, on Saturday, the 25th day of the moon, Urban being pope, and France contaminated with the adultery of the worthless king Philip."² It was upon Fulco's complaining to the council of the injury done him by the king, that the pope excommunicated him; though many, who were present, endeavored to divert him from it, apprehending that Philip, provoked at such a step, might declare for his rival.

By this council thirty-two canons were issued, whereof the following are the most remarkable; namely, the first, forbidding priests, deacons, and archdeacons, to keep concubines; that is, commanding them to part with their wives, on pain of being sus-

¹ Eadmer. Noor. l. i. p. 25, et seq.

² Peiriskius in Registris.

The "Treuga Dei." The primacy of Lions confirmed. The crusade projected by the council of Clermont.

pended from all the functions of their offices; the fifteenth and sixteenth, forbidding the clergy to receive investitures from laymen, and kings and princes to give investitures, as was ordained by pope Gregory, of holy memory; the seventeenth, declaring it unlawful for a bishop or a priest to promise fidelity, that is, to take an oath of allegiance to kings, or to any layman. Thus were priests and bishops exempted from the obligation of obeying their lawful sovereigns, while bishops were required, at their consecration, to swear obedience to the pope. The twenty-fifth canon forbade the sons of priests, deacons, or subdeacons, to be admitted to holy orders, unless they were monks or regular canons. By the twenty-eighth it was ordained, that they who received the eucharist, should receive the body and the blood separately. By this canon was condemned the custom lately introduced of receiving the bread dipped in the wine, as contrary to the institution of our Saviour, who, at his last supper, gave the bread and wine separately. The custom of receiving the eucharist, in one kind only, obtained, at this time, in some places, as appears from Rodolph, abbot of St. Trudo, who wrote in this century;¹ and it was afterwards approved, nay, and even commanded by the council of Constans, though no less repugnant to the institution of Christ, who administered the eucharist to his apostles in both kinds, than that which the council of Clermont condemned.

By this council the observance of what they called "Treuga Dei," or "Truce of God," was warmly recommended, and the decrees, made by several provincial councils concerning it, were all confirmed. To understand what was meant by that expression the reader must know, that every lord and even every private man, especially in France, under the weak government of their later kings, claimed a right of revenging, by force of arms, any injury that was done them; which filled the whole kingdom with murders and rapines, the great lords being constantly at war with one another, and sparing in their wars neither churches nor monasteries. As the kings were not, for want of power, in a condition to put a stop to these civil dissensions, the bishops, who suffered the most by them, as they were not allowed to repel force by force, made several decrees, in their provincial synods, against them, declaring it unlawful for any private person whatsoever to do himself justice by force of arms, and threatening those with excommunication who should attempt it. But no regard was had by the parties at war to their

¹ The abbot wrote in verse; and his words, as quoted by Gropperus, are,

"Hic et ibi cautela fiat, ne presbyter agris
Aut sanis tribuat laicis, de sanguine Christi:
Nam fundi posset leviter; simplexque putaret,
Quod non sub specie sit totus Iesus utraque."
Gropper. c. 44.

decrees, or their menaces, till the year 1041, when the bishops, despairing of being ever able to root out entirely so destructive a practice, contented themselves with bringing the lords to consent to a truce for certain days in the week: and it was accordingly, with their approbation, agreed, that no hostilities should be thenceforth committed from Wednesday evening till Monday morning; that, during the four days of truce, no violence whatever should be used; and that they, who offended against this convention, should be punished with death, or excommunicated and sent into exile. This agreement was made in a council held in Aquitaine in 1041, and was called "Treuga Dei," or "the Truce of God," as having been suggested by God, and afterwards approved by exemplary punishments, miraculously inflicted, as was believed, upon such as transgressed it.¹ This truce, called in Latin "Treuga," from the Spanish word "Tregua," as some conjecture, was confirmed by the present council of Clermont, and afterwards by the council of Rome under Paschal II. in 1102, by the Lateran under Innocent II. in 1130, and by the Lateran under Alexander III. in 1180. By these councils several holy days were added to the four days of each week, all devastation by fire was forbidden; and clerks, monks, pilgrims, merchants, husbandmen, and women, were exempted from all violence, and they excommunicated, who should offer them any. It is to be observed, that the decrees of these councils related to the wars, that the barons or other private persons made upon one another, and not, as Baronius imagined, to wars between sovereign princes.

The primacy, which Gregory had granted to Gebuin, archbishop of Lions, was confirmed, by the present council, to Hugh and his successors in that see; and Walter, bishop of Cambrai, was suspended from all sacerdotal and episcopal functions, and threatened with an anathema if he did not quit that see, as he had bought it of the emperor, and received the investiture from him, in defiance of the decrees of so many councils.

By this council the expedition for the recovery of the Holy Land, known by the name of the "crusade," was set on foot, and it is, on account of the encouragement it gave to that wild, chimerical, and destructive undertaking, the most famous of all the councils that were held to the present time. The infidels had, as has been observed above, made themselves, in a few years, masters of above one half of the Eastern empire, had subdued both Cilicia, Syria, Isauria, Lycia, Pisidia, Lycaonia, Cappadocia, Galatia, the one and the other Pontus, Bithynia, with part of Asia Minor, and wanted only shipping to attack the imperial city

¹ Glaber. l. iv. c. 5.

The crusade set on foot chiefly by means of Peter the Hermit. The pope exhorts all to take the cross. The bishops preach the crusade in their respective dioceses with great success.

itself. By them the churches and monasteries were plundered and burnt, the priests and monks either inhumanly massacred or condemned to perpetual slavery, and the pilgrims, who came to visit the holy sepulchre, exposed to the same cruel treatment.¹ Alexius Comnenus, at this time emperor of Constantinople, sent ambassadors, as has been said, to the council of Placentia, to lay before that assembly the deplorable condition which the Christian religion was reduced to in the East, and implore their assistance. The pope had already been informed of the calamities the Christians suffered under the yoke of those barbarians, and most earnestly pressed to relieve them by the famous hermit, Peter, whom I shall have frequent occasion to speak of in the sequel. He was a native of the diocese of Amiens, in Picardy, had gone in pilgrimage to visit the holy places at Jerusalem, according to the devotion then in vogue; and as he staid some time in that city, he was an eyewitness of the inexpressible miseries the Christians groaned under there, and besides found, from the account the patriarch Simeon gave him of the state of affairs, that the whole empire would, without the assistance of the western princes, in a very short time, fall a prey to the sworn enemies of the Christian name. Hereupon the Hermit, fired with zeal, offered to solicit succors of the pope and all the western princes in the patriarch's name, if he approved of it. To this the patriarch readily agreed, as we may well imagine; and the new commission was confirmed to Peter by our Savior himself appearing to him while he was praying in the church of the Resurrection. Thus Guillelmus Tyrius, or William archbishop of Tyre, in his history of the holy war;² and Baronius chooses to believe him rather than those who will have the Hermit's commission to have been sent him from heaven.³ Peter returned by sea to Rome, and hearing that the pope was in that neighborhood, he immediately went to him, and acquainted him with the lamentable state of religion in the East, begged he would interpose his authority, and bring all the Christian princes in the West to enter into an alliance in defence of their helpless persecuted brethren in the East. The pope promised to promote, in due time, so holy an undertaking to the utmost of his power: and the Hermit passing, in the mean while, the Alps, visited the courts of all the ultramontane princes, being charged with letters to them from the patriarch Simeon; stirred them as well as their subjects every where up to the defence of the places, which our Savior had consecrated with his presence, and promised eternal rewards to those who should be the fore-

most in redeeming them from the sacrilegious pollution of the enemies of God.

The zeal of the Hermit was seconded by that of the pope, first in the council of Placentia, and afterwards in the present, that of Clermont, which was assembled chiefly to encourage this undertaking. The pope, therefore, after settling what related to the discipline of the church, laid before that numerous assembly, in a long and pathetic speech, the deplorable condition of the Christian religion under the infidels in the East, the imminent danger it was in of being, in a very short time, utterly extirpated all over that extensive empire; urging, with great vehemence, the indispensable obligation incumbent upon all Christians to relieve their oppressed brethren, and redeem the holy places, which Christ had sanctified with his birth, his actions, and his death, from the sacrilegious pollutions of his sworn enemies; assuring them of victory, as they were to fight under the conduct and command of Christ himself, and the great God of Armies; declared those who should enlist in so holy a war absolved from all their sins, promised life everlasting to such as should die in it, &c. The pope was frequently interrupted in his speech by loud cries of persons of all ranks and conditions from every part of that numerous assembly, offering themselves ready to fly, at his holiness's command, to the relief of their persecuted brethren, and redeem them, even at the expense of their lives, from the tyranny they groaned under. Urban, finding that the project took even beyond his expectation, ordained that they who engaged in this holy warfare should wear a red cross on their right shoulder, to show under whose banner and for whom they fought; extended the "Truce of God" to the persons and effects of all who served in this expedition; and threatened all with excommunication who should on any color or pretence whatsoever molest them, or any who belonged to them, till their return from the Holy Land. He then commanded the bishops who were present to publish, to preach, and promote, to the utmost of their power, the holy war, in their respective dioceses; and closed this famous council on the 28th of November, 1095.¹

The bishops, in obedience to the pope's command, made it their whole business to preach and promote the intended expedition in all the cities, towns, and villages under their jurisdiction, and so magnified it, that men, persuaded that the taking of the cross would atone for every sin, and so answer all the purposes of repentance and a holy life, crowded, without distinction of age or condition, from all parts to serve under such

¹ Guill. Tyr. l. i. c. 9.

² Idem *ibid.* c. xxi. 12.

³ Baron. ad ann. 1095.

¹ Guill. Tyr. l. i. c. 15. Petrus Diac. Chron. Cassin. l. iv. c. 11.

Councils held by the pope in France in 1095, 1096. Urban returns to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1096.] The crusaders begin their march into the East.

princes as were willing to put themselves at their head. This infatuation prevailed so universally in the Western kingdoms, that an army was assembled the following year, consisting of no fewer than three hundred thousand men.¹ Women, and even children showed no less eagerness to serve in this holy war than men; and would, had they not been restrained, have doubled the number of those already too numerous armies. Several great lords, seized with this epidemical phrenzy, sold their lordships and demesnes at half their value, thinking they only wanted a little ready money to provide themselves with arms and conquer kingdoms in the East. Thus Godfrey of Buillon, among the rest, sold that lordship to the bishop of Liege, whose successors possess great part of it to this day, and at the same time the castle of Stenay, with the lands belonging to it, to the bishop of Verdun, who likewise purchased of Baldwin, Godfrey's brother, the little he had in that country. Thus, while the temporal princes, says father Maimbourg, abandoned their territories for the love of God, the clergy, improving their devotion to their own advantage, enriched themselves with their spoils.² This design was first formed by Gregory VII., as has been observed above; and so far as we can judge from the principles and views of that pope, as well as from the use we shall see his successors make of it, we have but too much reason to believe that it proceeded from a very different zeal from that for religion, or for the relief of the persecuted Christians in the East. The holy war, as it is called, lasted near two hundred years, cost perhaps more Christian blood than had been shed before in all the wars the Christians had made, and none in the end gained any thing by it but the church and the popes.

The pope continued in France after the council of Clermont in November, 1095, till the latter end of September, 1096, visiting different places, consecrating churches, holding councils, and preaching every where the crusade. He held a council at Limoges in December, in which he is said to have deposed Humbald, bishop of that city. He held two other councils, the one at Tours in the third week of Lent, the other at Nismes in July. In the latter he absolved king Philip, who had dismissed Bertrada, from the excommunication; forbid lay investitures, and the receiving any benefice whatever from a layman; excommunicated those who should presume to arrest a clerk or imprison him, and declared the monks, whom he compared to angels, being himself a monk, qualified to exercise the sacerdotal functions; and as they had renounced the

world to serve God in retirement, more worthy than they, who lived in it, of the power to preach, to baptize, to absolve men from their sins, to impose penance, and administer the eucharist.¹ The pope visited several other places, namely, Angiers, Poitiers, Toulouse, Saintes, Bourdeaux, and the isle of Maguelore, which he consecrated, absolving those from all their sins who were, or should be thenceforth buried there. At Tours, Urban performed, on the fourth Sunday of Lent, the ceremony of blessing a golden rose filled with musk and balsam, which he wore that day, and then gave to Fulco, earl of Anjou. Some will have the custom of blessing a golden rose on the fourth Sunday in Lent, and afterwards sending it to some prince, or person of great distinction, to have been first introduced by this pope. But from a bull of Leo IX. in 1050, it appears that this custom obtained then. For by that bull the pope grants many privileges to a monastery of women built by him in the city of Bamberg, and obliges them to send yearly to Rome a golden rose to be blessed by him and his successors on the fourth Sunday of Lent, or the value of such a rose.² From France the pope returned to Italy, in the latter end of September of the present year 1096, staid some time at Lucca, and went from thence to Milan, where he preached to an immense multitude of people come from all parts to hear him, showing, in his discourse, that the lowest clerk is greater, and more to be respected than the greatest king;³ all the popes after Gregory having made it their study to debase princes and exalt the clergy. Urban returned soon after to Rome, and was there received by the people, the clergy, and the nobility, with the greatest demonstrations of joy, the friends of his rival Guibert being obliged to save themselves in the castle of St. Angelo, which they still held.⁴

In the mean time the crusaders set out in vast numbers from France, Italy, and Germany, on their march into the East. The first horde, as we may call it, consisting of near three hundred thousand men, marched off in three distinct bodies, the one commanded by Peter the Hermit, the chief promoter of this expedition, the other by a monk named Godescald, and the third by "Gualterius sine habere," as he is called by the contemporary writers, that is "moneyless Gualter." As the end of this holy undertaking was to extirpate the enemies of Christ and the Christian religion, the crusaders, looking upon the Jews in that light, began with them, and in passing through Germany, where great numbers of that nation resided, they inhumanly murdered them all without distinction of sex or age. We are told, that

¹ Spond. Epist. Baron, ad ann. 1095.

² Maimbourg. Hist. des Croisades, l. i. p. 46.

¹ Concil. tom. x. p. 605.

² Theophyl. Raynaud. de Rosa Mediana, &c.

³ Landulph. in Chron. c. 28.

⁴ Bertold. in Chron.

The behavior of the crusaders in the countries through which they passed. They arrive at Constantinople. Pass the Hellespont and are all cut to pieces by the Turks. Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, goes to Rome. How received by the pope.

at Verdun, Spire, Worms, Cologne, and Mentz, those unhappy wretches, finding they could no otherwise avoid falling into the hands of their merciless enemies, barricaded themselves in their houses, and there killed one another; that the mothers cut the throats of their suckling infants; that husbands and fathers put to death their wives and children; and that none of them escaped the fury of the holy warriors, but such as abjured Judaism and embraced Christianity.¹ As the crusaders burnt, plundered, and destroyed every thing in the countries through which they passed, and even massacred the inhabitants for not starving themselves to support the soldiers of Christ with plenty of provisions, the people flew every where to arms in their own defence, and falling upon those free-booters, made such havock of them, especially in Hungary and Bulgaria, that the Hermit, upon his arrival at Constantinople on the 1st of August of the present year, could scarce muster twenty thousand men. He was there joined by the other two bodies, that had got thither before him, but were greatly weakened, having suffered no less for the disorders they committed on their march than the body he commanded. They were kindly received by the emperor Alexius, who ordered them to be supplied with all necessaries; but he was against their crossing the Hellespont, the Turks being masters of the whole country beyond it, till they were reinforced by other bodies, which, he heard, were on their march to join them. The Hermit acquiesced; but his men, under no kind of discipline, began, in the mean time, to lay waste the neighboring country, to plunder and set on fire the houses and villas of the Greek lords, as if they were come to make war upon them, and enrich themselves with their spoils; nay, these soldiers of Christ, as they called themselves, regardless of all religion, and prompted by the love of booty, which alone had induced most of them to engage in this undertaking, even stript the churches of the lead, with which they were covered, and sold it to the Greeks themselves. In short there was no evil, which they did not commit, "*non cessabant agere omnia mala,*" says an anonymous writer, who lived at this time, approved of the expedition, and was no friend to the Greeks.² This behavior made the emperor change his mind; and glad to get rid of such troublesome guests, he supplied them with shipping to cross the Hellespont, little caring what became of them. Being landed on the other side the Hellespont, they directed their march, in two bodies, or columns, towards Nice in Asia Minor, the one commanded by Raymond a German lord, and the other by the

Hermit. The body under Raymond was attacked by the Turks, at a castle called Exceregorgos; and they were all cut in pieces with their general, on St. Michael's day. The other body fared no better; the Turks fell upon them at a place called Cinitot, not far from Nice, and not one of them outlived the slaughter of that day besides their general, who had the good luck to make his escape, and return alone to Constantinople, where he was looked upon as a madman. At Cinitot "*Gualter sine habere,*" who commanded under the Hermit as his lieutenant-general, was killed, with several other persons of distinction.¹ The Hermit had, according to the anonymous historian, resigned the command of the army before that unhappy affair, finding that his men would no longer obey his commands, and was, fortunately for him, returned to Constantinople. Such was the fate of the first army of the crusaders. In this year Godfrey of Bouillon, and his brother Baldwin went into the East, and arrived at Constantinople on the 1st of August.²

Urban returned to Rome, as has been said, in the latter end of the year 1096, and no farther mention is made of him by any of the contemporary historians till the year 1098, when he received at Rome, with extraordinary marks of kindness and esteem, Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury. That arrogant prelate having, at last, obtained, or rather extorted leave from the king (William Rufus) to go to Rome, embarked at Dover about the middle of October 1097, and travelling through France in the habit of a pilgrim, was received at Lions by Hugh, archbishop of that city, with all the respect that was due to his character. He stayed there till Wednesday before Palm-Sunday, and then pursuing his journey to Rome, was admitted, the day after his arrival in that city, to the pope, who, laying aside all his pomp and grandeur, treated him, in a manner, as his equal, allotted him an apartment in the Lateran palace, appointed proper persons to attend him, nay, and ordered the same honors to be paid to the "*apostle of another world,*" as he called him, that were paid to himself. But Anselm was soon obliged by the excessive heat to leave Rome, and retire to a villa that belonged to a monastery in the diocese of Capua, and was situated on an eminence at a small distance from that city. He was invited thither by John, formerly monk in the monastery of Bee, in Normandy, and acquainted with him while a monk in the same monastery. Anselm continued there till the arrival of the pope, who had appointed a council to meet at Bari on the first of October of the present year, and had ordered him to assist at it.

¹ Bertold. in Chron. ad ann. 1096. Albert. Agens.

² Anonym. apud Mabill. Musæum Italic. l. i. part 2.

¹ Musæum Italic. l. part 2, et Chron. Malleacens. ad ann. 1097.

² Idem ibid.

The monarchy of Sicily. Council of Bari. Anselm distinguishes himself in that council.

As Roger, duke of Sicily and Calabria, and his nephew Roger, duke of Apulia, were then besieging Capua, that had revolted from the Normans, the pope went with Anselm to visit those princes, who met them, at some distance, attended by all the chief officers of the army, and entertained them some days in their camp with the greatest magnificence. The pope did not fail to interpose his good offices in behalf of the besieged; but upon their refusing to hearken to the terms which he proposed, he retired with Anselm to Aversa, and there continued till the reduction of the place, when he went to Salerno to take his leave of the duke of Sicily, then upon the point of returning to that island.¹

The famous bull of the monarchy of Sicily is supposed to have been granted to the duke at this interview. The pope had appointed Robert, bishop of Trani, his legate *a Latere* in Sicily. But the duke, no stranger to the authority those legates assumed, and the disturbances which they frequently raised, earnestly entreated the pope to revoke the commission, plainly insinuating that he would suffer no legate in his dominions. As the duke had done many signal services to the apostolic see, had driven the Saracens quite out of Sicily, and subjected all the churches in that island to the see of Rome, though claimed by the patriarch of Constantinople, the pope not only recalled the commission he had given to the bishop, but, to engage the duke still more in the defence of his see, he conferred upon him all the power he had granted to his legate, declaring him, his heirs, and his successors, "legates born," and vested with legatine power in its full extent. The bull, granting this unprecedented privilege, is dated at Salerno in the month of July, the seventh Indiction, and in the eleventh year of pope Urban, that is, in 1098; and Baronius has inserted it at length in the eleventh volume of his annals, to which I refer the reader. Though this bull is thought by most men of learning to be entirely fictitious, yet the kings of Arragon, to whom Sicily was subject for many years, claimed and exercised the legatine power as the successors of duke Roger. It has been likewise claimed, and sometimes exercised by all the princes who have been masters of that island since their time; and even in our days by the late duke of Savoy. For Clement XI. having, in 1715, published two bulls, the one abolishing the monarchy, as it is called, and the other establishing a new ecclesiastical hierarchy or government, the duke banished all who received either; and on that occasion swarms of Jesuits were sent from Sicily to Rome, as they have been lately from Portugal to Rome; so that no change was made in the ecclesiastic polity,

and the monarchy still subsists in its full force. In virtue of Urban's bull, whoever is master of Sicily is pope of that kingdom, is supreme head of the church there, has a power to excommunicate and absolve all persons whatever, ecclesiastics as well as laymen; and cardinals themselves residing in that island, to preside at all provincial councils, and, in short, to exercise all jurisdiction that a legate *a Latere*, vested with the fullest legatine power, can exercise; and this extensive jurisdiction the kings of Sicily may exercise by their lieutenants, viceroys, and governors. It is to be observed, that as the kingdom of Sicily may fall to females, a woman may be at the head of the church in Sicily as well as in England; which, however, is a standing joke with the Roman catholics, and even, what has not a little surprised me, with that incomparable historian Pietro Giannoni, though he finds no fault with the spiritual monarchy of Sicily, including more power than any king of England ever claimed, and yet liable to fall to the distaff, as it actually did in the time of Jane of Arragon and Castile.

From Salerno the pope repaired to Bari, to preside at the council which he had appointed to meet there on the first of October of the present year. It consisted of one hundred and eighty-three bishops, among whom was Anselm, and several Greek bishops, whom Urban had invited in order to attempt a reconciliation between them and the Latins, who wanted their friendship and assistance to carry on the war against the infidels with the wished-for success. The acts of this council have not reached our times, and all we know of it is, that the point, which had been so often debated, was here debated anew, namely, whether the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, or from the Father only; that in this dispute Anselm distinguished himself above all the rest, and silenced the Greeks with passages, not from the fathers, but from the scripture alone; that all were astonished at his profound knowledge, at the strength and perspicuity of his reasonings, and that the pope and the other bishops of the council vied, in a manner, with each other in commending and extolling him.¹ William of Malmsbury writes, that Anselm, out of modesty, sat silent, leaving the other bishops to dispute with the Greeks, till the pope, recollecting that he was present, (for in the hurry of affairs he had forgot to allot him his proper place) addressed him thus:—"Anselm, archbishop of the English, our father and master, where are you?" That Anselm rising up at these words, the pope bid him draw near, and placing him by the archdeacon of the Roman church, who, according to the custom that then obtained, sat before him, he told him aloud that his elo-

¹ Eadmer. Novor. l. ii. c. 3.

Eadmer. Novor. l. ii. c. 9.

Anselm diverts the pope from excommunicating the king. The pope threatens the king of England, but is appeased. Council of Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1099.] The cause of Anselm warmly recommended by one of the bishops.

quence and knowledge were wanted to put an end to the present dispute, encouraged him to undertake the defence of the church, his holy mother, as sent by God for that purpose, and satisfy the Greeks that the opinion, which they so obstinately maintained, was not only erroneous but heretical. The historian adds, that upon the bishops of the council asking who he was, whom his holiness thus distinguished, and whence he came, Urban took occasion to honour Anselm with the title of "pope of another world," extolling him for his eminent virtues, for his humility, for his learning, and above all for the zeal with which he had maintained, against the king of England, the undoubted rights of the apostolic see. Thus Malmsbury;¹ but Eadmerus, who was present, is silent with respect to most of those particulars.² Anselm was afterwards prevailed upon by his friends to publish the passages and arguments, which he alledged in this council against the error of the Greeks; and they are to be met with in his treatise upon "the Procession of the Holy Ghost," which is still extant.

As Anselm had complained to the pope of the king of England, charging him with extorting large sums from the churches in his dominions, with seizing on the temporalities of his bishopric after his departure, and denying bishops leave to go to Rome, his complaints were by the pope laid before the council, as well as the ill treatment which Anselm pretended to have met with at his hands. The pope added, that he had admonished the king three times, and exhorted him to alter his conduct, but that no regard had been paid to his admonitions, and that he therefore applied to them for their advice. The bishops answered with one voice, that since his holiness had admonished him three times, and he had hearkened to none of his paternal and repeated admonitions, nothing now remained but to strike him with an anathema, that he might thus, at least, be retrieved from his wicked ways. At these words Anselm, who had hitherto kept silence, starting up, threw himself at the pope's feet, and what with his tears, what with his prayers and entreaties, prevailed upon him, in the end, to suspend the sentence. Urban however wrote to the king, reproaching him with his behavior towards Anselm, ordering him to restore the temporalities of his see, which he had unjustly usurped, and reinstate him in his dignity. Anselm wrote at the same time to the king, who received the pope's letter, but would not receive his; looking upon him as an enemy to the peace and welfare of his kingdom; nay, being informed, that the bearer of those letters was the archbishop's servant, he swore by St.

Luke's face, his usual oath, that if he did not immediately leave the kingdom he would order his eyes to be plucked out.¹

From Bari the pope returned with Anselm to Rome, and there received, in the latter end of December, an answer from the king of England to the letter he had written to him in favor of the archbishop. As in that letter the king rather justified than excused his conduct, the pope ordered the envoy to return, without delay, to England, and tell his master, in the name of St. Peter, that if he did not reinstate the archbishop in all his possessions, the sentence of excommunication would be inevitably thundered out against him. He added, that he had appointed a council to meet at Rome the third week after Easter, and therefore desired the king would acquaint him, before the meeting of that assembly, with his final resolution. But the envoy, named William, was a man of parts and address, and having brought with him many rich and valuable presents, he knew so well how to dispose of them, that he not only obtained leave to stay a long time at Rome, but prevailed upon the pope to suspend the sentence with which he had threatened the king, till Michaelmas, that is, for nine months and upwards.²

In the mean time the council met at Rome on Sunday, the third week after Easter, which, in 1099, fell on the last day of April. They assembled in the church of St. Peter, being one hundred and fifty bishops, besides other ecclesiastics of all ranks and degrees, and an infinite multitude of laymen. By this council were confirmed the decrees of the two former councils of Placentia and Clermont, and sentence of excommunication was pronounced by the pope and all the bishops who were present, against all laymen who should presume to give investitures, and all ecclesiastics who should dare to receive them, or ordain those who had. This sentence extended to such ecclesiastics as did homage to laymen for any benefice or preferment, it being thought beneath the office and the dignity of the clergy to serve laymen as their slaves, and, in a manner, as their handmaids. The decrees of other councils against married clerks were renewed, and all were forbidden to communicate with them till they had dismissed their concubines.³ As the church was greatly crowded, and the continual noise of some coming in and others going out prevented the decrees and resolutions of the assembly from being heard by all, the pope ordered Reinger, bishop of Lucca, who had a strong and clear voice, to stand up and read them aloud. The bishop obeyed, but stopping unexpectedly in the midst of the decrees, and fixing his eyes upon the numerous audi-

¹ Malms. de Gest. Pont. Angl. l. i.

² Eadmer. ubi supra.

¹ Eadmer. ubi supra.

² Idem, et Malms. ubi supra.

³ Concil. t. x. p. 615.

ence, "But what are we about," he said, "We are loading those with new ordinances who submit to us, but afford no relief to those who want our protection, and are come to implore it. The whole world complains that the head does not grieve with the members. Behold, one sits here modestly and silently among us, but his silence cries aloud: he has been stripped of every thing he possessed, and hoped to be redressed here: But this is the second year of his being among us; and what relief has he yet received? No relief at all. Anselm is the person I speak of—Anselm, archbishop of England." Having uttered these words, to show his zeal and indignation, he struck the ground with his crosier, fixing his eyes again on the audience. The pope, whom he chiefly seemed to point at, heard him with great calmness, and when he had done, calling him by the name of "brother Renger," he bid him give himself no farther trouble, for a remedy should be found, and in due time applied. The bishop replied, it is but fit, for the just judge will not suffer such things to go unpunished. Renger then resumed the decrees. The historian adds, that Anselm had no share in this declaration, but on the contrary was greatly disturbed at it.¹

In the mean time, another grand army, consisting of better disciplined troops, and commanded by more experienced officers, took different routes into the East. Among these were Robert, duke of Normandy, elder brother of William Rufus, to whom he mortgaged his dominions for the necessary money to equip himself for that expedition.² Hugh, surnamed the Great, brother to Philip, king of France, count of Flanders; Boamond, the son of the famous Robert Guiscard; his nephew Tancred;³ Raimund, count of Thoulouse, lord of Languedoc, and great part of Provence; and many other persons of great distinction. Raimund led near a hundred thousand men; Godfrey of Bouillon seventy thousand foot and ten thousand horse; Boamond seven thousand horse completely armed, with some infantry; and the other princes had all large bodies under their command, insomuch that this second army was far more numerous than the first. The emperor Alexius, though greatly alarmed at the arrival of such vast armies in his dominions, ordered them to be plentifully supplied with provisions, and markets to be erected for that purpose in all the places through which they passed. He even sent interpreters, who understood their different languages, to prevent any misunderstanding between them and the natives. But the insolence with which they behaved even to the emperor himself, can scarce be conceived. Anna Comnena, the emperor's

daughter, tells us, that while her father was one day sitting in his throne at a public ceremony, a French count placed himself in the throne by him, telling Baldwin, brother to Godfrey of Bouillon, upon his taking him by the hand to remove him, that he thought it unmannerly in the Greek clown to sit down in the presence of men of their rank. His words were interpreted to the emperor, who, instead of resenting them, only smiled at the rusticity of the count.¹ Alexius, wisely overlooking their haughty behavior, and the many disorders they committed while in the neighborhood of Constantinople, treated their princes with the greatest grandeur and politeness, especially Boamund, whom he feared the most, as he had experienced his valor in the war which his father had made upon the empire in Epirus, where he gained, in 1083, a complete victory over the imperial army, though in number greatly superior to his, and commanded by the emperor in person. But Boamund, in spite of all the emperor's civilities and many rich presents he sent him, was for beginning the war with the siege of Constantinople, painting the emperor as a crafty designing man, as a sworn enemy to the Latin name, and one from whom they had no less to fear than from the infidels themselves. He had inherited of his father an aversion to the Greeks, had engaged in this enterprise merely to better his fortune, his father having only left him the small principality of Tarentum, and was therefore for enriching himself with the spoils of the imperial city. But his proposal was rejected with great indignation by the French, declaring that they had left their country and all that was dear to them to make war upon the infidels, and redeem their Christian brethren from the tyranny they groaned under; and that it was fit they should live in amity with them, and restore what the common enemy had taken from them.² Boamund acquiesced, and an agreement was concluded between them and Alexius, who bound himself by a solemn oath to assist, and supply them with provisions so far as in him lay, while they, on their side, promised to abstain from all hostilities in the countries still subject to the Greek empire.³ Soon after this agreement the emperor, no less impatient to get rid of this than of the first army, lost no time in supplying them with shipping to cross the Hellespont into Asia Minor, and take the field against the Turks, masters of almost that whole province. They were found, upon a muster after their landing, to amount to a hundred thousand horse, and near five hundred thousand foot, including servants, victualers, priests, and women, whom those pious soldiers of Christ made no scruple, as the his-

¹ Malmsh. l. i.² Eadmer. Novor. l. i. c. 2.³ Anna Comnena, l. iv. c. 7.¹ Ann. Comnena, l. iv. c. 7.² Orderic, l. ix.³ Idem *ibid.*

Urban's death. His character.

The Carthusian order founded.

torian informs us, criminally to converse with.¹ The Turks drew together all the forces they could muster, but were in two pitched battles defeated with the loss, as we are told, of two hundred thousand men, whereas there fell on the side of the Christians but thirteen thousand, among whom was Monteil, bishop of Puy in Auvergne, and the pope's legate.² Encouraged with these two signal victories, they invested the city of Nice, and made themselves masters of that important place after a seven weeks' siege. This happened in 1097, and the same year they laid siege to Antioch, which city the Turks defended with great resolution and intrepidity for the space of eight months. But the Christians having in the mean time gained a third victory, as complete as either of the other two, the garrison was thereby so disheartened, that they thenceforth made but a faint resistance, and the place was carried by assault on Thursday the 3d of June, 1098.³ The city of Antioch was taken by the Turks in 1089, and the princes of the crusade ought, in justice, to have restored it to the emperor, from whom the infidels had taken it. But instead of returning it to the lawful owner, they all, with one consent, gave it, with its fertile territory, to Boamund, who had no less distinguished himself by his conduct than his courage. No wonder that the emperor was not so hearty in their cause as might have been expected, when he found that they were to keep the countries which they conquered, and he was to get nothing by their victories. Had he foreseen the consequences of his applying to the pope for relief, he would have contented himself with defending his dominions, in the best manner he could, with his own forces. The princes of the crusade continued five months at Antioch and in that neighborhood, to allow some respite to their men, quite spent with the fatigues they had undergone. But they took the field again early in the spring; and having, not without great loss of men, reduced several strong-holds, they at last approached the city of Jerusalem, which was invested to the north by Robert duke of Normandy, and Robert earl of Flanders, and to the south by Raimund count of Thoulouse. The siege lasted five months, and the city was taken, in spite of the obstinate resistance of a numerous garrison, by scalade, on Friday the 15th day of July, 1099. A soldier, named Letot, was the first that scaled the wall, and duke Godfrey of Bouillon the second. The Turks were all massacred, and while the streets were yet streaming with their blood, a solemn procession was made, to return thanks to the Almighty for the recovery of the holy city

and the holy sepulchre. They spent eight days in devotion, and in massacres, and then proceeded to the election of a king of Jerusalem, when Godfrey of Bouillon was unanimously elected. He accepted the dignity, but rejected the diadem, declaring that he would not wear a crown of gold where his Lord had worn one of thorns.¹ As Simeon, the Greek patriarch of Jerusalem, died during the siege, in the isle of Cyprus, the princes of the crusade appointed one Arnulph, a Latin clerk, as the historian calls him, for his successor.² John, the Greek patriarch of Antioch, not choosing to keep his see under the Latins, though he had kept it under the Turks, resigned it at the end of two years after the reduction of the place, and retired to Constantinople. Upon his resignation Bernard, chaplain to the pope's legate, was preferred to the patriarchal see of Antioch in his room. And thus were two of the patriarchal sees in the East filled with Latins. And thus far of the crusade, to the taking of Jerusalem.

Urban did not live long enough to receive the joyful tidings of the surrender of Jerusalem. That city was taken, as has been said, on the fifteenth of July, 1099, and the pope died at Rome the same year, on the 29th of the same month, after a pontificate of eleven years, four months and eighteen days, including the day of his death. He may be styled another Gregory VII.; for he adopted all his principles, confirmed all his decrees, and pursued, with no less vigor than Gregory himself, though perhaps with more art and address, the grand work which that pope had begun, that of establishing the temporal as well as the spiritual monarchy of his see. He was buried in the Vatican, and his tomb being discovered in later times, the following epitaph was engraved upon it: "Urbanus II., auctor expeditionis in infideles,"—Urban II., author of the expedition against the infidels. As he was a monk, and a great friend to the monkish orders, he is highly commended by them for his eminent virtues, and even said to have wrought some miracles. But his miracles have gained no credit even in the church. For though he has a place in the Benedictine Martyrology, with the title of "blessed," he has never been admitted into the Roman. In this pope's time, and in 1084, was founded the order of the Carthusians, by Bruno, canon first of Cologne, and afterwards of Reims. They were called Carthusians from the desert to which Bruno first retired with his companions. By their institution they are to observe perpetual silence. But as many of them, overcome with melancholy, put an end to their own lives, Clement XI. dispensed, in our days, with the observance of silence one day in the week.

¹ Guill. Tyr. l. i. c. 17.² Chron. Malleac. ad ann. 1097³ Idem, ann. 1098.¹ Guill. Tyr. l. ix. c. 9.² Albert Aquens, l. vi.

Paschal, elected. His birth, education, &c. Is informed by the princes of the crusade of their success. Guibert dies;—[Year of Christ, 1100.]

PASCHAL II., THE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ALEXIS COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East*.—HENRY IV., HENRY V., *Emperors of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 1099.] Urban dying on the twenty-ninth of July, the cardinals, bishops, and clergy of Rome, with the heads of the people, assembled on the thirteenth of August in the church of St. Clement, to proceed to the election of a new pope, when cardinal Rainerius, or Ragingerus, was unanimously elected. When he found they were determined to choose him, he privately withdrew, and concealed himself, hoping they might, in the mean time, prefer another to the dignity, of which he thought himself of all the most unworthy. But as he did not conceal himself so as not to be discovered, he was soon brought back, and some of his friends crying out, when he appeared again in the assembly, "Paschal is pope, St. Peter has chosen him," the whole assembly resounded with the same words, and he was immediately carried to the Lateran palace, and there enthroned, or placed, with the usual ceremony, in the pontifical throne. He was consecrated the very next day, that is, on the fourteenth of August, which in 1099 fell on a Sunday, in the church of St. Peter, by the bishops of Ostia, Porto, Albano, Lavici, Præneste, and Nepi.¹ Pandulphus Pisanus, who wrote the life of Paschal, describes here the ceremony of the pope's enthronation. He put on, as soon as elected, a scarlet mantle, the cardinals wearing then only purple, as all bishops do now, and a cap of state being placed upon his head, he went in that attire, on horseback, from the place of the election to the Lateran, attended by the electors, and crowds of people singing hymns. He alighted at the south gate of the basilic, and sat down in a chair that was placed there. Then entering the palace, he came to two chairs, and being there girt with a belt, from which hung seven keys, and seven seals, emblems of the sevenfold grace of the Holy Ghost, which was to direct him in loosing and binding, he was placed first in the one and then in the other; and the ferula, pastoral staff, or crosier, was delivered to him. When this ceremony was over he was master of the Lateran palace, and allowed to go alone into those apartments, which none but the Roman pontiffs were allowed to set their foot in. Thus Pandulphus Pisanus, who adds, that Paschal was crowned as well as consecrated in the Vatican;

whereas other popes were, so far as we can learn from Anastasius Bibliothecarius, enthroned in the Lateran palace, consecrated in the Vatican, and from thence reconducted to the Lateran and crowned there.¹ We are told that the election of Paschal was miraculous; that it was foreseen by a holy bishop named Albert, and that he knew by divine revelation that Paschal would hold the see four times four and three, that is, nineteen years;² which indeed happened, but the prophecy was not made public till it was fulfilled.

Paschal was a native of Tuscany, the son of one Crescentius, and being brought up from his infancy in the monastery of Cluny, he there embraced, while yet very young, a monastic life. He was afterwards sent to Rome, by his abbot, upon some affairs relating to the monastery; and Gregory VII., in whose pontificate he came, finding him, on that occasion, to be a man of uncommon parts, kept him with him, and, as he fully answered his expectation, he caused him to be ordained priest, preferred him to the dignity of cardinal, and made him abbot of St. Lawrence.³

The princes of the crusade took care to acquaint the new pope with the success that had attended their arms in the East, by a letter directed to his holiness, to all the bishops, and to all the faithful in general.⁴ Paschal was transported with joy at the news of the reduction of the holy city, and no less at the discovery of part of the true cross, and the lance with which the Roman soldier pierced our Savior's side. But he did not at all approve of the election of Arnulph, whom they had preferred to the patriarchal see of Jerusalem, and was therefore deposed in a council held in that city; and Diabert, bishop of Pisa, whom the pope had appointed his legate in the East, was chosen patriarch in his room.

In the beginning of the second year of Paschal's pontificate, that is, in September or October, 1100, died Guibert, who had assumed the name of Clement III., and being supported by the emperor and the imperial party, had given so much trouble to three popes, namely, Gregory VII., Victor III., and Urban II. He maintained, at least, the name of pope for the space of twenty years.

¹ Anast. in Nich. i.

⁴ Bertold. in Chron. ad ann. 1099. Pandulph. Pisan. in ejus Vit.

² Bertold. in Chron. ad ann. 1099. Dodechin. et Pandulph. Pisan. in Vit. Pasch.

³ Idem ibid.

⁴ Dodechin. ad ann. 1100.

Three anti-popes. Philip of France excommunicated. Anselm returns to England.

But being driven from Rome by the Romans in Urban's time, and from his bishopric of Ravenna by Paschal, he retired, according to some, to Citta di Castello; according to others, to the mountains of Abruzzo, and died suddenly. He is allowed even by his enemies to have been a man of parts, of great address, eloquence, and learning.¹ Guibert's friends no sooner heard of his death than they chose one Albert in his room. But he was taken the very day of his election, and confined by Paschal to the monastery of St. Lawrence. In his room was chosen a Roman, named Theodoric, who fared not much better; for he too fell into Paschal's hands one hundred and five days after his election, and was shut up in the monastery of Cava, near Palestrina. Lastly, the partisans of Guibert elected an archpriest called Magninulph, who took the name of Silvester IV. But Paschal's party prevailing, Silvester, though he wanted not friends, was forced to leave Rome, and death prevented his attempting, as he intended, to return to it.²

Paschal, having now no rival to contend with, began to apply himself to the functions of his office; and being informed that Philip of France had recalled Bertrada to court, and lived in public adultery with her, as he had done before, he sent two cardinals to France, John and Benedict, with the character of his legates, to admonish the king; and, if he did not mend upon their admonitions, to cut him off as a rotten member from the body of the church. The legates, on their arrival in France, acquainted the king with their commission; but finding that he paid no kind of regard either to their exhortations or their menaces, they left the court, and repairing to Poitiers, assembled a council there, which is said to have consisted of one hundred and forty bishops. They met on the 18th of November of the present year, made sixteen canons, calculated to redress some abuses that obtained in the Gallican churches, and when the canons were read, one of the legates standing up acquainted the assembly with the endeavours they had used, by his holiness's command, but used in vain, to retrieve the king from his wickedness, expressed great concern at his being obliged to proceed to such extremities, and then, with the approbation of the council, pronounced the sentence of excommunication against the king, and at the same time against his adulterous concubine, Bertrada.³ At this council was present William, Duke of Aquitaine, who, provoked at their presuming to excommunicate the king, ordered his servants to fall upon them, and put them all, without mercy, to the sword. The order would have been executed had not the members of the coun-

cil, all but two abbots, disappeared the moment it was given; and these the duke spared as the more worthy to live the less they valued their lives.¹

William Rufus, king of England, being this year unfortunately killed, his brother Henry I. got possession of the crown in the absence of Robert, duke of Normandy, his elder brother then in Palestine; was consecrated at London by Maurinus, bishop of that city, and acknowledged by the bishops as well as the nobility. But as he did not doubt that his brother would return, and claim the crown as the elder of the two, to gain the pope, or, at least, to prevent him from openly espousing the cause of his brother, in whose favor he knew him to be greatly prejudiced on account of his engaging in the holy war, he recalled Anselm, than which he could do nothing more pleasing to the pope, and reinstated him in his see. Of this step, the king had soon occasion to repent, though it appeared to him of two evils the least. For Anselm going to court a few days after his arrival, and being there required to do homage to the king after the example of his predecessors, and receive his archbishopric from his hand, he declared, without the least hesitation, against the one and the other; adding, that if the king was resolved to receive and observe the decrees of the apostolic see, nothing should interrupt the peace and harmony between them; but if he was not, he could not in conscience nor in honor remain in England, since he should be obliged, if the king disposed of bishoprics and abbey, to deprive himself of his communion, as well as of the communion of those who received them at his hand. This resolution in Anselm was entirely agreeable to the decrees of the late council of Bari, at which he had assisted, forbidding, upon pain of excommunication, laymen to give and ecclesiastics to receive investitures from them, or to do them homage. The king well knew that his predecessors had time out of mind both nominated and invested all the bishops of the kingdom, and that their right had never been disputed. However, as he was unwilling to quarrel with the archbishop at so critical a juncture, it was agreed between them that both should send to Rome to consult the pope, and the point in dispute should be dropped till Easter of the following year, 1101.² In the mean time the king marrying Mathilda, the daughter of Malcolm, king of Scotland, by his queen St. Margaret, Anselm performed the nuptial ceremony, and afterwards consecrated and crowned the queen.

During this truce, as Eadmer calls it, between the king and the archbishop, the pope, knowing that the archbishop was

¹ Uspereg. Dodechin. &c.
² Concil. t. x. p. 720, 721.

² Pindulph. Sigebert.

¹ Gaufred. Grossin. Vit. Bernard.
² Eadmer, l. i. c. 3.

The pope attempts to introduce the legatine power into England;—[Year of Christ, 1101.] The legate sent back. England invaded by the duke of Normandy. The king and the duke reconciled by means of Anselm. The envoys of Anselm and the king return from Rome. The pope's letter to the king.

wholly in his interest, resolved to lay hold of so favorable an opportunity to introduce the legatine power into England, a power above all other power but that of the pope himself. Paschal sent over accordingly Guido, archbishop of Vienne, afterwards pope under the name of Calixtus II., with the character of his legate a *Latere*. But this was a thing unheard of in England, says the historian; it struck all with admiration; and as no power had ever yet been known in England above that of the archbishop of Canterbury, all declared that they would own no other; and as the legate came, so he returned, being by none acknowledged, or allowed to exercise any function whatever of his office.¹ Legates had been sent from Rome into England long before this time. Gregory, bishop of Ostia, and Theophylact, bishop of Todi, came into this kingdom in the reign of king Offa, in the year 786, being sent by Hadrian I. to inquire into the state of the English church; and they told the English bishops, in the speech which they made to them, that they were the first priests that had been sent from Rome to England since the time of Austin.² But it does not appear that those legates exercised, or even claimed, any power over the English bishops; they only assisted them with their advice and directions. In the pontificate of Alexander II. and the beginning of the reign of William the Conqueror, three legates came from Rome to England; but it was at the king's request that the pope sent them, and they acted only as directed and instructed by him, desirous of casting upon them the odium of his intended innovations, and arbitrary proceedings against the English in favor of the Norman clergy. But Guido was sent by Paschal, unknown to the king and the whole nation, to exercise here the same uncontrolled power over all persons, laymen as well as ecclesiastics, as was exercised by the legates in the countries that had unadvisedly admitted them. It is to be observed, that Anselm, however zealous for the papal power, did not in the least interest himself in behalf of the legate, sensible that his own power and authority would be eclipsed by his; nay, Eadmer, who was his secretary and inseparable companion, and may be therefore supposed to have spoken his sentiments, exclaims against the legatine power as a thing altogether unprecedented in England.³

As the envoys, sent to Rome by the king and the archbishop, did not come back by Easter, they consented to prolong their agreement till their return. In the mean time Robert, duke of Normandy, returning from the Holy Land upon the news of the death

of the king his brother, and claiming the kingdom, which Henry his younger brother had seized, as his inheritance, landed in England with a considerable force, determined to maintain his right to the crown by dint of arms. Many of the nobility went over to him, many privately favored his cause, and much blood would have been shed on both sides, had not Anselm been prevailed upon by the nobility to interpose. By his mediation, as well as by the address and prudent conduct of the king, the two brothers were reconciled, and peace was restored to the kingdom.¹

In the mean time returned the envoys, sent by the king and the archbishop to Rome, with a long letter from the pope to the king, calculated to prove ecclesiastic investitures to be the incommunicable right of the apostolic see. The reasons he alleged to prove that paradox were, 1. The Lord declares the right of investing bishops to be his alone, saying, "I am the door;" if kings therefore pretend to be the door, says the pope, they who enter through them are not pastors, but thieves. 2. St. Ambrose would not suffer the emperor to dispose of a church, telling him that he had no right to divine matters; that emperors might dispose of palaces, but the disposing of churches belonged to the bishops. 3. God, and not man, is the author of the marriage between the bishop and his church. 4. He quotes a law of Justinian to prove, that bishops should be elected by the people, and not by the prince alone.²

These reasons are all, as every reader must be sensible, evidently unconvincing. For in the first place, they who ordain a bishop, are the door through which he enters, and not the prince, who by investiture only puts him in possession of the temporalities of his church. All bishops, and among them many of great sanctity and most exemplary lives, had, time out of mind, received investitures from the princes, under whom they were to enjoy the temporalities of their churches, and to whom or to their predecessors they were indebted for them. And were none of them pastors? Were they all thieves? The emperors were, for several ages, the door, in Paschal's sense, through which the popes themselves entered; for they were not to be ordained till their election was confirmed by those princes: and were they too all thieves? Was Gregory VII. himself one, who was not consecrated till the emperor's pleasure was known? The instance of St. Ambrose is quite foreign to the purpose; for the question was not, whether the emperor had a right to invest bishops, but whether he could grant a church to the Arians that belonged

¹ Eadmer, l. i. c. 3.

² Concil. Brit. l. i. p. 292.

³ Eadmer, ubi supra.

¹ Eadmer, in Vit. Anselm. l. ii.

² Ead. Novor. l. iii. c. 2.

New envoys sent to Rome by the king and the archbishop. Council of Rome ;—[Year of Christ, 1102.] The emperor excommunicated.

to the catholics? which Ambrose maintained he had no power to do. As to the marriage of bishops, princes did not pretend to marry them to their churches, but only to put them in possession of the dower of their spouse. With respect to the law of the emperor Justinian, the method of election was different in different times and nations. In some places bishops were elected by the people and the clergy of the diocese, and the bishops of the province. In other places they were nominated by the prince only, the people acquiescing in his nomination, and the bishops of the province ordaining the person whom he had nominated, unless he was unqualified by the canons, in which case they remonstrated against his ordination. In the more early times the emperors frequently named the person whom they would have preferred, without so much as consulting the people, to prevent popular tumults, that often ended in bloodshed. Thus was Nectarius nominated by the elder, and Nestorius by the younger Theodosius, to the patriarchal see of Constantinople. By the council of Arles, in 952, it was ordained, that upon a vacancy the bishops of the province should nominate three, and the people and the clergy should be confined in their choice to one of the three. In Spain, about the year 599, the people and clergy were allowed to nominate three, and the metropolitan as well as the bishops of the province were to cast lots which of the three should be ordained. The pope took, it seems, upon trust the law of Justinian, requiring bishops to be elected by the people. For by two of his novels the common people were entirely excluded from the elections on account of the disturbances they raised, and the Optimates alone, that is, people of better rank, were allowed to concur with their suffrages.¹

The reasons alledged by the pope to support his claim, did not, we may well suppose, satisfy the king and the English nation. On the contrary, they only served to show the weakness of his cause. The king therefore, knowing he had justice and immemorial prescription on his side, sent for Anselm, and told him, that he must either do him homage, as his predecessors had all done before him, or quit the kingdom; for he would suffer no man to live in his dominions, who refused, upon any pretence whatever, to pay him that mark of obedience and subjection. Eadmer writes, that the king ordered him to ordain the bishops, whom he should nominate, or to leave the kingdom that moment, and that Anselm boldly answered, he would do neither, and thereupon retired to Canterbury.² As the king had all the bishops as well as the nobility on his side, no less

steady than the king himself in asserting the undoubted rights of the crown against the unjust usurpations of the pope, he was determined not to yield. But not caring to proceed, as that juncture, to extremities, and willing to gain time, he readily hearkened to the advice of his council; which was, that new envoys should be sent to Rome both by him and the archbishop to argue the point in dispute in the presence of the pope. For this important embassy the king chose Gerard archbishop elect of York, Robert bishop of Chester, and Herbert bishop of Thetford. By the archbishop were sent two monks, Baldwin and Alexander, the one a monk of Bec in Normandy, the other of Canterbury.¹

While these things passed in England, the pope was wholly intent upon making his party good against the emperor and his adherents. With that view he assembled a great council at Rome, consisting of all the bishops of Apulia, Calabria, Campania, Sicily, Tuscany, and a great many bishops, or their deputies, come from beyond the mountains. They met in the Lateran about the latter end of March, and the pope presiding in person, the decrees of the preceding popes, especially of Gregory VII., were all confirmed, and on Maundy-Thursdays, being this year the 3d of April, the sentence of excommunication was, with great solemnity, pronounced against the emperor by the pope himself in the presence of an immense multitude. This sentence the pope ordered to be published in all churches, especially beyond the mountains, that none might plead ignorance, and thereupon communicate with the person, who called himself emperor, and by that means partake of his wickedness. In the same council the pope exacted the following oath of all the bishops; "I anathematize all heresies, and chiefly that which at present disturbs the peace of the church, teaching that no regard is to be had to the censures and anathemas of the church. I promise obedience to lord Paschal, pontiff of the apostolic see, and to his successors, in the presence of Christ and his church, affirming what the holy universal church affirms, and condemning what she condemns."² As anathemas and excommunications were, at this time, thundered out on every trifling occasion, men began not only to pay no kind of regard to them, but to teach, that no kind of regard ought to be paid to them; and it was to suppress that heresy, as they called it, that the present oath was drawn up, and required of the bishops of the council.

As all who received the pall were required, upon receiving it, to take this oath, and likewise the oath that was prescribed by Gregory VII., of which I have spoken above,³ the arch-

¹ Novel. 123. c. i. et Novel. 127.

² Ead. l. iii. c. 2.

¹ Ead. l. iii. c. 2.

² See p. 395.

³ Abbas Usperg. in Chron.

The pope's letter to the archbishop of Colocza. Rapaciousness of the apostolic legates. The English return from Rome, but disagree in the account of their negotiations. Other envoys sent to Rome. The pope writes by them to the king.

bishop of Colocza, in Hungary, refused to take either, when both were sent him, soon after this council, together with the pall, alledging that all oaths were forbidden in the gospel; that none were ever taken by the apostles, and none prescribed or required by any of the general councils. The archbishop objected chiefly to the clause in the oath prescribed by Gregory, obliging those to whom legates or nuncios were sent, to bear their charges, and "supply them with all necessaries in coming and returning." For they were, for the most part, men, as the writers of those times witness, of an insatiable avarice, and made it their study not to promote the service of God, but to plunder the churches and enrich themselves, as if they had been sent only to accumulate wealth, and carry back with them to Rome the treasures of Cræsus.¹ The pope, in his answer to the archbishop's letter, explains the use of the pall, extols the authority of the Roman church, because she gives law to all other churches, and authority to all councils. As to the oaths, he tells the archbishop that they are lawful when necessary; that it is not for his own private interest he requires them, but to preserve the unity of the church, by uniting all the members to the head. He adds, that the Saxons and Danes are more distant from Rome than they, (the Hungarians,) and yet receive, with honor, the legates of the apostolic see, defray the expenses of their journeys, and cheerfully furnish them with whatever they want.

The following year, 1103, the envoys of the king of England and the archbishop of Canterbury returned from Rome; but very different were the accounts they gave of their negotiations there. The three bishops positively affirmed that the pope had declared to them that he would allow the king to grant investitures, and would not excommunicate those who received them from him, provided he gave him no other occasion to complain of his conduct. The two monks affirmed, no less positively, that the pope had declared the quite contrary to them, and appealed to the letters which he had written by them to the archbishop, and by the bishop to the king. The letters were produced, and by them was confirmed what the monks had attested. For the pope, in his letter to the king, promised him an inviolable friendship, provided he renounced his pretensions to investitures, laymen being forbidden by his holy predecessors as well as by himself, and not without a particular inspiration of the Holy Ghost, to give them, and ecclesiastics to receive them at their hands. In his letter to the archbishop, he encouraged him to persevere in his opposition to all who should attempt to encroach

on the just rights of the church of Christ; tells him that, in the council which he had lately held in the Lateran, he had renewed and confirmed the decrees of his predecessors, forbidding lay investitures, and that he would ever religiously adhere to their ordinances; being sensible that the desire of pleasing laymen was the source of all simony, from which the church, he said, never could be free, so long as the laymen were allowed to dispose of bishoprics, abbeys, and other ecclesiastical preferments. Such were the pope's letters to the king and the archbishop. But the envoys of the king maintained, in answer to these letters, that they had had several audiences of the pope, at which the envoys of Anselm were not present, and that his holiness had contradicted, by word of mouth, in the private conferences they had with him, what he said in his letters, but that he would commit nothing to writing, lest other princes, hearing of his condescension and indulgence to the king of England, should claim the same favors as due to them as well as to him. The lords and the bishops of the king's council were divided upon these opposite reports. Some were for standing to the pope's letters, and the account given by the archbishop's envoys, and confirmed by those letters; while others looked upon the testimony of three bishops as an irrefragable proof, in which they ought all to acquiesce. Most of the lords, as well as the bishops, were of this opinion, and Anselm, not choosing to give the bishops the lie, nor show to the world that he placed more confidence in his monks than in them, proposed the sending of new envoys to Rome, promising that if the king should, in the mean time, grant investitures, he would neither look upon him, nor upon those who received them, as excommunicated. But at the same time he declared, that he would not consecrate them. This proposal was readily agreed to, and in the mean time the controversy lay dormant.¹

Upon the departure of the envoys Anselm retired to Canterbury, and there continued till their return, which happened this year. They brought with them a letter from the pope to the archbishop, wherein he declared what the bishops had reported was notoriously false, "We take Jesus Christ, said he in his letter, who searches the reins and hearts of men, to witness, that no such criminal thought, as we have been charged with by our brethren, the envoys of the king of England, has ever entered into our mind; and God forbid we should ever utter with our mouth what is not in our heart. As to the bishops, who have changed truth into falsehood, we exclude them from the grace of St. Peter and our communion, till

¹ Joan. Satisbur. Policrat. l. v. c. 16.

² Eadmer.

The king tries in vain to gain Anselm. Sends him and William of Warlewast to Rome at the same time. William's bold speech to the pope. The pope's resolute answer. He writes again to the king.

they repair the injury they have done to the Roman church."¹ Whether the envoys or the pope spoke the truth, I shall leave the reader to judge.

As during the interval between the departure and return of the last envoys, Anselm refused to consecrate some bishops, the king, who had nominated them, went in person to Canterbury, to try whether he could by any means get the better of his obstinacy, and gain him over to his cause. He represented to him how shameful and dishonorable it would be in him tamely to part with the undoubted rights of his crown, which his predecessors had all enjoyed undisturbed. He even descended to prayers and entreaties, begging he would no longer oppose him, as he could not but know that he had justice on his side. But all was in vain, the archbishop remained inflexible. The king therefore, no less determined to maintain than he was to oppose his just claim, resolved to deliver himself and his kingdom, as soon as possible, from so dangerous and obstinate a bigot. With that view, as he did not choose to proceed to open violence, he desired that Anselm would go himself to Rome, and try whether he could obtain of his holiness what he had refused to others. Anselm understood the meaning of this proposal, and looking upon his being sent to Rome, at this juncture, as an honorable exile, desired the affair might be respited till the meeting of the bishops and the lords at Easter, that he might know, after hearing them, what answer he should return. His request was granted; but the advice of the whole assembly, not one excepted, concurring with the desire of the king, the archbishop consented, though much against his will, to undertake that journey. He embarked accordingly at Dover in the latter end of April of the present year 1103, and having first visited the monastery of Bec in Normandy, he pursued his journey, by land, to Rome. The pope, when informed of his arrival in that city, sent him word, that to recover himself from the fatigue of so long a journey, he would have him to pass that and the next day in quiet, in the lodging that was allotted to him near the church of St. Peter. The third day Anselm was admitted to the pope, and received by him with all possible marks of confidence and esteem. As the king placed no confidence in the archbishop, and his sending him to Rome was only a pretence to remove him out of the way, he dispatched, at his departure, William Warlewast, bishop elect of Exeter, with the character of his ambassador to the pope, knowing that he would plead his cause with more zeal than the archbishop, should he even undertake it. A day being fixed by the pope to hear

Anselm and the bishop, the latter harangued with great energy and eloquence in favor of the king, urging the eminent services which the kings of England had, in all times, rendered to the apostolic see; their having ever been distinguished, on that account, by the Roman pontiffs above all other princes; the advantages, which Rome had always reaped and continued to reap from their generosity, but would certainly forfeit, and might never afterwards recover, if they disobliged the king. The bishop represented at the same time how dishonorable it would be for the king to give up the rights of the crown, which his predecessors had all enjoyed undisputed, and transmitted, with the crown, to him. This speech made no small impression upon all who were present. Some, however, rose up to answer it; but the bishop stopped them short, saying aloud, with a determined air, "Let either side urge what they will, I would have all here present to know, that the king of England, my master, will not suffer investitures to be taken from him, were it even to cost him his kingdom." At these words the pope starting up, and fixing his eyes upon the bishop, addressed him thus, with anger and resolution in his countenance, "If your king will not, as you say, part with investitures, were it to cost him his kingdom, I would have you to know, before God I say it, that pope Paschal will not suffer him to keep them with impunity, were it to cost him his head." These words were, no doubt, put in the mouth of the holy father, and the wrath, or rather rage, with which he uttered them, was put in his heart by the Holy Ghost. However, he soon returned to himself; and at the pressing instances of the Romans, no doubt, apprehending that this quarrel might be attended with the loss of the wealth which their city drew from England, he allowed the king to retain some ancient usages in his kingdom, which, it seems, he had sued for. As to investitures, he absolutely forbade them, and absolved the king from the excommunication he had incurred by granting them; but would not absolve those, who had received them from him, till they had done penance, and given satisfaction for so enormous a crime. It is observable, that Anselm spoke not a single word at this audience either for or against the king's claim.¹

Anselm left Rome soon after this occurrence, on his return to England; and the pope gave him, at his departure, a letter, or bull, dated the 16th of November, 1103, confirming all the privileges that his predecessors had granted to his see. The bishop staid at Rome, under pretence that he had made a vow to visit the tomb of St. Nicholas at Bari, a saint famous in those days, and

¹ Eadmer.

¹ Eadmer, Novor. l. iiii.

Anselm forbidden to return again to England. Philip of France absolved from the excommunication;—[Year of Christ, 1104.] Oath he took on that occasion.

still famous in ours. But his true motive was to try whether he could persuade the pope to grant him, in the absence of Anselm, what he had not been able to obtain while he was present. But he found that Paschal meant what he said, "that he would not, for his head, part with investitures." When the bishop took his leave, the pope charged him with a letter for the king, wherein he begged, entreated, and conjured him, as he tendered the welfare of his soul, and his own happiness in this life and hereafter, not to claim, as his right, what belonged to God alone; repeated what he had said in his former letter, namely, that Christ alone is the door, &c., and promised, if he renounced what he could not claim, in conscience or in justice, namely, investitures, to take him, and his new-born son, William, into the immediate protection of St. Peter and the apostolic see, and to look upon their enemies as enemies of the Roman church.¹ In the mean time Anselm, pursuing his journey to England, arrived at Lyons a little before Christmas, and there William Warlewast, who had travelled with him from Placentia, where he overtook him, to that city, notified to him, agreeably to his private instructions, the king's resolution in the following words: "The king has ordered me to let you know, that if you are resolved to behave towards him as your predecessors are known to have behaved towards his, he will receive you willingly." This was forbidding him, and so Anselm understood it, to return to England, unless he was resolved to submit to the king. He therefore staid at Lyons, and was there entertained by cardinal Hugh, the archbishop, as if he had been archbishop and lord of the city.² And there we shall leave him for the present, and relate what passed in the mean time in France.

King Philip had been excommunicated by Hugh, archbishop of Lyons, in a council held at Autun in 1094, for marrying Bertrada, while his own wife and her husband were still living; and this sentence was confirmed by pope Urban in the council of Clermont, in 1095. But he was absolved the following year, 1096, by the same pope, upon his dismissing Bertrada, and promising to break off all correspondence with her. However, he recalled her in 1099, and cohabited with her, as he had done before; which drew upon him a third excommunication in 1100. Under that sentence he continued, no less respected and obeyed by his subjects, even by the bishops and the clergy, as if no such sentence had been pronounced against him, till the year 1104, when he applied to Paschal for absolution. Upon his application the pope sent Richard, bishop of Albano, to inquire, upon the spot, whether the repentance of the king, who

had deceived his predecessors, was sincere, empowering him, if it was, to absolve him, upon condition that he promised, upon oath, to have thenceforth no kind of intercourse with Bertrada. The legate, upon his arrival in France, assembled a council at Raugenci, about ten miles from Orleans, at which were present most of the Gallican bishops. At this council the king appeared in person, and applying to the legate and the other bishops for absolution, declared that he was ready to swear upon the Holy Gospel, that he would from that time forward avoid all commerce with Bertrada, and never see or converse with her alone. Bertrada too was present, and she offered to take the same oath with respect to the king. But the legate and the bishops disagreeing, the council broke up, and the legate left the place before the king was absolved. The pope was no sooner acquainted with what had passed, than he wrote to the bishops of the provinces of Reims, Sens, and Tours, ordering them to meet at the place the legate should appoint, if he was still in France; and, if he had left that kingdom, to follow, in every thing, the directions of Lambert, bishop of Arras, and, with his advice and approbation, absolve both the king and Bertrada. The legate was gone, and in his absence Lambert appointed a council to meet at Paris on the 2d of December, in order to absolve the king, provided he took the oath prescribed by the pope. That oath Lambert took care to send to him by John, bishop of Orleans, and Galo, bishop of Paris, that he might know beforehand what the council would require of him. He read it, and expressing great sorrow and compunction for the scandal he had given, declared he was willing to atone for his crimes, and convince the whole world of his sincerity by taking that oath, and performing what penance soever it should please the church, the pope, and the council, to impose upon him. Not satisfied with this declaration, he walked barefooted to the place of the council, and there laying his hand upon the Gospels, pronounced the following oath, addressed to Lambert and the other bishops: "Hear you, Lambert, who art here the representative of the pope; hear, all ye archbishops and bishops, who are here present, that I, Philip, king of France, shall henceforth abstain from the carnal and criminal commerce which I have hitherto carried on with Bertrada, and sincerely renounce that crime. I shall never cohabit with her, nor shall I ever converse with her, except in the presence of unsuspected witnesses. All this I promise to observe, without fraud or deceit, as is prescribed in the pope's letters. So help me God, and these Holy Gospels of Jesus Christ." The like oath was taken by Bertrada; and the sentence of absolution, with respect to both,

¹ Eadmer in Vit. Ansel. ² Idem, Novor. l. iii.

The archbishop of Treves deposed and restored in a council at Rome. Council of Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1105.] The archbishop of Milan cleared from simony. Agreement between the king of England and Anselm. The king gives up investitures.

was then pronounced, with the consent of the bishops, by Lambert, in the name of the holy pope, Paschal.¹ As queen Berta died in 1094, and Fulco, earl of Anjou, had married Bertrada within the forbidden degrees, without a dispensation from the pope, Philip, it seems, flattered himself that the pope might, in consideration of his submission, be prevailed upon to declare her marriage with Fulco null, and allow him to marry her. Thus some account for the king's mean behavior on the present occasion; nay, some are of opinion, that though Bertrada was as nearly related to the king as she was to the earl, the pope dispensed with the king's marrying her.² But of that marriage no notice is taken by any of the contemporary writers.

In the same year 1104, Paschal held a council at Rome. But all we know of that assembly is, that Bruno, archbishop of Treves, was deposed, and restored in it to his dignity. He had been nominated to that see by the emperor in 1102, and had received the investiture from him. Two years after, being desirous to visit the tombs of the apostles, he went to Rome, and arrived in that city while the council was sitting. The pope received him with all the marks of distinction that were due to the metropolitan of the first province of Belgic Gaul. But as he had been nominated by the emperor, had received the investiture at his hands, and had besides consecrated churches, and promoted clerks before the bull was sent him, which were all enormous crimes at Rome, he was, with great severity, reprimanded by the pope, and deposed, with his own consent, by the bishops of the council. To this sentence Bruno readily submitted, delivering up to the pope and the council his pastoral staff and ring, but the pope, well pleased with his humility and submission, and only wanting the archbishop to receive the ensigns of his dignity from him, restored them to him the third day, and at the same time gave him the pall. However, that he might be made sensible of the heinousness of his crime in receiving the badges of his sacred dignity from the hand of a layman, he was ordered by the pope and the council to forbear, for the space of three years, the use of the dalmatic, an ornament worn by all archbishops in the celebration of mass.³ This penance the archbishop is said to have punctually performed.

The following year the pope held another council in the Lateran palace during Lent, at which were present most of the bishops of Italy; and by all Grosulanus, archbishop of Milan, was cleared from the charge of simony, brought against him by a priest of

that church called Liprand, though the priest had undergone, with great solemnity, and quite unhurt, the ordeal by fire to prove him guilty. That Liprand had undergone that trial was proved by numberless eye-witnesses; but that the pope and the council did not think so convincing a proof of his guilt, as the testimony of several persons, witnessing the sanctity of his life, was of his innocence.¹ By the same council the sentence of excommunication was thundered out against the count of Meulan and his accomplices, said to have persuaded the king of England not to part with investitures, which they called an enormous crime. All bishops were likewise excommunicated who had received investitures from the king's hand. But the sentence against the king himself was delayed till the arrival of the envoys, whom he had despatched to Rome, and the pope expected daily. This the pope himself notified by a letter to Anselm, who was still at Lyons.²

In the mean time Anselm, tired with the delays and slow proceedings of the court of Rome in this affair, and no longer expecting any assistance or relief from thence, left Lyons and retired to a place that belonged to the monastery of Cluny. But being informed soon after his arrival there, that Adela, countess of Blois, and sister to the king of England, lay indisposed in the castle of Blois, he went thither to pay her a visit. The countess, who was quite recovered of her late illness, received him with the greatest marks of respect and esteem, and being not a little surprised to see him, as she had not heard of his leaving Lyons, she inquired, as was natural, into the motives of his journey. Anselm answered without hesitation, that he was come to excommunicate the king of England for the injury he had done to God and to him. He had no such commission from the pope, nor durst he take such a step without it. But he knew that the fear of an excommunication, at the present juncture, would make the king hearken to an accommodation, and agree to it almost upon any terms. And so it happened. For the king, who was come over into Normandy with a powerful army, to subdue that country, apprehending that the excommunication might, at so critical a juncture, not only defeat his design, but be attended with more fatal consequences, no sooner heard from his sister of Anselm's intention, than he sent for him, and an agreement was concluded between them upon the following terms: That the king should give up his right to investitures, and Anselm should be allowed to return to England; but should not excommunicate those who had received the investiture from the

¹ Concil. t. x. Ivo. ep. 144.

² Blondel Diatrib. de reg. Christ. paragraph 10.

³ Anonym. Auctor. Hist. Trevir. apud Dacher. Spic. tom. xii.

¹ Law. Tulp. c. xi.

² Pasch. ep. 100, et Eadmer, Novor. l. iv.

Henry, the emperor's younger son, rebels against his father. Overruns all Saxony. Assembles a council at Northusum.

king, nor exclude them from his communion. Against this last article Anselm urged the decrees of the late popes, forbidding all communion with such as had received investitures from laymen. It was therefore agreed that envoys should be sent on the part of both to consult the pope with respect to that point, and to have their agreement confirmed by him. On this occasion the king restored to Anselm the temporalities of his see, which he had seized at his departure from England. But he nevertheless declined returning till the sentiments of the pope were known concerning the article in question.¹ This agreement was not executed till two years after, the king being wholly intent upon the conquest of Normandy.

In the mean time the emperor, though excommunicated and anathematized by four popes successively, continued still to assert his right to that invaluable prerogative, which the king of England so meanly gave up through fear of an excommunication. But what wickedness, what treachery or treason will not a pope countenance, if not advise and command, when any ways conducive to the aggrandizing of his see! The emperor had two sons, Conrad and Henry. Conrad, the elder of the two, was seduced by the partizans of Gregory VII., and not without his approbation, as has been shown, to rebel against his father and his sovereign. But he dying in 1102, the party began to tamper with the younger son Henry. He had served his father with the greatest fidelity, and gained a complete victory over the countess Mathilda in 1080, and had, upon the rebellion of his elder brother, been taken by the emperor for his partner in the empire. But the ambitious youth, not satisfied with a share of the power, readily gave ear to the wicked suggestions of three great lords, zealous partizans of the pope, Dezbold marquis, Berenger count, and Otto, or Otho a nobleman of great authority, and nearly related to him on his mother's side. These three, abusing the confidence the young prince, at this time in the twenty-second or twenty-third year of his age, placed in them, laid hold of every opportunity to stir him up against his father as an enemy to the church. The pope too, says Herimannus, a writer of those days, wrote artful letters to him, encouraging him to rescue the church and the apostolic see from the servitude they groaned under, and restore peace and tranquillity to the empire. This was encouraging him to take up arms against his father, and he understanding it so accordingly, unexpectedly withdrew from court with his three above-mentioned counsellors, and repaired to Bavaria, where the pope had a strong party. He there publicly abjured the heresy pro-

scribed by the pope; that is, the right to give investitures, and declared himself an obedient son of the apostolic see. This declaration drew crowds of people to him from all parts, especially from Suabia, Saxony, and Franconia; and he saw himself in a very short time at the head of an army capable of facing his father's in the field. To strengthen his party still more, and seduce such of the emperor's subjects as still adhered to him, he caused manifestoes to be dispersed all over Germany, protesting therein, that it was not the desire of reigning that had induced him to take up arms against his father; that he had nothing in his view but to bring about a reconciliation between the church and the empire, and was therefore ready to obey the emperor, as the meanest of his subjects, provided he submitted to St. Peter and his successors, and got himself absolved from the censures he had incurred by his obstinacy and disobedience. We shall see in the sequel, this prince, more disobedient to the apostolic see than his father, pursuing the very same measures, and with more vigor and better success than he had ever done.

Henry overran, in a very short time, all Saxony, and having made himself master of all the strong-holds in that county, he kept his Easter at Quintilenburg, and was there absolved by Rothard, archbishop of Mentz, and Gebehard, bishop of Constance, the pope's legate in Germany, from the censures he had incurred by obeying his father, and adhering to him against St. Peter and his church. Was not this declaring the duty a son owes to his father, and subject to his sovereign, criminal and worthy of excommunication, where either interferes with the duty and obedience that the pope claims as due to him? Young Henry, who wanted neither parts, nor cunning, nor address, to engage the pope and all his party still more in his interest, appointed a council to meet at a royal villa in Thuringia, called Northusum, in order to redress several abuses that prevailed in the German churches, and were connived at by his father. The council met in the week before Whitsunday, and the decrees of former councils against simony, and the marriage of the clergy, were all confirmed by it, and several other regulations were made relating to the discipline of the churches in those parts. Henry would not, out of an affected humility, assist at this council, till he was pressed to it by the bishops; and he then made the same protestations as he had done in his manifestoes, calling God to witness, that it was not done to deprive his father of the imperial crown, but only to oblige him to submit to the successor of St. Peter, that he had taken up arms against him. In this council the bishops of Hildes-

¹ Pasch. ep. 100, et Eadmer, Novor. l. iv.

Henry's artful conduct. Reduces several places. The rebels defeated and put to flight by the emperor. Henry gains over most of the commanders in his father's army, and seizes on all his treasures. The emperor attempts a reconciliation with the pope. A numerous diet meets at Mentz.

heim, Paderborn, and Halberstat, throwing themselves at the feet of the archbishop of Mentz, their metropolitan, owned their fault in having adhered to the emperor, and received investiture from him; but their cause was referred to the pope.

Henry, upon the breaking up of this council, repaired to Mersburg, and there caused Henry, who had long before been appointed archbishop of Magdeburg, to be ordained. He had refused, it seems, to receive investiture from the emperor, and the bishops dared not consecrate him till he had submitted to that ceremony. Thus did Henry, to attain his ends, tacitly give up his right to investitures. But when he found himself in the quiet possession of the imperial crown, he obliged the pope to give it up in his turn. From Mersburg, Henry marched at the head of his army to Mentz, with a design to reinstate in that see Rothard, who had been driven from it by the emperor for adhering to the pope. Some writers tell us, that Henry entered the city without opposition, and restored the bishop after an eight years' exile. But others say, that the young prince, finding his father had shut himself up in the city with a numerous garrison, did not think it advisable to lay siege to it. Be that as it will, he made himself master of several other places, and among the rest of Nuremberg, after a siege of two months obliging the inhabitants every where to submit to the pope, that is, to receive the decrees. The emperor, having assembled his forces, took the field, and engaging the rebels in the neighborhood of Ratisbon, put them to flight, pursued them with great slaughter, and recovered most of the places they had taken, restoring every where the bishops whom they had driven out, and driving out those, whom they had placed in their room. The young prince is said to have distinguished himself in that action above all the rest; but having nevertheless the good luck to survive it, he retired to Saxony, recruited his army there, and hearing that his father was encamped on the banks of the Regen, he came and encamped on the opposite side of that river. It was not his design to venture a second engagement, but to try whether he could not compass by treachery, what he despaired of being able to obtain by dint of arms; and he succeeded therein beyond his expectation. The emissaries he sent into his father's camp, as the two armies were only separated by the river, gained over, in a very short time, most of the chief commanders; insomuch that the emperor, finding himself forsaken by them as well as their vassals, and left almost alone, was forced to save himself by flight from falling into the hands of his son. Young Henry, seeing himself now master of the field,

marched straight to Spire, and there seized on all his father's treasures.

The emperor finding himself thus abandoned even by those whom he looked upon as his best friends, resolved to attempt a reconciliation with the pope, as his disagreement with him served his son and the other rebels with a pretence to deprive him of his crown. He wrote accordingly to Paschal, declaring, in his letter, that he was ready to submit to his holiness so far as was consistent with his dignity, and to pay the same obedience to him that had been paid by his predecessors in the empire to his in the apostolic see. In that letter he taxes those who had encouraged, or who any ways countenanced the unnatural rebellion of his son, with treachery, perjury, and an utter contempt of all laws human and divine; assures the pope that he has nothing so much at heart as to establish a lasting peace between the church and the empire, and by that means prevent the unspeakable calamities that threatened both; desires his holiness to let him know whether he is ready to concur with him in so meritorious a work, and solemnly declares, in the close of his letter, that nothing shall be wanting on his side, that can be reasonably required of him, to attain so desirable an end as the unity of the church, and an uninterrupted harmony among all its members under the same head.

What answer the pope returned to the emperor's letter we know not, nor whether he returned any. But the princes of the empire, foreseeing the evils that would inevitably attend a war between the father and the son, agreed to meet at Mentz, and attempt a reconciliation between them. They met accordingly at the place appointed on Christmas day; and it was one of the most numerous diets that had ever been seen in Germany, all the German lords being present, except the grand duke of Saxony, as he is called, who could not attend on account of his great age. The emperor came in person to a place in that neighborhood with a design to lay before the lords of the empire the cruel treatment he had met with from his son, and leave them to determine whether the father should submit to the son, or the son to the father. But the prince, apprehending that his presence, and the mean condition to which he was reduced, might raise compassion in many, and prejudice them in his favor, resolved to prevent his appearing at the diet. With that view he went privately to the place where the emperor had taken up his abode, and being admitted to him, threw himself at his feet, and begging pardon, with all the seeming marks of a sincere grief for his past conduct, promised to serve him thenceforth with all the fidelity that was due from a subject to his sovereign, and all the duty, obedience, and submission

The emperor betrayed, seized, and imprisoned by his son. Obligated to deliver up to him the ensigns of the imperial dignity. Haughty behavior of the pope's legates. The pope approves the deposition of the father, and promotion of the son. Account of the deposition of the emperor, as by the abbot of Usperg.

that was owing from a son to his father. The emperor readily forgave him, and embracing him with many tears, only told him, that were a father ever so wicked, heaven would never employ a son to call him to an account for his wickedness, or to punish it. They then set out together for Mentz, the prince pretending to have come on purpose to attend his father to the diet. They had gone but a little way, when they were met by messengers upon messengers, pretending, as had been agreed beforehand between them and young Henry, to have been sent by the emperor's friends at Mentz to give him notice of the arrival of many lords from Saxony and Suabia his avowed enemies, and divert him, as he tendered his life and liberty, from venturing himself among them. This raised some jealousy in the emperor; but the son renewing, in the most awful manner, the protestations he had made of filial duty and obedience, and declaring that he was ready even to lay down his own life for his, he acquiesced; and placing an entire confidence in the son, retired by his advice to the strong castle of Binghen, at a small distance from Mentz, as a place where he might bid defiance to all his enemies. But no sooner did he enter the castle than the gate was shut, and all his attendants excluded. The perfidious son having thus by the blackest treachery got him into his power, caused him to be closely confined, and placing those about him whom he knew to be his most bitter enemies, would allow none of his own friends or servants to come near him. When he had been thus kept some days, insulted by his enemies, and ready to perish with hunger and with thirst, for he was scarce allowed the necessary food to support nature, a German prince named Wigbert, came from his son, and entering the prison told him abruptly, that he must forthwith deliver up all the ensigns of the imperial dignity, for such was the will of the princes assembled at Mentz, and he could no otherwise save his life but by complying with it. He was now in their power, and thought it advisable to yield. But the son, not satisfied with his thus divesting himself, as it were, in a private manner of the imperial dignity, repaired with the lords of his party, and the bishops of Constans and Albano, the pope's legates, from Mentz to Ingelheim, and having caused his father to be brought thither under a strong guard, he obliged him to deliver the regalia to him in the presence of all, with his own hand. The emperor then asked whether they designed to take his life away as well as his dignity. At these words one of the legates rising up, "you have," said he, "justly forfeited your dignity by rebelling against the apostolic see, and you shall no otherwise escape with your life but by owning that

you have persecuted Hildebrand unjustly, that you have unjustly supported Guibert, and have raised and carried on a most unjust persecution against the apostolic see and the whole church." The emperor begged that he might be allowed to plead his cause in the presence of his friends as well as his enemies, but was answered by the legate, that the affair must be finally determined upon the spot, and if he did not own himself guilty, and unworthy of the empire, he might be made to atone for his obstinacy with his life. The emperor entreated the legates to absolve him, at least, from the excommunication; but was told by them, that with respect to his absolution they had no instructions from the pope, and he might, if he pleased, go to Rome for it. The father being thus deposed in this assembly, the perfidious and rebel son was acknowledged, by all who composed it, for sole king of Germany, and consecrated as such by the pope's legates. He immediately dispatched six bishops, and some of the great lords of the empire, to acquaint the pope with the result of the diet, with the deposition of his father, and his own promotion to the crown in his room; and his holiness approved and confirmed the one and the other in the name of St. Peter; which was approving and ratifying one of the most shocking instances of treachery, perfidy, treason, and rebellion, that occurs in history.

Such is the account which the emperor himself gave of his deposition and the promotion of his son, in a letter which he wrote this year to the king of France,¹ and it is entirely agreeable to what we read in the anonymous writer of his life, who lived at this time, and seems to have been an eyewitness to what he writes. But the abbot of Usperg, supposed by Baronius to have likewise writ at this time, though nothing is more certain than that he was not yet born, taking no notice of the emperor's imprisonment in the castle of Binghen, says, that the lords of the diet, hearing that he was coming to plead his cause in person, and apprehending, as he had a strong party at Mentz, his presence might occasion great disturbances in that city, went all in a body to meet him at Ingelheim, and there deposed him with one consent. The abbot adds, that when he delivered the regalia to his son, he wished him a prosperous reign, and warmly recommended him to the princes of the empire, and throwing himself at the feet of the bishop of Albano, the pope's legate, as soon as he had laid down the ensigns of his dignity, begged and conjured him to take off the excommunication, and restore him to the communion of the church; that the laity, touched with compassion, all in-

¹ Apud Baron. ad ann. 1106.

The emperor escapes from the place of confinement, and retires to Liege. His letter from thence to his son. His letter to the king of France; and to the bishops and princes of Germany. Answer of the lords of the prince's party to the emperor's letter. The emperor dies, and his body dug up after his death.

terceded for him; but that the legate, unaffected with the prayers and entreaties of so great a prince prostrate at his feet in the utmost distress, still refused him the so much wished and so humbly sued for absolution, referring him to the pope. Strange! that what melted the emperor's enemies among the laity into mercy, should have made no impression upon his enemies among the clergy; for that the abbot seems to insinuate, saying, that "the laity were touched with compassion." Upon the breaking up of the diet, Henry retired, says the same writer, to lead a private life at the place which his son had assigned him for his abode. Thus did this great prince's quarrel with the popes, and his maintaining the undoubted rights of his crown against their tyranny and encroachments, cost him his kingdom; and it would have cost him his life too, had he not found more compassion in the laity than in the priesthood.

He had not been long at the place of his confinement, when he was privately informed, by some of his friends, that his son, not satisfied with depriving him of the empire, was resolved to deprive him of his life, or at least to keep him closely confined so long as he lived. That intelligence he received, as is supposed, from Henry of Limburg, duke of Lower Lorraine; for having made his escape undiscovered, as soon as he received it, he took refuge in that prince's territories, and was entertained by him as his lawful lord and sovereign. As most of the cities in those parts declared for him, and among the rest the city of Liege, with its bishop, Obert, he chose that city for the place of his residence, and wrote from thence to his son, to the king of France, and to the princes, archbishops, and bishops of Germany. In his letter to his son he reproaches him, but without the least bitterness, with treating him, his sovereign and his father, who had always loved him with the greatest tenderness, as the worst of his enemies; declares that he is ready to pay all the respect, obedience, and submission to the apostolic see that can be reasonably required of him, and that therefore his disobedience to St. Peter and his vicar, is only made use of by his enemies as a cover to conceal their wicked designs from the less discerning; conjures him by his allegiance, and the duty he owes to him as his prince and his father, to dismiss the evil counsellors about him, and follow the advice of one whose interest, welfare, and glory are linked inseparably with his; and closes his letter with putting him in mind of the strict account he must one day give, perhaps sooner than he expects, of all his actions at a tribunal that rewards and punishes every man according to his deserts. The direction of this letter was, "Henry, emperor of the Romans, to his son

Henry." In his letter to Philip of France, whom he styles king of the Celtæ, he gives the above account of his sufferings, and of the cruel treatment he had met with from his son, and implores his assistance, not for his own sake only, but for that of all princes as well as his own; since treason committed against him was committed against them all, and ought to be resented by each of them as committed against himself. In his letter to the bishops and princes of Germany he protests that he wishes for nothing so much as to see that perfect harmony restored which once subsisted between the church and the empire; that to put an end to the present troubles, he is ready to give what satisfaction soever the pope shall require, and they shall think it consistent with the dignity of the head of the empire to grant; and that with respect to the dispute between him and the apostolic see, which alone has occasioned the troubles they complained of, he is willing to acquiesce in the judgment and decision of Hugh, the holy abbot of Cluny, his ghostly father, and of other religious persons, who free, like him, from all sinister and ambitious views, have only the public welfare at heart.

To this letter the lords of the prince's party returned a most insulting and abusive answer, charging the emperor with sacrilege, perjury, rapines, conflagrations, and even with apostacy from the catholic faith; tax him with applying to the French, to the English, and the Danes, in order to engage them in his quarrel, and thus complete the ruin of the empire; but nevertheless declare that, to leave no room for complaints, they are not averse to the assembling of another diet, and allowing him to plead his cause in person, if he chose it, before the lords and bishops of the empire. In the mean time, the son laid siege to the city of Cologne, that had declared for the emperor, with a design to march, as soon as he had reduced it, against the people and city of Liege, for affording his father an asylum. But the garrison and inhabitants of Cologne repulsed the aggressors, in their repeated attacks, with so much bravery, for two whole months, that the prince was upon the point of raising the siege, when he received the news of his father's death. He died at Liege on the 7th of August of the present year, 1106, in the fifty-fifth year of his age, and was buried with great funeral pomp by the bishop and the clergy of Liege. But the partisans of the pope, carrying their revenge even beyond the grave, caused the body, which the bishop had buried in consecrated ground, to be dug up as that of an excommunicated person, unworthy of a place there. It was dug up accordingly, and, by an order from the son, sent in a stone coffin to Spire, where it remained five years with-

Council of Florence. Council of Guastalla. Lombardy reunited to the apostolic see. The king of Germany resolves to maintain his right to investitures.

out the church.¹ Thus was this great prince, Henry, the fourth emperor of that name, in defiance of all laws, human and divine, persecuted to his grave, and beyond it, by his own subjects and his own children, with the approbation, if not at the instigation, of four popes successively, for not yielding up to them a prerogative that his predecessors had all enjoyed as their undoubted right, and no pope, how daring soever and ambitious, had presumed to claim till the time of that incendiary, Gregory VII. Great were the virtues of that unhappy prince, and great were his vices; but he is better known by his misfortunes than either by his virtues or his vices. The pope, imitating the zeal of those who had caused the emperor's body to be taken out of the grave, caused the body of the antipope Guibert, dead six years before, to be dug up and thrown into the river, and in the same manner were treated by his holiness's partisans the bodies of all the bishops who had received investitures from the emperor's hand.²

The pope no sooner heard of the death of the emperor, than he set out for Germany, being invited thither by the ambassadors of the new king, promising, in their master's name, an entire submission and obedience to the apostolic see, and begging his holiness to come and receive, in person, the homage, which all in all those parts were ready to pay him. On his arrival at Florence he was informed, that the bishop of the place had maintained that the antichrist was born, and the end of the world was at hand. The pope was desirous to know upon what the bishop grounded his opinion, and therefore, stopping a few days at Florence, he assembled the neighboring bishops, and held a council there. But the novelty of the subject drew such crowds to the place where the bishops were assembled, and the noise was so great, that the question could not be debated, and the council broke up. However the pope had a private conference with the bishop, and finding that he only wanted to make himself remarkable by holding and preaching that opinion, he enjoined him perpetual silence concerning it.³

From Florence the pope pursued his journey, and, arriving at Guastalla on the Po, he held another council there on the 22d of October. As most of the bishops and the clergy in Lombardy had adhered to the late emperor, and had been ordained by bishops whom he had nominated or invested, it was decreed by this council, that all thus nominated and ordained should keep their respective stations, and exercise the functions of their office, provided they were neither usurpers, nor guilty of simony, nor of any other crime. Another decree was issued,

importing, that the heresies which had lately prevailed, being now extinct, together with their author, meaning the emperor, it was fit that the church should recover her ancient liberty; and the decrees, restoring her to it, should be renewed, confirmed, and enforced. After this preamble, they forbade laymen, upon pain of excommunication, to give investitures, and clergymen to receive any at their hands, on pain of forfeiting the benefices and dignities which they had thus received. By the same council it was decreed, that the whole province of Æmilia, containing the cities of Placentia, Parma, Reggio, Modena, and Bologna, should be no longer subject to the see of Ravenna, which had, for the space of near a hundred years, set up against the Roman, and usurped its lands as well as its jurisdiction. At this council were present the ambassadors sent by Henry, King of Germany, to assure the pope anew of his sincere attachment to the apostolic see, and his earnest desire of maintaining a perfect harmony between the church and the empire.¹ From Guastalla the pope repaired to Parma, at the request of the inhabitants, and there ordained Bernard bishop of that city, declared his see immediately subject to the Roman, and appointed him his legate over all Lombardy. Thus was all Lombardy re-united to the apostolic see, from which the whole country, except the places held by the countess Mathilda, had been separated ever since the year 1080, when they all declared for the antipope Guibert, chosen that year at Brixen.²

The king and the German lords, concluding that the pope intended to keep his Christmas in Germany, met at Metz, in order to receive his holiness and celebrate that festival with him there. But Paschal, instead of continuing his journey to Germany, took unexpectedly the road to France, pretending that new difficulties were started there concerning investitures, which he wanted to remove before he went to Germany. But this was a mere pretence; for he had laid aside all thoughts of going to Germany, and putting himself in the power of the young king, who, as he was informed, seemed determined to maintain his right to investitures, notwithstanding all his protestations of obedience, and subjection to the vicar of St. Peter and his see. He found himself firmly established on the throne by the death of his father, and thinking he no longer wanted the assistance of the pope, had resolved to assert, to the utmost of his power, that very right, the asserting of which by his father had served him for a pretence to take up arms against him, and drive him from the throne.³ This intelli-

¹ Usperg. ad ann. 1106. Domnizo in Vit. Mathild.

² Domnizo, *ibid.*

³ Suger in Vit. Ludovic. apud Duchesn. t. iv. p. 288, et Usperg.

¹ Usperg. ad ann. 1106.

² *Idem*, ad ann. 1105.

³ Pandulph. Pisan. Vit. Paschal.

The pope goes to France;—[Year of Christ, 1107.] Solemn embassy from the king of Germany to the pope. The king maintains his right to investitures. Lay investitures condemned in a council at Troyes.

gence the pope received from persons of known zeal for the apostolic see, and therefore, saying with a deep sigh when he received it, "the door into Germany is not yet open to us," he altered his design, and taking the road to France, arrived at Cluny a little before Christmas, which he kept in that monastery. From Cluny he set out for St. Denis, to meet there Philip, king of France, and his son Lewis, the sixth of that name. In his way he visited a great many places at the invitation of the inhabitants, consecrating churches and monasteries, and celebrating mass with the same pomp, ceremonies, and solemnity as he did at Rome. On the fourth Sunday in Lent, which, in the present year, 1107, fell on the 24th of March, he was at Tours, and from thence repaired to St. Denis attended by a great number of bishops, and almost all the nobility of France. At St. Denis he had an interview with the two kings, who, paying the same respect to him as to St. Peter himself, fell on their knees before him. But the pope, raising them up with his hand, expressed great satisfaction at the reception he had every where met with in their dominions, commended them for treading in the footsteps of their ancestors, the defenders and protectors of the apostolic see, and then entering upon the motives of his journey, told them that he was come to implore their protection against the enemies of the church, particularly against Henry, king of Germany, who, notwithstanding the obligations he owed to the Roman see, threatened the church with the same calamities that it had suffered under his father. The two kings assured the pope that he should find them no less ready to assist him, when called upon, than his predecessors had found the most zealous among theirs to assist them.

In the mean time Henry, hearing of the pope's journey into France, and not doubting but he had undertaken it to engage the assistance of those princes, in case of a rupture between him and the apostolic see, convened a diet at Mentz, consisting of all the lords and bishops of his kingdom; and by all the investing of bishops and abbots was declared a right inherent in the crown, and it was resolved, that a solemn embassy should be sent to the pope, to put an end, if possible, in an amicable manner, to that dispute. For this embassy were chosen the archbishop of Treves, the bishops of Halberstat and Munster, Albert, great chancellor of the empire, and many other persons of the first rank and distinction. They met the pope at Chalons on the Marne, and in the audience they had, the bishop of Treves, who spoke for the rest, after wishing his holiness all prosperity in the king's name, and offering him his service, so far as was consistent with the rights of his crown, he declared, that ever since the time of Gre-

gory the Great the election of a bishop was notified to the emperor before it was made public; that if he confirmed it, it was then published, the elect was ordained, and after ordination applied to the emperor, and was by him invested with the crosier and the ring, in the temporalities of his see, paying homage for them, and taking the usual oath of allegiance; that it was but reasonable he should hold upon these, and no other terms, demesnes, cities, castles, &c., that were given by the emperors, and depended upon the empire; and that the king, his master, was disposed to render all the respect, obedience, and submission, that was due to his holiness, provided his holiness was, in his turn, disposed to render unto Cæsar what was Cæsar's. The bishop of Placentia answered the archbishop in the pope's name, that the church, redeemed by the blood of Christ, and set at liberty, ought not to be enslaved anew; that she would be the prince's slave, if she could not choose her own ministers without his consent; that the staff and ring belonged to the altar, and consequently could not be disposed of by laymen; and that it was highly unbecoming, that hands, consecrated by the body and blood of Christ, should receive the ensigns of their dignity and power from hands imbrued in blood shed by the sword. The bishop was going on, when his ambassadors, interrupting him, said aloud, "This is not the place where we are to decide the dispute; the sword must decide it at Rome." With these menaces they left the assembly abruptly, and returned to their lodgings. The pope sent some of the bishops, who attended him, to confer with the chancellor Albert, in whom he knew the king reposed an entire confidence. But they found him no less determined than the rest to maintain the king's right to investitures, which, he said, all the other emperors and kings of Germany had enjoyed, and the present king was determined never to give up. The ambassadors set out the next day on their return to Germany: and the pope leaving Chalons, repaired first to Chartres, where he kept his Easter with Ivo, the celebrated bishop of that city, and from thence to Troyes, to preside at a council, which he had appointed to meet there.¹

The council met about the end of May, consisted of most of the bishops of France, Burgundy, and the neighboring countries; and the pope, to show that he was resolved, notwithstanding the menaces of the Germans, to maintain his pretended right to investitures, caused all the decrees relating thereunto, to be confirmed by the assembly. This the king of Germany foresaw, and therefore sent ambassadors to declare to the pope and the council, in his name, that ever

¹ Suger. ubi supra. Usperg. Orderic. l. ii. p. 820.

since the time of pope Gregory the Great, his predecessors had invested bishops with the staff and the ring; that this prerogative had been confirmed by Charlemagne, and in him to all his successors, by pope Hadrian I., and that he would not suffer his right to it to be determined by the subjects of another prince. The pope would not allow the decree of his predecessor Hadrian to be genuine, but nevertheless granted the king the delay of a whole year, that he might, when most convenient during that time, go to Rome, and there plead his cause, in person, before a general council, which should be convened to hear his reasons and do him justice. The king acquiesced; and we hear no more of this dispute till the year 1110, when we shall have occasion to resume the same subject.

The pope found the king of England more pliant than the late emperor, or the present king of Germany. Henry had declared, by his ambassador at Rome, as has been related above, that he would not for his kingdom, part with his right to investitures. He nevertheless parted, or rather promised to part, with that prerogative, upon the terms I have spoken of above, namely, that Anselm should not excommunicate those who had received investitures from him, nor exclude them from his communion. As Anselm would not agree to these terms without consulting the pope, envoys were sent, in 1105, both by him and the king, for that purpose, to Rome. The pope, overjoyed to hear that the king was disposed to renounce investitures upon any terms whatever, readily agreed to those he demanded, and the envoys returned in 1106 with the following agreement, namely, that bishops and abbots might be consecrated, notwithstanding their doing homage to the king upon their election; that Anselm should communicate with such of them as had, till the time of the present agreement, received investiture from the king; and that thenceforth the king should renounce all right to investitures. As the clergy were forbidden, by the decrees of Gregory and Urban, to do homage to princes, Paschal tells Anselm in a letter which he wrote on this occasion, that out of the great regard he had for the king of England, he condescended at the homage that was paid him, till he could persuade him to give it up. Anselm, who waited in Normandy for the return of the envoys sent to Rome, no sooner received the pope's letter, containing the articles which he was to agree to, than he prepared to set out for England, in order to have them approved and ratified by the king. But he was taken ill, and in the mean time the king arrived in Normandy, to pursue the conquest which he had so successfully begun. Before he took the field, he went to the monastery of Bec, where Anselm still continued, not being yet

well recovered from his late indisposition. However, upon the arrival of the king, he celebrated mass with great solemnity, and in the conference they had before the king left the place, all things were settled to the entire satisfaction of both, the king being pleased with the pope's allowing the bishops, abbots, and other ecclesiastics to do him homage; while Anselm was no less pleased with the king's renouncing a right of the utmost importance to the apostolic see, and as such so strongly insisted on by so many popes. On this occasion, the king, at the request of Anselm, freed all the churches in England from the heavy impositions which his brother, William Rufus, had laid upon them, promised never to touch the revenues of vacant sees, to return to Anselm the whole sum that had accrued from the income of his see during his absence, and, as to the tax laid on the parochial clergy, to exact nothing of those who had not yet paid it, and exempt such as had already paid it, from all imposts for the space of three years. All differences being thus composed, Anselm set out on his return to England in the latter end of August or the beginning of September, 1106; and the king, a few days after, completed by a signal victory, the reduction of all Normandy. The duke's army was entirely defeated, the duke himself and most of the Norman lords were taken prisoners, and sent to England, where they were shut up in different castles till death delivered them.¹ The king immediately acquainted Anselm with his victory, ascribing the success of an unjust a war as, perhaps, was ever undertaken, to the particular protection of heaven. It is to be observed, that neither the pope nor Anselm ever once offered to divert the king from that war, unjust and unnatural as it was, while they threatened him with excommunication, and left nothing else in their power unattempted to divert him from giving investitures; as if they had thought the delivering of a staff and ring to a bishop, or an abbot, more criminal than such a war, and the shedding of so much Christian blood.

The king did not leave Normandy till a little before Easter, 1107, being employed in settling the affairs of his new conquest. He no sooner arrived in England than Anselm, desirous of having the above agreement approved and confirmed by the whole nation, persuaded the king to assemble for that purpose all the bishops, abbots, and lords of the kingdom; and he accordingly appointed them to meet on the 1st of August, 1107. They met at the time appointed, in the king's palace at London, and the affair of investitures was warmly debated for three days together, some being for the king's investing bishops and abbots with the staff and the

¹ Eadmer, Novor. l. iv. c. 3.

The king makes a formal resignation of his rights to investitures. Paschal returns to Rome. Council of Beneventum;—[Year of Christ, 1103.] Solemn embassy from the king of Germany to the pope;—[Year of Christ, 1109.]

ring, in the same manner as they had been invested by his two immediate predecessors, his father and his brother; while others, gained by the artifices of Anselm, but more by his good offices in persuading the king to ease the churches of the heavy impositions laid upon them, approved of the king's laying aside the usual method of investing, and contenting himself with the homage that the bishops and the abbots were allowed to pay him upon their election. But the king had already renounced his right to investitures, by his agreement with Anselm, and therefore made a formal resignation of it in the present council, contrary to the advice of many of the bishops as well as the lords. The council being ended, several sees, that had long been vacant on account of this dispute, were immediately filled, and the ceremony of investing the new bishops, by the delivery of the staff and ring, was omitted. Thus were no fewer than six bishop ordained, in one day, by Anselm, and Gerard archbishop of York, "after they had been canonically elected," says the historian, "by their respective churches;"¹ which words seem to insinuate that the king gave up his right to the nominating as well as to the investing of bishops. Thus ended this controversy in England, the king tamely parting with one of the most undoubted rights, and most valuable prerogatives of his crown. But finding that the king of Germany still continued to assert the right that he had given up, he threatened to resume it, complaining to Anselm of the pope's partiality in requiring him to resign a prerogative which he allowed another prince to enjoy, who had no better right to it. Anselm acquainted the pope with the king's complaints; and his letter was immediately answered by Paschal in the following terms: "Know that I never did, that I never will suffer the king of Germany to give investitures. I only wait till the fierceness of that nation be somewhat tamed: but if the king continues to follow the wicked example of his father, he shall feel, in due time, the weight of the sword of St. Peter, which we have already begun to draw."² We shall see, in the sequel, the issue of this dispute with the king of Germany, and in the mean time return to Paschal, whom we left at Troyes giving audience to the German ambassadors, in the council which he held in that city.

From Troyes Paschal returned to Rome about the latter end of the present year, 1107, and was there received, says the abbot of Usperg, by all ranks of men, as if he had returned from the dead. He continued at Rome the greater part of the following year, 1108; and during his stay there, restored the see of Braga to the metropolitan dignity

which it had formerly enjoyed,¹ and annulled the marriage of Urraca, daughter of Alphonsus VI., king of Castile and Leon, with Alphonsus, king of Arragon, to whom she was related in the third degree of consanguinity. The pope, in his letter to Didicus, bishop of Compostella, orders him to command Urraca, in his name, to depart from the king on pain of being excluded from the communion of the church, and deprived of all secular power. However, in 1110 she had not yet obeyed that order, as appears from a grant of king Alphonsus, her husband, to the monastery of St. Mary of Balvanera, bearing that date, wherein the king calls her his wife, saying, "I and my wife Urraca, the daughter of the most valiant king Alphonsus, and related to me by blood, who jointly rule with royal authority from the Pyrenean mountains to the reflux of the ocean, grant," &c.² From Rome the pope repaired to Beneventum to hold a council there; but of that council we know no more than what we read in the chronicle of Petrus Cassinensis, namely, that Paschal came to Monte Cassino in the month of October of the present year, 1108, and taking with him Bruno, bishop of Segni, and abbot of that monastery, went from thence to Beneventum, and in a council which he held there, excommunicated, as his predecessors had done, all laymen who should presume to give, and all clerks who should receive investitures at their hands; and besides forbade clerks to wear lay or costly habits.³ Paschal, upon his return to Rome, appointed Gerard, bishop of Angoulesme, his legate over all France, who is said to have held no fewer than eight councils during the time of his legation, and to have reformed many abuses that prevailed in those churches.⁴ Paschal entertained a very high opinion of Gerard's sanctity, as well as his abilities. But we shall see him adhering to an anti-pope, when he could not prevail upon the true pope to confirm to him, his legatine power.

In the mean time the young king of Germany, desirous of having an end put to the quarrel between him and the pope, and not a little provoked at Paschal's excommunicating in all his councils, laymen who gave, and ecclesiastics who received, investitures from them, sent Frederick, archbishop of Cologne, Bruno, archbishop of Treves, Heriman of Winceburch, in whom he reposed great confidence, and several other German lords, with the character of his ambassadors to Rome, to try whether they could, upon any reasonable terms, conclude an agreement with his holiness, and restore by that means, the union that had formerly

¹ Bernard. in Vit. Gerald. ² Sandoval, fol. 120.

³ Petrus Cassin. Chron. lib. iv. c. 35.

⁴ Pasch. ep. 37.

¹ Continuator. Ingul. p. 126.

² Pasch. ep. 44.

Articles of the treaty concluded between the pope and the king. Alliance between the pope and the Normans. Lateran council;—[Year of Christ, 1110.] The king sets out for Italy. Ratifies the treaty concluded by his ambassadors.

subsisted between the apostolic see and the empire. The pope received them on their arrival at Rome with all possible marks of distinction, declared that it was his sincere desire to live in the strictest friendship with his beloved son, the king of Germany, and that he ever should, provided the king on his part behaved as became a catholic king, a son and defender of the church. The ambassadors continued at Rome all this year and part of the next, negotiating an agreement between the pope and the king; and an agreement was, in the end, concluded upon the following terms: that the emperor, (for so he is styled by Petrus Diaconus,) should renounce all right and title to investitures by a writing, which he should deliver to the pope in the presence of the clergy and the people; that he should leave the churches free with their oblations, and such demesnes as did not belong to the empire before the church possessed them; that he should absolve the people from their oaths, which they had been forced to take against their bishops; that he should restore the patrimonies and possessions of St. Peter, as was done by Charles, Lewis, Henry, and the other emperors, and maintain, to the utmost of his power, the said apostle in possession of them; that he should not contribute, by word or deed, to deprive the pope of his pontificate, of his life, his limbs, or his liberty; and that in this article should be included Peter of Leo, (that is, Peter, the son of Leo, a man of great power in Rome, and zealously attached to the pope,) his children, and such others as the pope should name; and lastly, that the emperor should deliver to the pope Frederic, his sister's son, and twelve lords of the empire, who are all named in the treaty, as he says, for the observance of these articles. The pope, on his side, engaged, if the emperor fulfilled what he had promised, to order the bishops, who should be present at his coronation, to resign and deliver up to him whatever had belonged to the crown in the time of Lewis, Henry, and the other emperors his predecessors; to forbid them, on pain of excommunication, to usurp or claim the royalties, that is, cities, duchies, marquises, counties, the right of coinage, of holding markets, levying taxes, exacting tolls; to give him no trouble for holding the lordships, and whatever else had belonged to the empire; to receive him with honour, and crown him in the same manner as his predecessors had been crowned by other popes; and lastly, that Peter of Leo should continue with the king till the pope had fulfilled all the articles of this agreement.¹

As the pope did not know whether the king would ratify the treaty he had con-

cluded with his ambassadors, he applied, in the mean time, to the Norman princes of Apulia and Calabria, who readily engaged to assist him with all their forces, and to march, at a moment's warning, to his assistance, by whomsoever attacked. In like manner the chief and most powerful citizens of Rome declared, all to a man, that they would stand by his holiness to the last, in case the agreement between him and the king should not take place. The pope, thus encouraged, held a council in the Lateran palace, and there excommunicated anew all laymen who should, from that hour, give investitures, and all ecclesiastics, who should, upon any pretence whatsoever, receive them at their hands. At the same time they were suspended from all the functions of their office, who should ordain any that had been thus promoted.¹

The king was no sooner informed by his ambassadors of the issue of their negotiations with the pope, than he resolved to go to Rome, in order to be crowned there, and put the finishing hand to the treaty, which they had begun. This his intention he notified to the states of the empire in a general diet, which he had appointed to meet for that purpose, at Ratisbon, inviting all the lords and princes, who were present, to attend him, in the most splendid manner they could, that the ceremony of his coronation might thus be rendered the more august. He set out from Germany in the beginning of August, at the head of a very numerous army, consisting of thirty thousand horse, besides foot, and entering Italy on the day of the assumption of the Virgin Mary, that is, on the 15th of that month, he obliged all the cities and countries through which he passed to do him homage; and such places as refused to admit him he besieged, took, and laid in ashes, and, among the rest, the two cities of Novara in Lombardy, and Arezzo in Tuscany. As the season was far advanced, and his army had suffered greatly in passing the Appenine mountains, he stopped some time at Florence, kept his Christmas there, and after the holidays resumed his march, and arrived at Sutri. He was there met by the ambassadors he had sent to Rome, who delivered to him the treaty, which they had concluded with the pope. As by one of the articles of that treaty the bishops were to deliver up to the king all the towns, castles, estates, and lordships, that had been given them by the emperor his predecessor, or had ever belonged to the empire, and he, in exchange, was only to renounce the right of delivering to them a staff and a ring, he immediately ratified it, and swore strictly to observe every article it contained; but upon condition, that

¹ Petrus Damian. Chron. Cassin. lib. ii. c. 37.

¹ Concil. t. x.

The king enters the Leonine city;—[Year of Christ, 1111.] How received by the pope. His interview with the pope. He arrests the pope. The Romans strive to rescue him. Great slaughter on both sides.

the bishops agreed to it of their own accord, or that his holiness obliged them to agree to it.

The treaty being thus ratified and sworn to by the king, and by Peter of Leo in the pope's name, the king approached the city with his army, and encamped, on the 11th of February, 1111, at a small distance from the walls. The next day, being Quinquagesima Sunday, he made his entry into the Leonine city, was received without the gate by the Jews, under it by the Greeks, and within by the whole Roman clergy, and a hundred nuns with burning tapers in their hands; when, alighting from his horse, he was attended by them, and an infinite multitude of people, with loud acclamations, to the Vatican. The pope waited for him upon the steps of St. Peter's church, which the king ascended, and prostrating himself before him, kissed his feet. The pope raised him, and they then embraced and kissed each other three times, and then proceeded together, the king holding the pope's right hand, to the silver door, one of the doors of St. Peter's church. There the pope appointed him emperor, kissed him again, and the bishop of Lavinia said the first prayer over him. They then entered the church, and coming to a place called the Porphyry Wheel, the pavement being inlaid with porphyry in circles, they both sat down in two chairs placed there by the pope's order, while the cardinals, the Roman clergy, and the Germans, stood round them. Being thus seated, the pope desired the king to restore to the church her just rights, and renounce investitures, pursuant to the treaty, which he had ratified and sworn to observe. The king answered, that as he had engaged to renounce investitures, upon condition that the bishops gave up to him all the estates and lordships which they held of the empire, he must first know whether they were disposed to comply with that condition. He accordingly rose up, and, leaving the pope, retired, with such of the German and Lombard bishops as were present, to the vestry, to confer with them there. As the conference lasted a long time, the pope, weary of waiting, sent to the king to desire he would return and perform what he had promised. He returned, and the bishops with him, all to a man protesting against the treaty and declaring that they would not part with their estates; that the pope had no right to dispose of them, and that as the emperor had given them to the church they were unalienable. The pope strove in vain to satisfy them, saying, "It was just to render unto Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's; that he, who serves God, ought not to be taken up with the affairs of this world; that the use of arms, and consequently the possession of castles and strong-holds, is, according to St. Ambrose, foreign to the office of a bishop." The bishops, sensible that the

pope's whole conduct, in this very affair, was a manifest contradiction to the maxims which he inculcated to them, and that he only wanted to acquire the disputed prerogative at their expense, kept to the resolution they had taken in spite of all his holiness's exhortations as well as menaces. However, the pope, pretending to have fulfilled, on his side, all the articles of the treaty, challenged the king to fulfil them in like manner on his. This occasioned a warm dispute between the king and the pope, in the heat of which a German of the king's retinue stepping up to the pope, "to what purpose," said he with a haughty air, "so many speeches? What have we to do with your articles and treaties? Know that our lord the emperor will have you to crown him, without any of your articles or conditions, as your predecessors crowned Charles, Lewis, and Pepin." The pope answered with great composure, that he neither could, nor would crown him, till he had executed the treaty, which he had bound himself by a solemn oath to observe. As the king had ratified the treaty, and sworn to observe it, only upon condition that the bishops resigned their lordships, which they refused, and would not by the pope himself be prevailed upon to do, he was so provoked at the pope's unfair proceeding, that he ordered his guards to surround him that moment, saying, that he should crown him. The pope, however, was allowed to celebrate mass as it was Quinquagesima Sunday; but as he was going to retire, when the service was ended, the soldiers stopped him, and all the cardinals who were with him, and kept them in the church till the dusk of the evening, when they were all conveyed, under a strong guard, to a house at a small distance from the church.¹

In the mean time two of the cardinals, John bishop of Tusculum, and Leo bishop of Ostia, having made their escape, and got, in the disguise of two plebeians, into Rome, inflamed the inhabitants to such a degree against the Germans, that they flew immediately to arms, and murdered every German they met in the streets, who, being ignorant of what had happened, were either innocently visiting the holy places out of devotion, or viewing the rarities of the city out of curiosity. The enraged Romans did not stop there, but passing the bridges of the Tiber in battle-array, attacked the king with such fury, that it was with great difficulty he kept his ground. The Romans, however, were repulsed at last: but they soon returned, in great numbers, to the charge, the fight was renewed, and such was the slaughter on both sides, that the Tiber was tinged with the blood of the slain. The king himself was wounded in

¹ Acta Vaticanæ. apud Baron. ad ann. 1111, et Petrus Diacon. Chron. Cassin. l. 4. c. 38, 39.

The emperor retires from the Leonine city, taking the pope and cardinals with him. The pope withstands the menaces of the emperor. Yields at last.

the face, was unhorsed, and would have fallen into the hands of his merciless enemies, had not Otho, count of Milan, flying to his rescue, given him his horse, and thus enabled him to put himself again at the head of his cavalry, who had begun to give way. The count was taken, and carried into the city by the Romans, where they cut him to pieces, with the utmost barbarity, and threw his mangled members to the dogs. The Germans, though encouraged by the king at their head, were driven back to St. Peter's, and even from their quarters in that neighborhood, which the Romans plundered. But the Germans falling upon them as they were passing the bridge of St. Angelo, loaded with the booty, a dreadful slaughter ensued, the booty was recovered, and great numbers of the Romans were either slain on the bridge, or forced to throw themselves into the river, where they all perished. They who escaped the slaughter, being joined by others, still rallied, and the fight lasted till night coming on parted the combatants. In the mean time the cardinal of Tusculum, having assembled the Romans, and representing to them in an inflaming harangue the unworthy treatment the pope had met with from the Germans, and the obligation they were under of rescuing him out of the hands of his enemies, even at the expense of their lives, worked them up to such a pitch of fury and rage, that they bound themselves by a solemn oath to resist the king to the last drop of their blood, and to look upon all as their enemies who should join or assist him. The cardinal promised, at the same time, remission of all their sins to such as should die in so good a cause, in so holy a war.¹

The king, informed of the disposition of the Romans, and the resolution they had taken, thought it advisable to retire; and he left accordingly the Leonine city in the night, carrying with him the pope, the cardinals, and several of the Roman nobility. The king strove, on his march, to bring the pope to his terms; that is, to crown him without requiring him to give up investitures. But finding that he still refused to comply with these terms, he caused him to be stripped of his pontifical ornaments, and bound like a criminal. The cardinals, and such of the Roman nobility and clergy as were taken with the pope, met with no better treatment, and they were all bound and shut up in different prisons, in the neighborhood of mount Soracte, where the king first halted. From mount Soracte the king entered the country of the Sabins, with a design to return against Rome. He left the pope with the two bishops of Sabinia and Porto, and four cardinals, under a strong guard, at a castle called Terbicum, and the

rest of the cardinals at the castle of Corcodisum, places now utterly unknown. The pope was attended by some German lords, and none but Germans were allowed to come near him. In the mean time, the king, by laying waste the neighborhood of Rome with fire and sword, and preventing any supplies of provisions from being conveyed into the city, had reduced it to the utmost distress. But the Romans, encouraged by the bishop of Tusculum, still refused to submit, nay, and rejected, with scorn, the large sums with which the king attempted to bribe them. Their obstinacy so provoked the young prince, that he ordered the pope, the cardinals, and all the other prisoners to be brought to his camp, and, in the presence of his whole army, swore, that if the pope did not fulfil the articles of their agreement, he would put him to death, and all who were with him. The pope, not in the least intimidated with these menaces, answered, that he was in the king's power, and he might therefore dispose of him as he pleased; but that he would rather part with his life than what was dearer to him than life itself, the rights of his see. Hereupon the emperor, finding that the obstinacy of the pope was proof against his menaces, changed his style, and offered to release him and the rest of the prisoners, provided he renounced his claim to investitures, declaring that, by that ceremony, he did not mean to confer any spiritual power, authority or jurisdiction, but only to convey the temporalities, and demesnes, that depended upon the empire. But the pope, no more moved by the offers of the emperor than by his threats, still returned the same answer. However, the cardinals and other prisoners, no longer able to bear this captivity, earnestly besought him to have pity upon them, and comply for their sakes, if not for his own, with the demands of the emperor. They represented to him the deplorable state of the Roman church, that had lost almost all its cardinals, the miseries that so many men of the first distinction in Rome endured in the prisons to which they were confined, being, for their attachment to him and his see, snatched from their wives, their children, their country, and from every thing that was dear to them, and the imminent danger of a schism, since the emperor would not fail to cause another pope, more pliant, to be chosen, if he could not obtain from him what he demanded. The pope long withstood the prayers and entreaties of all his friends. But as they, laying before him the calamities which the church was threatened with, and the hardships that they were forced to undergo, gave him no respite; he yielded in the end, and bursting into tears, "I am forced," he said, "to suffer for the peace and liberty of the church, what I had rather have lost my life than have suffered."²

¹ Petrus Diacon. Chron. Cassin. l. iv. c. 38, 39.

Articles agreed to by the pope and the emperor. The bull granted by the pope to the emperor. The emperor crowned.

The pope having thus consented to an agreement with the emperor, the following articles were drawn up by his order, and signed by ten cardinals, two bishops, and three deacons: "Pope Paschal shall not molest king Henry on account of giving investitures to the bishops and abbots of his kingdom; he shall not concern himself with them, nor shall he ever excommunicate the king for granting them, or for any injury he had done, on occasion of this dispute, to him or his friends and adherents; the king shall invest, as he has done hitherto, with the crozier and the ring, the bishops and abbots who shall have been elected freely, without simony, and with his approbation; the archbishops and bishops shall consecrate those whom the king shall have thus invested, and none shall be consecrated till he has invested them; the pope shall crown the emperor forthwith, shall assist him to preserve his kingdom, and shall confirm to him, by a special bull, the right of investing." The articles drawn up in the emperor's name, and sworn to by the archbishop of Cologne, the bishops of Trent, Spire, Munster, by Albert, Chancellor of the empire, and by eight counts and marquises, were as follows: "I, Henry, on Wednesday or Thursday next, shall set at liberty pope Paschal, and all the cardinals, bishops, and other persons, as well as hostages who have been taken with him, and for him; and shall cause him to be conducted safe to the gate of the Transiberine city. I shall not henceforth arrest, or cause any to be arrested, who shall be faithful to pope Paschal; and the Roman people, as well as the inhabitants of the Transiberine city, shall enjoy peace and safety, unmolested, both in their persons and estates; I shall restore the patronies and demesnes of the Roman church, which I have taken, shall help and assist her to recover and to hold whatever in justice belongs to her, as my ancestors have done, and shall obey pope Paschal, saving the honor of my kingdom and empire, as the catholic emperors have obeyed the catholic popes."

These articles were drawn up and sworn to in the emperor's camp, at a small distance from Rome. The emperor, however, distrusting, it seems, the pope, would not release him till he was in possession of the bull confirming to him the right of investiture. Paschal's secretary, therefore, and his seal, were sent for from Rome, and as soon as the secretary arrived, the bull was drawn up, was signed by the pope, and sealed with his seal. It was couched in the following terms: "Paschal, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to his beloved son, Henry, king of the Germans, and by the grace of God, emperor of the Romans, health and apostolic benediction. As your kingdom

has been always distinguished by its attachment to the church, and your predecessors have deserved by their probity to be honored with the imperial crown at Rome, it has pleased the Almighty to call you, my beloved son Henry, in like manner, to that dignity, &c. We therefore grant to you that prerogative, which our predecessors have granted to yours, namely, that you invest the bishops and abbots of your kingdom with the staff and ring, provided they shall have been elected freely and without simony, and that they be consecrated, after you shall have invested them, by the bishops, whose province it is. If any shall be chosen by the people and the clergy without your approbation, let him not be consecrated till you have invested him. The bishops and archbishops shall be at full liberty to consecrate the bishops and abbots whom you shall have invested. For your predecessors have so endowed and enriched the church out of their own demesnes, that the bishops and abbots ought to be the foremost in contributing to the defence and support of the state; and it behoves you, on your parts, to suppress the popular dissensions that happen at elections. If any person, whether clerk or layman, shall presume to infringe this, our concession, he shall be struck with anathema, and shall forfeit his dignity. May the mercy of the Almighty protect those who shall observe it, and grant your majesty a happy reign."¹

All things being thus settled, the pope was set at liberty, having been kept prisoner for the space of eight weeks, that is, from Quinquagesima Sunday, which in the present year, 1111, fell on the 12th of February, to the first Sunday after Easter. The pope and the emperor entered the Leonine city together, and proceeding straight to the church of St. Peter, the emperor was there crowned by the pope on Sunday, the 12th of April, with the usual solemnity, the gates of Rome being all kept shut during the ceremony, to prevent the Romans and the Germans from quarrelling anew. When the ceremony of the coronation was ended, the pope celebrated mass, and coming to the communion, divided the host, took one part of it himself, and gave the other to the emperor, saying, "We give you, emperor Henry, the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, the same that was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered on the cross, as we are taught by the holy catholic church; we give it you in confirmation of the peace we have made; and as this part of the vivifying sacrament is divided from the other, so may he who shall attempt to break this agreement, be divided from our Lord Jesus Christ, and excluded from his kingdom." The em-

¹ Petrus Diacon. Chron. Cassin. l. iv. c. 38, 39. et 40.

The emperor returns to Germany. The pope blamed council;—[Year of Christ, 1112.]

for the bull granted to the emperor. The Lateran The grant of the pope revoked.

peror, before he took his leave of the pope, insisted upon his delivering to him the above mentioned bull with his own hand, in the sight of all who were present. This Paschal declined at first, but was in the end obliged to comply. With that bull the emperor returned in triumph to his camp, and soon after set out for Germany. The pope, now at liberty, entered Rome, where such crowds flocked from all quarters to see him, and congratulate him upon his deliverance, that it was night before he got to the Lateran palace.¹

Paschal met with a very different reception from the cardinals who had remained in Rome during his imprisonment, and from the clergy in general. They all looked upon him as one who had sacrificed the right of the church to his own safety, and pressing him, not without menaces, to revoke immediately the bull he had granted, and declare null all he had done; they protested to his face that they never would acquiesce in a grant so unjust, and so prejudicial to the interest and honor of the church, and so openly repugnant to the decrees of his two late predecessors Gregory and Urban. On the other hand, the cardinals who had been imprisoned with the pope, undertook his defence with no less warmth, representing his compliance with the demands of the emperor as a necessary measure to save the city and inhabitants of Rome, as well as the church, from imminent ruin. But their reasons were of no weight with the cardinals of the opposite party, who, upon the pope's going, we know not upon what occasion, into Campania, assembled as soon as he was gone, and having with one voice declared void and null all his concessions, they renewed the decrees against lay investitures, and with John of Tusculum, and Leo of Vercelli at their head, condemned all who should act, or should support any who acted contrary to those decrees; which was condemning the pope himself, and with him all who adhered to him. The pope being informed of what had passed, wrote to the cardinals from Terracina, blaming their indiscreet zeal, striving to convince them that, by yielding he had prevented greater evils, and promising to correct the evil which they thought he had done. This letter is dated the 5th of July of the present year, and it appeared the cardinals for the present. But Bruno, bishop of Segni, and abbot of Monte Cassino, once one of Paschal's chief favorites, insisted on his not only revoking the bull, but excommunicating the emperor for extorting it from him. As for the oath he had taken, Bruno maintained it to be null, because not taken freely, and even told Paschal in the very severe letter which he wrote to him on this occasion, that it was simony, heresy, and

idolatry for a layman to give, and for a clerk to receive investiture at his hands, and that he was no catholic who approved of the one or the other. As this was telling the pope that he was a heretic, or an abettor of heresy, he highly resented it, and wrote immediately to the monks of Monte Cassino, by Leo bishop of Ostia, and a monk of that monastery, commanding them to withdraw all obedience to Bruno, and to choose forthwith another abbot in his room. The monks obeyed; and Bruno retiring to his bishopric, led there a most religious and exemplary life till the year 1125, when he died, and was canonized after his death by Lucius II.

Paschal finding his conduct was censured, not only by the Roman, but by most other churches, sincerely repented of what he had done, and wanted to revoke the bull he had granted. But being at a loss how to reconcile his revoking it with the oath never to molest the emperor on account of investitures, he appointed a council to meet in the Lateran, in order to advise with the bishops of different nations about the means of observing that oath, and yet preserving the liberty and rights of the church. The council met on the 25th of March, 1112; consisted of twelve archbishops, one hundred and fourteen bishops, fifteen cardinal priests, eight cardinal deacons, a great number of abbots, and ecclesiastics of all ranks, and the pope presided at it in person. In the three first sessions of this council, several regulations were made relating to the discipline of the church, and in the fourth the decrees against the Guibertines, that is, against those who had adhered to the anti-pope Guibert, suspending them from all ecclesiastical functions, were renewed and confirmed by the pope, who they pretended had absolved and restored them. In the fifth session the pope gave the council a minute account of all his transactions with the emperor, from the time he was taken till he was set at liberty; told them that, to prevent greater evils, he had granted to the emperor the privilege of investing all the bishops and abbots of his kingdom; that he had confirmed the privilege to him by a special bull; that though it was extorted by force and violence, yet as he had sworn to observe it, and never to molest the emperor on account of investitures, he would not excommunicate him; that he had not done well in granting such a privilege.—was sensible that it ought to be corrected, but that, as to the manner, he left it to the judgment, to the prudence, and discretion of the council. The bishops desired they might be allowed to deliberate, and that the deciding of so important an affair might be put off to the next day, which the pope readily agreed to.

As the granting of investitures was by some, and by Bruno of Segni among the rest, deemed heresy, the pope, to leave no

¹ Petrus Diac. c. 41, 42. et Masson. in Not. ad Ivon.

The emperor excommunicated by the pope's legate in France. Embassy from the emperor Alexius to the pope;—[Year of Christ, 1113.] The emperor excommunicated in several councils;—[Year of Christ, 1114, 1115.]

room for such an imputation (as popes were not yet thought infallible) made, at their meeting the next day, a public confession of faith, declaring that he received the holy writings of the Old and New Testament, the four Gospels, the seven canonical epistles, the canons of the apostles, the four general councils of Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon, as the four gospels, the decrees of the Roman pontiffs, especially of Gregory VII. and Urban II., that he held what they had held, condemned what they had condemned, approved what they had approved, and forbade what they had forbidden, and that he would ever persevere in these sentiments. When the pope had ended his confession of faith, the council took his bull in favor of the emperor into consideration, and very different were their opinions concerning it. But that of Gerard, bishop of Angoulesme, who spoke the last, was received by all as dictated by the Holy Ghost, namely, that as the pope had only promised not to excommunicate the emperor, he might excommunicate his own bull, and thus render it as ineffectual as if it never had been issued. As his opinion was approved by the whole council, he drew it up in the following terms; "all of us, who are assembled in this holy council, condemn by the authority of the church, and the judgment of the Holy Ghost, the privilege extorted from the pope by king Henry, and that it may for ever be void and null, we excommunicate the said privilege, it being thereby ordained that a bishop though canonically elected, shall not be consecrated till he has received investiture from the king, which is against the Holy Ghost, and inconsistent with canonical institution." When this paper was read, the whole council cried out with one voice, "Amen, amen; fiat, fiat."¹

The pope would not excommunicate the emperor, but he suffered him to be every where excommunicated by his legates, and confirmed the sentence they had pronounced; which was the same thing as if he himself had excommunicated him, since their sentence was null, unless approved and confirmed by him. Thus Guido, archbishop of Vienne, at this time the pope's legate in France, having assembled all the bishops under the jurisdiction of his see, not only confirmed the sentence of the Lateran council, but declared it heresy to receive investitures of a bishopric, of an abbey, or of any other ecclesiastical preferment whatever from the hand of a layman, and thundered out the sentence of excommunication against the emperor for the violence he had offered to the pope, in forcing him to sign a detestable writing, derogatory to the undoubted rights of the church, and inconsistent with the de-

crees of his predecessors. The archbishop sent the acts of this council to the pope, who, with a manifest breach of his oath, immediately confirmed them.¹ Baronius writes, that Paschal was with great difficulty prevailed upon, and not till four years after, to confirm these acts.² But from the acts it appears, that the council was held in September, 1112, and the pope's letter, confirming them, is dated the 17th of November of the same year.³

The following year 1113, a solemn embassy was sent by the emperor Alexius Comnenus to Rome, to express his concern for the barbarous treatment his holiness had met with from the king of the Germans, and to thank the Romans in his name for the zeal they had shown, and the courage they had exerted in defence of their common father. The ambassadors, who were all persons of the first rank in the Greek empire, added, that the emperor, their master, proposed to come himself, or to send his son to Rome, to receive, after the example of the ancient emperors, the imperial crown at his holiness's hand.⁴ The pope sent with the ambassadors, on their return to Constantinople, Chrysolanus, archbishop of Milan, one of the most learned men of his age, and thoroughly acquainted with the Greek tongue. But of this affair no further mention is made in history. Alexius was greatly alarmed at the conquests made by the Western princes in the East, and it was, probably, to prevent them from invading his dominions that he thus courted the friendship of the pope.

The two following years 1114, 1115, several councils were held in France by Cono, cardinal and bishop of Palestrina, sent thither by the pope with the character of his legate *a Latere*, namely, one at Beauvais, another at Reims, a third at Chalons, a fourth at Cologne, and by all the emperor was solemnly excommunicated, and the decrees against lay investitures renewed and confirmed. Another council was appointed to meet at Cologne, and several archbishops, bishops, abbots, and even some of the first lords of the empire, had already assembled in that city; but cardinal Dieteric, or rather Theodoric, who was to preside at it, dying on his way from Rome to Germany, the German bishops chose one of their own body to represent the pope in his room; and by this council too the emperor was excommunicated, and with him all laymen, by what titles soever distinguished, who should thenceforth give investitures, and all ecclesiastics, who should, in defiance of the decrees of so many councils, receive them from a lay hand.

In the council, that was held at Chalons

¹ Concil. t. x. p. 767. Anonym. Hist. Pont. et Concil. Engel. apud Labeum. Biblioth. t. ii. p. 249.

² Concil. t. x. p. 786.

³ Bar. ad ann. 1112.

⁴ Concil. t. x. p. 786.

⁵ Chron. Cassin. l. iv. c. 46.

The pope's legate excommunicates the Norman bishops. The pope complains that his see was disregarded in England. The king remonstrates against the proceedings of the legate. Council of Troia.

about the middle of July, 1115, the legate Cono excommunicated all the bishops who, being summoned to that council, had not complied with the summons, and the bishops of Normandy in particular, who, though three times summoned, had neither appeared at that, nor at any other of his councils. This step highly provoked the king of England, as the Norman bishops were his subjects, and forbidden by the same laws, as the English bishops, to assist at any council, held out of their country, without his leave; and he resolved to resent it in a proper manner, the rather as he had not yet digested the treatment, which he had met with from the pope in the dispute about investitures, and was not a little chagrined by a letter that he had received a little before from Rome. That letter was written by Paschal on the following occasion: Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, dying in 1109, that see remained vacant for the space of five years, that is, till the year 1114, when Rudolph, bishop of Rochester, who had the inspection of the diocese during that long vacancy, was chosen to succeed the deceased archbishop, and put in possession of the see, without the approbation or even the knowledge of the pope. However the monks of Canterbury, by the king's order, sent soon after to Rome for the pall; and on that occasion the king wrote as well as they to the pope, to acquaint his holiness with the translation of Rudolph from Rochester to Canterbury. The pope, who had been long diverted, by his quarrel with the emperor, from attending to the affairs of England, was greatly surprised to hear that they had appointed a new archbishop, and even translated him from another see to that of Canterbury, without applying to him, who alone had a right to translate bishops. However, not caring to quarrel with the king of England at so critical a juncture, he granted the pall, but sent it over by a deputy of his own; and chose for that purpose Anselm, nephew to the late archbishop of that name, who had constantly attended the English deputies during their stay at Rome, was greatly instrumental in procuring the pall, and had lived several years in England in his uncle's life-time. The messengers were charged, on their return to England, with three letters, one for the monks of Canterbury, another for the king, and a third for the king and the bishops of the kingdom. In his letter to the monks he reproaches them, with great severity, for presuming to receive a new archbishop without acquainting him with it. In his letter to the king, he expresses great surprise and no less concern at St. Peter's being denied, in his kingdom, the honor that is due to him; complains of his not allowing either nuncios, or letters of the apostolic see, to be received in his do-

minions without his order or permission; of his suffering no appeals to be made to Rome; and in the close of his letter puts him in mind of the contribution, paid by his subjects to St. Peter, meaning the Peter-pence, which, he says, was so carelessly collected, that the Roman church received not half of what was due. His letter to the king and the bishops of England is dated the first of April, 1115, and in that letter he tells them that when Christ divided the world amongst his apostles, he committed Europe, in particular, to the care of St. Peter and St. Paul; that appeals had therefore, at all times, been made from different provinces of Europe to the apostolic see; that all matters of moment, concerning bishops, had ever been referred to, and finally determined by, the judgment of that see alone; "but you," he added, "determine all affairs by your own authority, call councils and translate bishops without our consent, or even our knowledge. If you preserve, with respect to these points, the regard you owe to the prince of the apostles and his see, we shall cherish you as our brethren and our children; but if you persist in your obstinacy, we shall shake off the dust of our feet, as the Gospel directs, and leave you to the judgment of God as being no longer members of the catholic church, but deservedly cut off from the communion of the faithful." This letter, and the sentence of excommunication pronounced by the legate against the Norman bishops, greatly exasperated the king, and with the advice of the bishops, whom he consulted on this occasion, he resolved to send an ambassador to Rome, with an answer to the pope's letter. As he intended, at the same time, to remonstrate against the proceedings of the legate, as derogatory to the privileges granted by the holy see to his father, his brother, and himself, he chose the famous bishop of Exeter, William of Warlewest, though blind, for that embassy, as he was well known to the pope, and one upon whose fidelity and abilities the king could safely rely. The bishop, blind as he was, went, in compliance with the king's command, to Rome; and though Eadmerus, as well as all other writers, is quite silent with respect to his negotiations there, yet, as we hear of no farther complaints on the king's side, the bishop, probably, prevailed upon the pope to satisfy him, and revoke the sentence of his legate against the Norman bishops.

The pope went this year into Apulia, and in a council which he held at Troia, consisting of all the archbishops, bishops, and abbots of those parts, as well as the Norman and other lords, the Treuga Dei was confirmed, and all who were present swore to

¹ Pasch. ep. 200, 205, 206. Eadmer. Novor. l. v.

The Lateran council;—[Year of Christ, 1116.] The pope's grant condemned by him and the council. The pope charged with heresy by some bishops, and defended by others. The pope refuses to excommunicate the emperor. Disturbances in Rome.

observe it, and forbear all hostilities for the space of three years.¹ From Troia the pope repaired to Benevento, and having there quieted the disturbances that prevailed among the chief citizens, aspiring at the government of the city, he returned to Rome about the middle of October, and soon after appointed a general council to meet there the following year on Monday, the third week of Lent, summoning all the bishops in the West to assist at it; or if prevented by age, indisposition, or any other canonical impediment, to send deputies to assist at it in their name.

The council met in the Lateran at the time the pope had appointed, that is, on the 6th of March 1116, was so numerous that some have styled it an œcumenical council, and the pope presided in person. In the two first sessions, the two pretenders to the see of Milan, Grosulanus and Jordanes, were heard, and in the third the bishop of Lucca, complaining of the Pisans for invading and seizing a territory which he said belonged to his church. As the bishops of the council were, with respect to this subject, divided in their opinions, and warm disputes thereupon ensued, one of the bishops, standing up, spoke thus: "The pope, our lord and father, should remember that so many bishops are here assembled, come from distant countries, and through great dangers by sea and by land, not to wrangle about temporal affairs, but chiefly to know what are his sentiments, and what we are to teach when we return to our churches." Then the pope addressed the council in the following words: "After the Lord had disposed of his servant as he thought meet, and delivered me and the Roman people into the hands of the king, I saw rapines, devastations, murders, adultery, committed daily; and it was to deliver the church and the people of God, from these and such like evils, that I did what I did. I did it as man, because I am but dust and ashes. I confess I did wrong; but beg you all to pray to God to forgive me. As for that cursed writing, which was drawn up in the camp, I condemn it, with an eternal anathema, that its memory may be for ever abhorred and detested; and I desire you all to do so." At these words they all cried out, "fiat, fiat,"—be it so, be it so.

When silence was made, Bruno, bishop of Segni, of whom I have spoken above, rising up, "Let us all," he said, "return thanks to the Almighty that we have heard pope Paschal, who presides at this council, condemn with his own mouth that privilege, which is heretical as well as iniquitous." "If the privilege," said here one of the bishops, "be heretical, he who granted it must of course be a heretic."

"A heretic!" replied cardinal Gaetan, "dare you call the pope a heretic in the face of the whole council? The writing he gave was, I own, bad, but it contained no heresy." "It cannot," said another, "be even called bad, since it was given to deliver the people of God from oppression, which is a good work according to the gospel, requiring us even to lay down our lives for our brethren." The pope, hearing himself charged with heresy, lost all patience, and commanding silence with his hand, addressed the bishops thus: "Hear me, my brethren and lords; the whole world knows that the Roman church was never infected with heresy, nay, that all heretics have, by this rock, been dashed to pieces; the Arian heresy, that had prevailed for the space of three hundred years, was here extirpated; the heresies of Eutyches, of Sabellius, of Photinus, and all other heresies and heretics, were here prescribed and suppressed; and it was for this church that our Savior prayed, when he prayed that Peter's faith might never fail." Thus ended the third session. The pope did not assist at the fourth, being employed in giving audience to the abbot of Cluny, to John Cajetan, Peter Leo, governor of the city, and others come with proposals from the emperor, desirous of putting an end, upon honorable terms, to the present dispute between the church and the state.

In the fifth session warm disputes arose between the friends of the emperor and Cono, bishop of Palestrina. The bishop, who had excommunicated the king in all the councils which he had held while legate in France, pressed the pope to pronounce the same sentence against him. But he was therein strongly opposed by Cajetan, urging the promise that his holiness had made, and confirmed with his oath. The pope declared that he never would excommunicate the emperor, but would inviolably observe the promise he had made. However, he confirmed, which was a manifest breach of that promise, the sentence that Cono and his other legates had thundered out against him, and all who adhered to him; and that sentence was renewed by all the bishops of the council.¹ The pope was obliged, soon after the council was ended, to leave Rome for a while, and retire to Setia, now Sezza, on account of the disturbances that were raised by the son of the late prefect, who had, upon his father's death, usurped the prefecture of the city, but could not prevail upon the pope and some of the chief citizens to acknowledge him, which occasioned a kind of civil war. But they, who supported him, being in an encounter defeated by the opposite party, peace was restored to the city, and the pope returned to Rome.²

¹ Falco in Chron.

¹ Concil. t. x. p. 806. Usperg. in Chron. ad ann. 1116.

² Falco in Chron. Benevent. ad ann. 1116.

The pope attempts to introduce the legatine power into England. The archbishop of Canterbury sent to Rome to remonstrate against that attempt. The pope confirms all the privileges of the see of Canterbury;—[Year of Christ, 1117.] Paschal favors the archbishop of York against the archbishop of Canterbury. The emperor sends deputies to Rome to get the sentence of excommunication revoked.

As Anselm, nephew to the late archbishop of Canterbury, had been well received in England when he brought the pall to the new archbishop, Paschal, not despairing of being able to introduce, by his means, the legatine power into this kingdom, sent him this year to England with the character of his legate. Anselm found the king in Normandy, and there communicated to him the pope's letter, appointing him legate of the apostolic see in England, and vesting him with all his power. The king entertained him with great magnificence at Rouen, but would not suffer him to pass over into England, without the advice of the bishops and lords of the kingdom. He sent them accordingly immediate notice of this new attempt of the pope, and the arrival of the legate in his Norman dominions. Upon this intelligence a great council was held in London in the presence of the queen, and it was unanimously resolved by all the bishops, lords, and abbots who composed it, that the archbishop of Canterbury, whom that affair chiefly concerned, should wait upon the king in Normandy, and remonstrate against such an attempt, as contrary to the customs and laws of the kingdom; nay, and that he should, if the king approved of it, go to Rome, and get the pope to recall Anselm. This province the archbishop readily undertook, as he was extremely desirous, says the historian, of visiting the tombs of the apostles, and he accordingly set out in a few days on his journey. The king, whom he found with the legate at Rouen, entirely approved of the resolution of the council; and he thereupon pursued, with Herebert, bishop of Norwich, his journey to Rome, which city the pope had left some time before at the approach of the emperor, and was then at Benevento. As the roads were infested by parties of the emperor's army, by whom all were seized and ill used who went to the pope, and the archbishop was already greatly fatigued with his long journey, he staid himself at Rome, and sent messengers with letters to the pope, to acquaint him with his arrival, and the business upon which he was sent. The messengers, of whom the chief was the bishop of Norwich, were well received by the pope, and having satisfied him that the sending of a legate into England was a violation of the privileges granted to the see of Canterbury, by its founder Gregory the Great, they obtained a letter confirming to that see all the privileges that it had ever enjoyed. The address of the letter was, "Paschal, bishop, servant of the servants of God, and to his venerable brethren the bishops of England, and to his beloved son Henry, illustrious king, health and apostolic benediction." It is dated Benevento the 22d of March, 1117. This letter the king com-

municated to Anselm, who thereupon left Normandy, where he had waited so long, and returned as he came. The king would not, it seems, even give him leave to cross over to England in order to collect the money that was there due to St. Peter.¹

The archbishop returned to England well pleased with the success that had attended his negotiations with the pope. But he was soon after not a little mortified by a letter from the pope to the king in favor of Thurstan, archbishop elect of York. I have mentioned above² the dispute between the two English archbishops of Canterbury and York, concerning the authority of the former over the latter. That dispute was decided in favor of the archbishop of Canterbury by a council held here in 1073, at which presided Hubert, the pope's legate, and the decision of the council was confirmed by the pope himself, Alexander II. However, Thomas, who was then archbishop of York, dying in the present year, Thurstan, his successor, following his example, refused to make canonical profession of obedience to Rudolph, at this time archbishop of Canterbury, and Rudolph refusing, on his side, to ordain him, the king obliged Thurstan to quit his see. But he, applying to Paschal, procured a letter from him to the king in his favor. For in that letter the pope declared, that he would preserve inviolable the privileges of the see of Canterbury, but would suffer nothing to be done to the prejudice of the see of York, and therefore begged the king to restore, by all means, as justice required, the elect to his see.³ Thus was the decree of Alexander, in a manner, reversed. But of the further proceedings of Thurstan I shall have occasion to speak in the following pontificate.

In the mean time the emperor, hearing of the sentence of excommunication thundered out against him by the Lateran council, and desirous of coming to an agreement with the pope, who, he knew, would not fail to stir up his subjects against him, sent deputies to Rome to negotiate a peace, and restore the wished for union between the church and the empire. The deputies, putting the pope in mind of the promise he had made never to excommunicate the emperor, begged him to revoke that sentence. But Paschal answered, that he had kept his word though given by force, that he had not been excommunicated by him, but by the bishops of the council, and that he therefore could not take off the excommunication without their advice, and hearing both parties. The emperor, provoked at this answer, resolved to return to Rome, and try

¹ Eadmer. Novor. l. v. p. 116. 117.

² See p. 376.

³ Malmesb. de Gest. Ang. Pontiff. l. iiii. Eadmer. l. v. p. 121.

The emperor goes in person to Rome, and the pope retiring at his approach, he is admitted into the city. He is crowned anew by the pope's legate. The emperor retires to Tuscany and the pope returns to Rome. His death.

whether he could not prevail upon his holiness to grant to him what he refused to his deputies. He accordingly set out, early in the spring of the present year 1117, at the head of a numerous army, and as he passed through Lombardy, took possession of the dominions of the countess Mathilda, dead two years before. He paid, it seems, no kind of regard to the donation, which that princess was said to have made to the Roman church in the time of Gregory VII., nor does it appear that Paschal ever laid any claim to the extensive territories that she had possessed in Lombardy as well as in Tuscany. The pope, hearing that the emperor was arrived in Lombardy and that he intended to return to Rome, left that city in great haste, and retiring to Apulia put himself under the protection of the Norman princes, who, he knew, would all stand by him, whereas many of the Romans had openly declared for the emperor. In the mean time the emperor, approaching Rome at the head of his army, reduced all the strong-holds in that neighborhood, and by that means distressed the Romans to such a degree, that they were soon obliged to open the gates and admit him into the city. He was received with great demonstrations of joy by those of his party, especially by Cencius and Ptolemy, two of the most powerful citizens of Rome, who had all along steadily adhered to him, and had, on that account, been excommunicated by the pope. A few days after his arrival he assembled the Roman clergy in the church of St. Peter, and expressing great concern, in the speech he made to them, at the pope's flight, he assured them, that, in returning to Rome, he had nothing else in his view, but to settle, in an amicable manner, all differences between the church and the empire, and to prevail upon his holiness, by gentle means, to crown him anew, as his former coronation was said to have been extorted by force. He therefore begged that favor of them, as representing the pope in his absence. The clergy returned answer, that his behavior contradicted his words, that he was come with an armed force, that he had reduced, by dint of arms, the neighboring castles, and obliged the city either to receive him, or to perish by famine. As to his request, they told him, that they neither could, nor would, grant it without the consent and approbation of the pope, to whom they referred them. Hereupon the emperor applied to Maurice Bourdin, archbishop of Braga, whom the pope had sent, as a man of great address and abilities, with the cha-

racter of his legate, to negotiate a peace. He was easily prevailed upon, some say, with a promise of the pontifical dignity, to comply with the emperor's request; and he accordingly crowned him anew, with the usual ceremonies, in the Vatican basilic, in spite of the opposition he met with from the whole Roman clergy.¹ Of this Paschal was no sooner informed, than, assembling a council at Benevento, he excommunicated Bourdin, as a traitor and rebel to the apostolic see, declared him, as such, deprived of his dignity, and wrote to Bernard, archbishop of Toledo, requiring him to notify that sentence to all the bishops of Spain, and to cause another to be preferred to the archiepiscopal see of Braga, which Bourdin had forfeited by his treachery.²

In the mean time the emperor, leaving Rome on account of the heat of that climate, which he found very troublesome, retired to Tuscany, and the pope approaching Rome upon his retreat, recovered, with the help of the Normans, some of the fortified places that were held by the Germans. In Campania he was seized with a dangerous malady, and thereupon carried to Anagni, where all who attended him despaired of his life. However, he recovered, and repairing from Anagni to Præneste, he there consecrated the church of St. Agapetus, and not only assisted at the long service of Christmas eve, but attended a procession. From Præneste he marched with his Normans to Rome, and entering the city, when least expected, struck such terror into all of the Imperial party, that some either fled, or kept themselves concealed, while others chose to submit, and swear fidelity to the apostolic see and St. Peter. But while the pope was making the necessary preparations to reduce his enemies by force, and to put the city in a state of defence against the return of the emperor, he fell ill again, and died, being quite spent with the fatigues which he had undergone, in a few days.³ His death happened on the 21st of January, 1118, after a pontificate of eighteen years, five months, and seven days. He was embalmed, was clad with the pontifical ornaments, and deposited in a marble tomb of curious workmanship in the Lateran basilic.⁴ Of this pope we have in the collection of councils a hundred and seven letters, most of them relating to ecclesiastical matters.

¹ Pandulph. Pisan. in Vit. Paschal II. Petrus Diac. c. 63.

² Gelas. II. ep. i. ad Gallor. ³ Pandulph. Pisan.

⁴ Joan. Diacon. Junior, apud Mabill. tom. ii. Musei Italici.

Gelasius II. elected;—[Year of Christ, 1118.] He is seized and barbarously treated, but set at liberty and crowned. The emperor arrives unexpectedly at Rome.

GELASIUS II. THE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ALEXIOUS COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East.*—HENRY V., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1118.] Paschal II. dying on the 21st of January, 1118, the cardinals and the Roman clergy met the very next day in the Benedictine monastery at Rome, called the Palladium, and having sent for John of Cajeta, who had retired to Monte Cassino, being a monk of that monastery, they chose him, with one consent, on the 25th of the same month, when the see had been vacant but three days. He was a native of Cajeta in Campania, was come of an illustrious family in that city, had early embraced a monastic life in the monastery of Monte Cassino, under the famous abbot Oderisius, and lived there till Urban II., hearing of his great piety and uncommon parts, called him to Rome, and having soon found him equal to the first employments in the church, he first preferred him to the dignity of cardinal deacon, and afterwards to that of chancellor of the holy Roman church. He was seized with his predecessor Paschal by the emperor, was carried with him out of Rome, was kept with the other cardinals closely confined, and underwent great hardships till the pope signed the agreement, spoken of in his life, between him and the emperor. He opposed, and was the only person that opposed, his promotion to the pontifical chair. But the cardinals, the Roman clergy and nobility, being all unanimous, he was forced to submit; and he took the name of Gelasius II.¹

The election of Gelasius alarmed the imperial party in Rome, and Cencius Frangipani, one of the most powerful among the Roman nobility, and then at the head of that party, provoked beyond measure at their choosing a pope without the consent, or even the knowledge of the emperor, broke into the church of the monastery with a troop of armed men, while the cardinals and the rest of the clergy were performing the ceremony of adoration, and, falling upon the pope, beat him in a most barbarous manner till he was all over blood and ready to expire, and then dragged him by the hair out of the church, as he was not able to stand, and ordered him to be carried to his house, where he confined him, in that condition, loaded with irons, to a dark dungeon. The cardinals and the clergy fared no better than the pope; many of them were dangerously wounded. Some were, after the most cruel usage, stripped of their garments, were

left for dead, and thus only escaped death. In the mean time the opposite party, being informed of the inhuman treatment the new pope had met with, flew to arms, and surrounding in great numbers the house of Frangipani, with Peter, prefect of the great city, and others of the Roman nobility at their head, threatened to set fire to it, and put all in it, without distinction, to the sword, if he did not, that moment, release the pope. Frangipani, not finding himself in a condition to withstand so superior a force, set the pope immediately at liberty; and from his house he was carried in triumph to the Lateran, and there crowned with the usual solemnity.¹

All disturbances seemed now to be at an end; the pope was universally acknowledged; bishops came, or sent deputies from all parts to congratulate him upon his accession to the pontifical throne; and great preparations were making for his ordination, as he had yet only received deacon's orders. But his tranquillity was short lived, and the pope found himself, when he least expected it, involved in new troubles. For the emperor hearing of the death of Paschal, and the election of Gelasius, set out immediately from Lombardy, where he then was, and marching night and day, arrived on the 2d of March, quite unexpected, at St. Peter's. He entered the Leonine city silently in the dead of the night, with a design, as was supposed, to seize the new pontiff, and oblige him to confirm the decree of his predecessor concerning investitures. But the pope was, that very night, informed of his arrival; and he no sooner heard of it, than quitting the Lateran palace, he privately withdrew to the house of one of his friends on the banks of the Tiber, with a design to embark there for Cajeta, now Gaeta, the place of his nativity. He embarked accordingly with several cardinals, and got safe to Porto at the mouth of the river. But the sea running very high he was forced to stop there; and in the mean time the emperor, being informed of his flight, sent a body of troops to apprehend him if he landed at Porto, and bring him back to Rome. Thus was the pope obliged to continue on board the remaining part of this day, the Germans discharging, in the mean time, showers of poisoned arrows, says the historian, at his holiness, and those who were with him.

¹ Pandulph Pisanus in Vit. Paschal II. prope fin.

¹ Pandulphus Pisanus in Vit. Paschal II. prope fin.

The pope retires to Gaeta. Embassy from the emperor to the pope, and the pope's answer. Bourdin, archbishop of Braga, elected pope by the imperial party. Gelasius acquaints the Gallican bishops with his promotion, &c. New disturbances in Rome.

When night came on the pope landed at some distance from Porto, where the Germans waited for him. But as he was advanced in years, was quite spent with the fatigue he had undergone, and not able to walk, cardinal Hugh of Alatri, carried him upon his shoulders to the neighboring castle of St. Paul at Ardea. He passed that night there undisturbed, and the next day, the Germans retiring upon the advice that he had made his escape, he re-embarked, put to sea, the storm abating, and arrived at Gaeta the fifth day after he left Rome. He was received there with loud acclamations of joy by all ranks of men; and the Norman princes no sooner heard of his arrival than they sent ambassadors to congratulate him upon his promotion, and offer themselves ready to support him to the utmost of their power.¹

In the mean time the emperor, finding the pope had got out of his reach, sent ambassadors to invite him back to Rome, and at the same time to let him know that if he renounced, as his predecessor had done, all right to investitures, he would confirm his election, and assist in person at his consecration, but that otherwise he would cause another to be chosen in his room. The pope returned answer that he was unalterably determined never to part with any of the undoubted rights of his see; that it was owing to force and violence, and not to choice, that his predecessor had renounced them; that his renunciation was consequently null, and his successors were not, in justice, bound to confirm it. He added, that he was elected according to the canons, and, therefore, that his election wanted no farther confirmation. Having thus dismissed the ambassadors, he was ordained on the 9th of March, which in 1118 fell on a Saturday, and the next day consecrated by three bishops, Lambert of Ostia, Peter of Porto, and Vitalis of Albano.²

The emperor, highly provoked at the obstinacy and insolent answer of the pope, caused a new election to be made, when, upon his recommendation, Maurice Bourdin, archbishop of Braga, was elected, under the name of Gregory VII., and acknowledged by all of the imperial party for lawful pope. He was a native of the diocese of Limoges; and Bernard, archbishop of Toledo, finding he was a man of uncommon parts, as he passed through France on his return from Rome to his see, took him with him into Spain, and soon after preferred him to the dignity of archdeacon of his church. He was afterwards made bishop of Coimbra, and from thence translated, in 1109, to the archiepiscopal see of Braga. In that station he quarrelled with his benefactor the archbishop of Toledo, and going to Rome, prevailed on pope Paschal to exempt

his see from all subjection to that of Toledo. As he staid, on that occasion, a long time at Rome, Paschal appointed him, as a man of great address and abilities, and one in whom he thought he could confide, to negotiate, in the character of his legate, a peace with the emperor. But he, betraying his trust, took part with the emperor, crowned him in the Vatican, and was on that account excommunicated and deposed by the pope in a council, as has been before related.¹

Gelasius no sooner heard of what had happened at Rome, than he writ to the bishops and all the faithful of Gaul to acquaint them with his promotion, as well as with the intrusion of his rival, and exhort them to maintain the unity of the church by adhering to him, who had been elected according to the canons, and even forced to bear so heavy a burden. In that letter he tells the Gallican bishops that Bourdin was intruded into the see of St. Peter the forty-fourth day after his own election, so that this schism began on the 10th day of March, as Gelasius was chosen on the 25th day of January. This letter is dated from Gaeta the 16th day of March of the present year 1118.² The pope wrote at the same time to Bernard, archbishop of Toledo, ordering him to cause another archbishop of Braga to be chosen in the room of Maurice, and to the Romans, exhorting them to avoid him as an excommunicated person, with whom they could not communicate without incurring the same excommunication.³

The emperor continued at Rome till the beginning of June, when he caused himself to be crowned anew by Bourdin as pope, having been crowned by him the preceding year only as the pope's legate.⁴ The ceremony was performed with great solemnity in the church of St. Peter on Whitsunday, the 2d day of June, and the emperor, leaving Rome a few days after, returned to Tuscany. Upon his retreat Gelasius returned privately to Rome, and there kept himself concealed till the 21st day of July, the festival of St. Praxedes, when he was prevailed upon by his friends to celebrate mass publicly in the church of that saint. But the service was scarce begun, when a troop of armed men, with Frangipani at their head, broke into the church with a design to seize on the pope a second time, and send him prisoner to the emperor. They met with a vigorous resistance from the pope's friends flocking from all quarters to defend him; and the fight lasted, with great slaughter on both sides, till night parted the combatants. The pope had the good luck to make his escape, undiscovered, in the beginning of the fray; and he was found in the evening in the fields adjoining to St. Paul's

¹ Pandolph Pisanus in Vit. Gelas. Faler Benevent. in Chron.

² Idem ibid.

³ See p. 452.

⁴ Concil. c. 6. p. 823.

² Concil. c. 6. p. 817.

⁴ See p. 452.

Gelasius reinstates the see of Ravenna in its former jurisdiction. Retires to France. His reception there. Is seized with a pleurisy. Dies at Cluny;—[Year of Christ, 1119.] His writings.

church without the walls of the city.¹ From thence they brought him back to Rome. But as the imperial party prevailed there, and he despaired of being ever able to drive out his rival Bourdin, he resolved to quit not only Rome, but Italy, and retire to France. His resolution being approved by the cardinals, he appointed Peter, bishop of Porto his vicar, disposed of all the other great employments to those who had distinguished themselves above the rest in his cause; and by a special bull restored to the see of Ravenna the jurisdiction which it had enjoyed to the time of his predecessor Paschal II. over all the bishoprics of Æmilia. This was done in behalf of Gualterius, at this time archbishop of Ravenna, and the first archbishop of that city that had sided with the pope against the emperor.²

The pope left Rome on the second of September, and embarking at Ostia with six cardinals, landed at Pisa, and there consecrated the great church of that city, erected the see into a metropolis, and subjected to it, as such, the island of Corsica. The same title as well as jurisdiction had been conferred on the bishop of Pisa and his see by Urban II., but his bull had not, it seems, taken place, Peter, at this time bishop of Pisa, being the first that took the title of metropolitan, and exercised jurisdiction over the churches of Corsica.³ From Pisa he pursued his voyage to Genoa, and having consecrated there the church of St. Lawrence, he put to sea again, and got safe, about the 5th of November to St. Gilles in Provence. He was received there with all possible marks of respect and esteem by the laity as well as the clergy, and visited by all the bishops, abbots, and nobility in that neighborhood, who, finding him in great distress, sent him large sums of money, that enabled him to support himself according to his high rank and dignity.⁴ Before he left St. Gilles he confirmed the bulls of his two predecessors, Urban II. and Paschal II., granting the primacy of all Spain to Bernard, archbishop of Toledo, and his successor in that see. Lewis, surnamed the Gross, at this time king of France, no sooner heard of the pope's arrival in his dominions, than he sent Suger, monk of St. Denis, with rich presents to assure him of his protection, and his sincere desire of seeing him firmly established upon the pontifical throne. The pope afterwards visited several cities, consecrating churches, or ordaining bishops; and finding the discipline and observance of the canons in some places greatly neglected, he appointed a council to meet at Rheims in the month of March of the follow-

ing year. But being in the mean time seized with a pleurisy, he caused himself to be carried to the monastery of Cluny, which was not far distant from the place where he was taken ill. When he found his end approached, he sent for the cardinals, and bestowing great commendations upon Conon, bishop of Palestrina, of whom frequent mention has been made in the preceding pontificate, he recommended him to them for his successor. But Conon declaring that he would, upon no consideration whatsoever, take that burden upon him; that the church wanted, at that juncture, the support of riches and temporal power, and that he therefore recommended to their choice Guido, archbishop of Vienne, a prelate not more respected for his known prudence and eminent piety, than for his high birth and temporal power. The pope and the cardinals acquiesced in his proposal, and they sent immediately for Guido; but the pope expired before his arrival.¹ His death happened on the 29th of January, 1119, and consequently when he had held the see one year and four days, as he had been elected on the 25th of January of the preceding year. Thus Hugh, monk of Cluny, who lived at this very time,² and after him all the historians and chronologers, except Baronius and Papebrock, who upon the authority of his epitaph, which they ascribe to Peter of Poitiers, will have Gelasius to have died after a pontificate of one year wanting two days. But as that epitaph contradicts all the contemporary historians, it is generally supposed to have been writ, not by Peter of Poitiers, who flourished at this time, but by some later writer. Sugerius writes, that pope Gelasius died at Cluny of the gout, soon after his arrival in France; but Pandulphus, who was one of his retinue, says, that he died of a disease, which the Greeks call pleurisy,³ and takes no notice of his having ever been afflicted with the gout. He was buried in the church of the monastery of Cluny, and has been honored with a place in some Martyrologies, but not in the Roman. He wrote in prose the life of Erasmus, bishop of Gaeta and martyr, and the lives of Anatolia and Cesarius in verse. Both these works were published at Rome with the life of Gelasius by the abbot Constantine Cajetan, in 1639.

In the pontificate of Gelasius, and on the 15th of August 1118, died the emperor Alexius Comnenus, in the seventieth year of his age, after a reign of thirty-seven years four months and fifteen days. He was succeeded by his eldest son Calo Johannes or Joannes Comnenus.

¹ Pandulph. in Vit. Gelas. ² Concil. 10. p. 418.

³ Ughell Italia Sacra, c. 3. p. 429.

⁴ Pandulph. in Vit. Gelas.

¹ Falco Benevent. in Chron.

² Ingi. ad Pontium Abbat.

³ Pandulph. in Vit. Gelas.

Calixtus II. elected at Cluny. His birth and employment before his election. Holds a council at Toulouse. Council of Reims. Canons of that council. Complaints laid before the council.

CALIXTUS II. THE HUNDRED AND SIXTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JOANNES COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East*.—HENRY V., *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 1119.] The cardinals, who attended Gelasius at Cluny, had resolved, with his approbation, to choose the archbishop of Vienne for his successor, and had therefore sent for him, the pope being desirous to see him. But the pope dying before he reached Cluny, he was unanimously elected by all the cardinals, who were present, the day after his arrival, and named Calixtus II. His election happened, according to Onuphrius and Sigonius, on the 1st of February,¹ after a vacancy of four days, as we read in some catalogues, the day of the death of Gelasius being included in that vacancy, as well as the day of the election of Calixtus. His election was approved and confirmed at Rome by all but those who adhered to the anti-pope Bourdin. He was the son of William, surnamed the Great, count of Burgundy, was uncle to Adalais the wife of Lewis VI., at this time king of France, and nearly related to the emperor. Paschal II. appointed him legate of the apostolic see in France soon after his promotion to the see of Vienne, and sent him over to England with the character of his legate *a Latere*. But he was not acknowledged there, nor allowed to exercise any power whatsoever, as has already been related.² In 1112 he held a council at Vienne, and in that council he excommunicated the emperor for the violence he had offered to the pope in forcing him to give up investitures.³

Calixtus returned, soon after his election, to Vienne, and was there consecrated by Lambert, bishop of Ostia, and other bishops, on Quinquagesima Sunday, which, in 1119, fell on the 9th of February.⁴ From Vienne the pope repaired to Toulouse, and in a council, which he assembled there, the sentence of excommunication was thundered out against a sect of heretics in those parts, condemning the eucharist, the baptism of infants, the priesthood, all ecclesiastical orders, and lawful marriages. By the same council laymen were forbidden, on pain of excommunication, to seize on the effects and plunder the houses of deceased bishops, a custom that still prevailed; and all monks, as well as ecclesiastics of what rank soever, who should quit their profession, or let their hair and beards grow, were declared

excommunicated, and suspended from all the functions of their office. At this council were present most of the French bishops, and some from Spain, and it sat from the 6th to the 25th of June.

The pope, leaving Toulouse upon the breaking up of the council, visited several cities in France, and repairing, about the middle of October, to Reims, opened the council, which he had appointed to meet there. To this assembly bishops came, in compliance with the pope's invitation, from all the western provinces; and they were in all fifteen archbishops, two hundred bishops and upwards, besides an infinite number of abbots and other ecclesiastics of all ranks. By this council five canons were issued, and signed by the pope and the rest of the assembly. By the first all simony was forbidden, and lay investitures by the second. By the third all were excommunicated who had seized, or should thenceforth seize lands belonging to the church. The fourth declared it unlawful for any ecclesiastic to dispose, at his death, of his preferment, or his benefice, or to require any thing for the administration of the sacraments, or the burying of the dead; and the fifth was levelled against such priests, deacons, and subdeacons as were married, or kept concubines.¹

Lewis, king of France, came in person to this council, attended by a great number of French lords, to complain of the king of England, who, he said, had invaded Normandy, one of the provinces of his kingdom, had seized and carried into England duke Robert, his vassal, and there still kept him closely confined, in spite of the frequent remonstrances he had made against his thus using and detaining a subject of France. Geffry, archbishop of Rouen, rose up to answer the king's speech; but so great was the noise made by the Gallican bishops, that he could not be heard; and it does not appear that the pope or the council any ways concerned themselves with that affair. They all hearkened with great attention to Hildegarda, countess of Poitiers, complaining of her husband, who had dismissed her, and taken another man's wife in her room. But as the count was not present, having been taken ill, as was pretended, on the road, as he was coming to the council, the pope ordered the bishops of Aquitain to let him know, that if he did not take back his law

¹ Onuph. in Chron. et Sigon. de regno Italia. l. 2.

² See p. 429.

³ Ibid. p. 448.

⁴ Historia Vezel. l. 1. Dacher Spicileg. com. 3.

¹ Oderic. Vital. l. 12. Concil. tom. 10. p. 805.

Negotiations between the pope and the emperor. The emperor excommunicated by the council. Thurstan archbishop of York, ordained by the pope.

wife within a limited time, he should be cut off from the communion of the church.

The emperor had promised to assist at this council, and contribute all in his power towards re-establishing the ancient harmony between the church and the empire. Some terms of agreement had been already proposed by William, bishop of Chaleurs, and Pontius, abbot of Cluny, in the pope's name. But as the pope claimed the investing of all bishops as the undoubted right of his see, the emperor dismissed the two envoys, saying that he proposed to treat with his holiness in person at the approaching council, when he did not doubt but the differences that had so long subsisted between them would be adjusted to their mutual satisfaction. He set out accordingly from Strasburg about the beginning of October, and being met between Verdun and Metz by the bishop of Ostia, cardinal Gregory, and the two deputies mentioned above, he was assured by them that his holiness had nothing more at heart than to see an end put, at last, to the present disturbances, but could not sacrifice the rights of his see to his own peace and tranquillity, and therefore hoped that the emperor would not insist upon his confirming the decree renouncing investitures that had, by force and violence, been extorted from his predecessors. Hereupon the emperor, declaring himself ready to agree to any terms that were consistent with the imperial dignity, begged he might be allowed to confer with his holiness in person; and appointed the castle of Mouson, about the distance of sixty miles from Reims, for the place of their meeting. Thither the pope repaired, upon the return of his deputies, though the council was then sitting; but not thinking it advisable to repair to the camp, for the emperor was encamped at a small distance from the castle, with an army of thirty thousand men, he sent three bishops, with cardinal John, of Crema, and the abbot Pontius, to acquaint the emperor with his arrival, and excuse his not attending him in his camp, as he was greatly fatigued with the journey. At this first interview the cardinal declared, agreeably to his instructions, that his holiness was ready to absolve the emperor, and all who had adhered to him, from the excommunication they had incurred; that he had left the council, and was come for that purpose; but absolutely insisted on the right of investing all bishops, as an unalienable right of the apostolic see. The emperor answered, that he could not renounce a right which his predecessors had all enjoyed time out of mind, without the consent and approbation of the lords of the empire, and that if the pope absolved him from the excommunication, he would, on his return from Germany, assemble a general diet, and persuade them, if by any means he could,

to approve and confirm such a renunciation. From this answer the pope concluded that the emperor only wanted to gain time, and was therefore for returning to the council the very next day. But being persuaded by the cardinals who attended him to send back the deputies, in order to know the emperor's final resolution, he removed that night to a castle at a greater distance from the camp, and from thence dispatched, early next morning, the bishop of Chalons and the abbot of Cluny, to offer the emperor absolution, in his name, upon condition he renounced investitures, and at the same time to let him know that he expected it in vain upon any other terms. The emperor returned the same answer as he had done the day before; and the pope, now despairing of being able to carry his point, set out early next morning, on his return to Reims. There he gave the fathers of the council a minute account of what had passed between him and the emperor, which so inflamed them, that they were all, to a man, for thundering out, that moment, the sentence of excommunication against the emperor, and all who obeyed or acknowledged him as such. But, by the advice of the pope, that affair was put off to the last day of the council, when, upon their not hearing, in the mean time, from him, the sentence of excommunication was pronounced, with great solemnity, against Henry, styling himself king of Germany and emperor; against Bourdin, whom he had wickedly intruded into the see of St. Peter, and all who countenanced or supported the one or the other. By the same sentence the subjects of Henry were not only absolved from their oath of allegiance, but forbidden, on pain of incurring the same excommunication, to obey him as their lord and sovereign. This sentence was pronounced by the pope himself, the members of the council all standing up in the mean time, with burning tapers in their hands.¹

I have spoken elsewhere of the difference that subsisted at this time between the two English archbishops, Rudolph of Canterbury, and Thurstan archbishop elect of York. Thurstan refused to make canonical profession of obedience to Rudolph, and Rudolph refused, on that account, to ordain him. As the king favored Rudolph, he would not suffer Thurstan to take possession of his see till he was ordained, and had made the profession that was required of him by the archbishop of Canterbury.² Thus the see of York remained, in a manner, vacant. As the king of England (Henry I.) was in Normandy when the council of Reims met, he allowed all the Norman bishops to repair to it, and such of the English bishops as were with him; and Thurstan among the

¹ Orderic. Vital. l. 12, et Acta apud Hesson Scholast. Concil. 10.

² See p. 451.

Thurstan banished by the king. *Interview of the pope and the king of England. The see of York exempted from all subjection to that of Canterbury. Calixtus sets out for Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1120.] His arrival and reception there. Goes into Apulia. The anti-pope taken, ill used, and confined to a monastery;—[Year of Christ, 1121.]

rest, but upon condition that he would not ask, nor receive consecration from the pope. The king even wrote to the pope himself to acquaint him with that affair, and desire he would not ordain Thurstan, though he should apply to him for his ordination. But no regard was had, either by the pope or the bishop, to the desire and request of the king; and Thurstan was consecrated by the pope, in the metropolitan church of Reims, soon after his arrival in that city. The behavior of Thurstan was highly resented by the king, who immediately forbade him ever to set foot again in his English or Norman dominions.¹

From Reims the pope repaired, as soon as the council broke up, to Gisors, in Normandy, to meet there the king of England, with a design, it seems, to mediate a reconciliation between Henry and Lewis king of France. The two kings complained of each other, and the pope spared no pains to re-establish a good understanding between them; but his endeavors were not attended with the wished for success. At this interview Henry obtained of the pope a confirmation of all the privileges that his father had enjoyed, especially that no legate should be sent into England or Normandy without his leave. Calixtus did not forget Thurstan on this occasion, but earnestly pressed the king to recall him from exile, and restore him to his see. The king answered that he could not comply with his holiness's request, having by a solemn oath put it out of his power ever to recall the archbishop, or suffer him to set foot in his dominions. "But I am pope," replied Calixtus, "and absolve you from your oath." The king, shocked at so unchristian a proposal, desired time to consider of it; and he sent the pope word soon after he left Gisors, that he could not prevail upon himself to accept the absolution which his holiness had offered him, as it tended to destroy all faith among men, and no one would trust another for the future, or rely upon his oath or promise, if oaths and promises, however solemn, might be set aside by an absolution. He added, that no man should learn of him to break his oath or his promise, and that he looked upon both as indispensably binding.² However, Thurstan was afterwards permitted to return and take undisturbed possession of his see; but upon condition that he should no where perform divine service out of his own diocese, till he had satisfied the archbishop of Canterbury.³ But the pope, who had espoused the cause of Thurstan, declared in 1120, the see of York quite independent upon that of Canterbury.⁴

The pope, leaving Gisors, visited several

¹ Eadmer, Novor. l. 5. ² Idem ibid. ³ Idem ibid.
⁴ Stubbs, l. 6, in Actis Pont. Eborac. apud Selden, tom. 2. p. 1716.

cities in France, confirming the privileges that his predecessors had granted to those churches. To the see of Vienne he subjected seven provinces, appointing his successors in that see primates over those provinces, with full power to assemble councils, to receive appeals from the bishops under their jurisdiction, to determine causes, and see that the canons were every where punctually observed. This bull is addressed to the canons of the church of Vienne, was issued at Valence, and is dated the 26th of February.¹ From Valence the pope set out for Italy, and crossing Provence passed the Alps, and entered Lombardy, whence he pursued his journey to Lucca, and from thence to Pisa, being every where received with all possible marks of respect and esteem. In the mean time Bourdin, hearing of his arrival at Susa, in his way to Rome, left that city in great haste, as the emperor was then in Germany, and retired to Sutri, where the imperial party was the stronger of the two. Upon his retreat Calixtus entered Rome amidst the loud acclamations of the Roman people, was attended by the clergy in a body, and the nobility to the Lateran palace, and there placed, with great solemnity, upon the pontifical throne. His entry into Rome happened on the 3d of June; but not thinking himself safe there so long as Bourdin, whose cause some of the most powerful families had espoused, was master of Sutri, he went into Apulia to implore the assistance of the Norman princes against his rival. He arrived at Benevento in the beginning of August, and the Norman princes no sooner heard of his arrival, than they came to do him homage, and offer him what troops he wanted to drive out the usurper of his see, and restore peace to the Roman church. The pope confirmed to them and their successors all the privileges and immunities that had been granted to them by his predecessors, gave them his apostolical benediction, and leaving Benevento, returned by sea to Rome in the latter end of this or the beginning of the following year.²

In the mean time a strong body of Normans arriving in the neighborhood of Rome, the pope sent them, under the command of cardinal John of Crema, to lay siege to Sutri, held by Bourdin and his followers. As the emperor was then engaged in quelling some disturbances raised by the partisans of Calixtus in Germany, the inhabitants of Sutri, finding they must submit in the end, as they were not able to withstand alone so powerful an army, seized on Bourdin as soon as the Normans began to batter the wall, and delivered him up to them. They treated him, says the historian, with the utmost barbarity, and carrying him to

¹ Calixt. ep. 5.

² Pandulph, in Vita Calixt.

A legate sent into England. How received. Agreement between the pope and the emperor concerning investitures;—[Year of Christ, 1122.]

Rome, placed him, as they approached that city, upon a camel with his face turned to the tail, which they made him hold instead of a bridle, put a bloody sheep's skin over his shoulders to represent him as pope in his scarlet mantle, and conducted him, thus attired, amidst the insults of the populace, into Rome. The Roman people would have torn him in pieces, but the pope rescued him out of their hands; sent him, under a strong guard, to the monastery of Cava, not far from Salerno, and ordered him to be there shut up in a cell.¹ Thus was an end put to the schism, after it had lasted near three years. Calixtus caused him afterwards to be removed from the monastery of Cava, to a strong castle situate on a rock in the neighborhood of the city of St. Germans; and from thence he was removed again by Honorius II., the successor of Calixtus, to the castle of Fumo near Alatri, where he died.² In England the people were, it seems, divided with respect to these popes, Bourdin being acknowledged by some under the name of Gregory VIII., and Gelasius, with his successor Calixtus by others. But the king and the archbishop of Canterbury owned first Gelasius, and afterwards Calixtus for lawful pope, in opposition to Gregory, or Bourdin.³ Matthew Paris writes, that the anti-pope Gelasius dying, Calixtus was lawfully chosen in his room. But if Gelasius was an anti-pope, Bourdin or Gregory was, according to that writer, the true pope; and how could Calixtus be lawfully elected while the true pope was still living.

Calixtus had confirmed to the king of England, as has been related above, all the privileges enjoyed by his father, and in particular that no legate should be sent into England without his leave. However, upon the reduction of Sutri and the taking of his rival there, he despatched Leo, monk of Cluny, with the character of his legate, to acquaint therewith the kings of France and England. In France Leo was received as the pope's legate, and allowed to act agreeably to that character. Having discharged his commission there, he repaired to Normandy, and sent from thence to acquaint the king with his arrival in his dominions, and desire leave to come into England, which the king readily granted, and even despatched Bernard, bishop of St. David's, and a clerk named John, to attend him, but upon condition he defrayed his own expenses, and came rather as a private man than a legate. Upon his arrival at court, the king received him with all possible marks of honour, expressed great satisfaction at the success that had attended his holiness against the usurper of his see, assured him of his entire submis-

sion and obedience to the successor of St. Peter; but when the legate began to enter upon other affairs, he told him, that he was not then at leisure to attend to matters of that nature; and besides, that he was determined to maintain the privilege that Calixtus himself had granted to him, exempting his kingdom from all legatine jurisdiction. With this answer he dismissed the legate, who immediately set out on his return to Normandy, finding the king would not suffer him to exercise in England any jurisdiction or power whatsoever.

The pope having now no enemy to contend with in Rome, resolved to leave nothing unattempted, on his side, to establish a lasting peace between the church and the empire, and he despatched, with that view, legates into Germany, with such terms as he thought the emperor and the German lords who sided with him could not but agree to. The legates were received by the emperor with the greatest marks of respect, and assured that he was no less desirous than his holiness himself, to put an end to the present disturbances. The terms they proposed seemed reasonable enough, and a general diet was appointed to meet at Wirtsburg, when they were to be communicated to the princes of the empire. The diet met accordingly, not at Wirtsburgh, but at Worms, as a more convenient place, and the terms were agreed to, by the whole assembly, as soon as proposed. The emperor demanded that no bishop or abbot should be elected without his previous consent or approbation; that the elect should not be consecrated till he was invested by him with the pastoral staff and ring, and that he should swear allegiance and do homage to him for the fiefs and lands he held of the empire. These prerogatives, he said, his predecessors had enjoyed time out of mind till the pontificate of Gregory VII. On the other hand, the terms proposed by the pope were: that all bishops and abbots in Germany should be elected in the presence of the emperor freely and without simony; that he should invest the elect, or put him in possession of his temporalities, not by the staff and ring, which were badges of spiritual power, but by the scepter; that all bishops and abbots should do homage to the emperor and his successors for the demesnes they held of the empire; and that as such as were consecrated in the imperial dominions out of Germany should be invested in the same manner as the German bishops, within six months. As it appeared to the emperor matter of the utmost indifference whether bishops were invested with the staff and ring, or with the scepter, so long as he was allowed to invest them, he readily agreed to the proposals of the pope, and they were immediately drawn up in writing, and signed by the pope's legates, by the emperor,

¹ Falco in Chron. Pandulph. ubi supra. Abbas Resperg, &c.

² Anonymus Cassin.

³ Eadmer, Novor. l. 6. Mattheus Paris, ad ann. 1129.

The general council of Lateran;—[Year of Christ, 1123.] The agreement with the emperor confirmed by that council. Canons of the Lateran council. Calixtus dies;—[Year of Christ, 1124.] His writings.

and all the lords of the diet.¹ Thus was an end put at last to this long and bloody contest between the popes and emperors about investitures. The emperor never pretended to confer any spiritual power by the crozier and the ring. But Gregory VII. and his successors, looking upon them as emblems of spiritual power, took from thence occasion to wrest the investing of bishops out of the hands of princes, and declare it the unalienable right of their see. But Calixtus, finding the emperor was determined to maintain at all events the right he claimed of investing bishops, thought it expedient for the sake of peace to leave him in the quiet possession of that right, provided the ceremony of investing was not performed by the crozier and the ring, that were looked upon as sacred, but by the scepter, a badge of temporal, and not of spiritual power. The diet of Worms met on the day of the nativity of the Virgin Mary, that is, on the 8th of September of the present year, 1122.²

Calixtus, desirous that this agreement should be known to the whole world, and confirmed by a general council, appointed one to meet at Rome, in the Lateran, on the 18th of March of the following year 1123. To this council he summoned all the western bishops, and likewise the abbots; and his summons was complied with by three hundred bishops, and six hundred abbots; so that this is reckoned the ninth general, and is the first Lateran council; no council having been held before in that church. The pope presided at it in person; and in the first session, held on Monday, the 29th of March, he acquainted the assembly with the agreement concluded between him and the emperor, laid before them the articles of that agreement, and earnestly entreated them freely to declare their sentiments concerning an affair which they could not but look upon as of the utmost importance. The articles were accordingly carefully examined by the council, were by all approved, and a decree was issued in the name of the pope and the council confirming them. At the same time the emperor was, with the approbation of the whole council, absolved by the pope from the excommunication that had been thundered out against him by the council of Reims.³

By this council seventeen canons were issued, most of them confirming those made by other councils. By the sixth, the ordinations of Bourdin, after his condemnation, were all declared null, and with them all ordinations performed by those whom he had ordained. The eleventh grants a ple-

nary indulgence or forgiveness of sins to such as should go to Jerusalem to assist the Christians against the infidels; declares their persons, families, and effects, to be under the immediate protection of the apostolic see, and orders all who had taken the cross in order to go to the Holy Land, or into Spain against the Moors, but had afterwards laid it aside, to resume it within the term of one year, and perform what they had promised, on pain of being cast out of the church, and having all divine service interdicted in their territories, except the administering the sacrament of baptism to children, and penance to persons at the point of death. As the monks were become very numerous, and encroached more and more upon the rights of the bishops and clergy, they were forbidden by the seventeenth canon to admit sinners to public penance, to visit the sick, to perform unctions, and to sing public and solemn mass.

The following year Calixtus died, after a pontificate of five years, ten months and twelve days. He was buried in the Lateran church, and is greatly recommended by all the contemporary writers for his generosity to the poor, his liberality to the churches, his strict observance of the canons, and, above all, for happily putting an end to the misunderstanding that had so long subsisted between the church and the empire, and had been attended with such dreadful consequences, and so much bloodshed. Of this pope we have thirty-six letters, and among them one forbidding divine service to be performed in the presence of William the son of Robert, count of Normandy, and nephew to Henry king of England, till he had dismissed the daughter of Fulco, count of Anjou, whom he had married within the forbidden degrees.⁴ By another he sends, at the request of Boleslaus, duke of Poland, Otto, bishop of Bamberg, to preach the Gospel to the Pomeranians; which he did with such success, that in a few years the pagan superstitions were every where abolished in that country, and the sacred mysteries of the Christian religion established in their room.⁵ Hence Otto has a place in the calendar under the title of "the apostle of the Pomeranians." The other letters of Calixtus relate to the affairs spoken of in his life. Besides letters, Calixtus wrote several books; some on the miracles of St. James the apostle, which are preserved in manuscript at Oxford and Cambridge, and others upon other subjects, namely, the lives and miracles of saints, the discovering of the body of St. Turpinus, archbishop and martyr, a treatise upon unlawful contracts, and the life of Charlemagne.

¹ Concil. tom. 10. p. 901.

² Anselm Gambiacensis in Chron.

³ Concil. tom. 10. p. 894.

⁴ Dacher. Spicileg. tom. 3. p. 148.

⁵ Vit. Hon. apud Canis. Antiq. Lection.

Election of Honorius. Excommunicates William of Normandy;—[Year of Christ, 1125.] Disturbances at Cluny quelled by Honorius. Death of the emperor Henry V., and election of Lotharius.

HONORIUS II., THE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[JOANNES COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East.*—HENRY V., *Emperor of the West.*—LOTHARIUS, *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1124.] Upon the death of Calixtus two were chosen to succeed him by two different parties, Theobald, cardinal priest of St. Anastasia, by the one, under the name of Celestine, and Lambert, bishop of Ostia, whom they named Honorius II. by the other. But the party of Honorius prevailing, Celestine thought it advisable to resign, and laid down accordingly all the ensigns of the pontifical dignity. His resignation was accepted; but as he had been elected the first, and the election of Honorius was therefore judged uncanonical, he likewise resigned, but was re-elected, without opposition, and consecrated the seventh day after the decease of his predecessor, that is, on the 21st of December, which in 1124 fell on a Sunday.¹ He was a native of the province of Bologna, was preferred by Paschal II. to the see of Veletri, and afterwards to that of Ostia,² no doubt by the same pope; for he was bishop of Ostia when Gelasius, the successor of Paschal, was elected, and, as bishop of that place, one of the three that ordained him at Gaeta.³

Honorius began his pontificate with thundering out the sentence of excommunication against William, the son of Robert count of Normandy, who instead of dismissing the daughter of Fulco count of Anjou, whom he had married within the forbidden degrees, not only continued to live with her, though the marriage was declared null by cardinal John of Crema the pope's legate, but had caused the letter, which the legate had writ to him upon that subject, to be publicly burnt; and the messengers, who brought it, to be thrown into jail, and even their hair and beards to be set on fire.⁴ The pope therefore not only excommunicated him, but forbade, as his predecessor had done, divine service to be performed in his presence, or in any place that belonged to him, till he had satisfied the apostolic see.

Great disturbances happened, soon after the election of Honorius, in the famous monastery of Cluny. Pontius abbot of that monastery, whom I have had frequent occasion to mention, resigned that charge in 1122, in order to go to Jerusalem and visit the holy place there. He returned in 1125, and repenting his resignation, drove out, at the head of a troop of banditti, Peter, surnamed the Venerable, who was then abbot,

and took again possession of the monastery, treating the monks, who did not acknowledge him, with the utmost barbarity. Honorius, being informed of these disorders, sent a cardinal, named Peter, to Cluny, with the character of legate, to examine into that affair upon the spot, and proceed against Pontius according to the rigor of the canons, if he did not immediately resign the government of the monastery to Peter, and obey him as his lawful superior. The cardinal found Pontius in possession of the monastery and of all the lands belonging to it; and, upon his refusing to own the abbot Peter for his superior, the sentence of excommunication was pronounced by the legate, and by Hubald archbishop of Lions, against Pontius and all the Pontians, that is, all who adhered to him. The pope afterwards summoned both parties to Rome, and after hearing all that was offered on either side, declared Pontius a sacrilegious usurper, suspended him for ever from all ecclesiastical functions, and caused him to be shut up in a tower at Rome called the Seven Halls, where he died the following year.¹ It is remarkable, that in the Benedictine martyrology he is said to have been buried at Cluny, and to have been famous for his sanctity and learning, though the abbot Peter tells us as an eye-witness, that he died at Rome under the sentence of excommunication, and was buried there near the church of St. Andrew the apostle.²

This year died the emperor Henry V. in the twentieth year of his reign, and the fifteenth of his empire, and was buried, says Ordericus, at Spire the metropolis of Germany.³ As he left no issue behind him, three princes aspired at the empire, namely, Lotharius duke of Saxony, and the deceased emperor's two nephews by his sister Agnes, Conrad duke of Franconia, and Frederic duke of Germany or Swabia. The death of the emperor was notified by the archbishop of Mentz to all the bishops and princes of the empire, and by him they were summoned to meet, with their respective armies, in a large plain adjoining to the city, in order to proceed to a new election. They met, in compliance with the summons, at the place and time appointed, the 24th of August, when Lotharius was elected by a great majority; and

¹ Ceccan in Chron.

² Pandulph. in Vit. Honor.

³ See page 454.

⁴ Dacher Spicleg. tom. 3.

¹ Petrus Venerabilis de Miraculis, l. 2. c. 13. Orde-ric. l. 12. p. 871. ² Idem. ibid. ³ Idem. p. 882.

Legate sent by Honorius into England. Presides at a council. The archbishop of Canterbury at Rome;— [Year of Christ, 1126.] The pope quarrels with Roger, count of Sicily;— [Year of Christ, 1127.]

thus was the kingdom of Germany, and afterwards the empire, translated from the Germans to the Saxons. Honorius no sooner heard of the emperor's death than he sent the cardinals Euard and Romanus with the character of his legates *a Latere*, to assist at the election of a new king; and in their presence Lotharius was anointed, or consecrated with the usual ceremonies at Aix-la-Chapelle by Frederic archbishop of Cologne.¹ It is to be observed, that Lotharius was only elected and consecrated as king, the title of emperor, which was but a bare title, not having been conferred upon him till the year 1133, as we shall see in the sequel.

At this time Henry, king of England, was at last prevailed upon to admit a legate into this kingdom, and allow him to act here in that character, though he had frequently declared, that no legate from Rome should ever be suffered to exercise any power or jurisdiction in his dominions. By what motives he was induced to alter this his resolution, history does not inform us. But while he was in Normandy with his daughter Mathilda, or Maud, who had fled to him upon the death of the emperor her husband, he consented to the coming of cardinal John of Crema into England, with the character of the pope's legate *a Latere*, and to his exercising all the power and jurisdiction annexed to that character. The cardinal brought letters with him from the pope addressed to the laity as well as the clergy of this kingdom, requiring them to receive him with all the respect that was due to the vicar of St. Peter: and he was every where received with honors, says Dunelmensis, in the progress he took through England, no doubt to inquire into the state of the different dioceses and churches. He was charged with a letter for David, king of Scotland, which he delivered that prince in an interview he had with him on the banks of the Tweed. By that letter the pope desired the king would order the bishops of his kingdom to assist at the councils which his legate should think fit or necessary to assemble.² On his return to London he held a council, at which he presided, and there were present the two archbishops, William, who, in 1122, had succeeded Rudolph in the see of Canterbury, and Thurstan of York, with twenty bishops and forty abbots. Though the legate presided at this council, the archbishop of Canterbury maintained his right to summon the bishops to it. For his summons to the bishop of Landaff runs in the following terms: "William, archbishop of Canterbury to Urban, bishop of Landaff. We hereby acquaint you that John, presbyter cardinal of the Roman church and legate,

intends to hold a council by our appointment, and with our connivance, at London, on the nativity of the ever-blessed Virgin Mary. We therefore command you to meet us at the said place, &c."³ The council sat three days, and issued, during that time, seventeen canons, calculated to redress several abuses that had crept into the English churches. By the 4th canon the clergy were forbidden to receive any benefice at the hand of a layman, and by the 13th all in orders were commanded to observe celibacy, and suffer no women to live in the same house with them, but their relations. We are told that the legate inveighed with great bitterness against the married clergy and their wives, showing how unbecoming it was, and dishonourable to God, for a priest to rise from the side of a harlot, and consecrate, with his impure hands, the body of our Lord; but that he himself was caught the following night in bed with a harlot.² Thus Huntingdon. But of so remarkable a fact no mention is made by any other writer, not even by any of the many enemies that the legate's steadily adhering to Innocent II. against the anti-pope Anacletus II. raised up soon after against him, though we find him reproached by them with pride, avarice, and tyranny, in the exercise of the power with which he was trusted. The following year the archbishop of Canterbury went to Rome in person, to complain to the pope of the usurpations of his legate, and ascertain the right granted him by the canons of the church universal, to preside at all councils held within the limits of his province. The pope, to satisfy him, appointed him his legate, vesting him with all the power annexed to that office; and that commission the archbishop readily accepted, though he could not but know that he thereby owned the very power, which he went to Rome on purpose to oppose, as inconsistent with the canons of the church universal.³ Thus did the archbishop undertake a journey to Rome to remonstrate against the legatine power as an usurpation, and returned home vested with that power.

The following year 1127, an affair of greater moment employed the thoughts and attention of the pope. William, duke of Apulia, dying at Salerno on the 26th of July of the present year without issue, his uncle Roger, count of Sicily, passed over into Italy, upon the first news of his death, with a fleet of seven ships of war, and arriving at Salerno declared that he was come to take possession, as the next heir, of his late nephew's dominions. The Salernitans received and acknowledged him for their sovereign upon certain conditions; and their example was followed by the inhabitants of

¹ Orderic, l. 12. p. 882. Otto Frisingen. Gotfrid Viterb. in Chron.

² Simon Dunelmens. de Gest. Reg. Angl. ann. 1125.

³ Concil. Britan. vol. 2. p. 33. ² Hunting. l. 7.

³ Continuator Florent. ad ann. 1125.

Roger excommunicated, and why. The pope raises an army and marches against him;—[Year of Christ, 1128.] Is obliged to conclude a disadvantageous peace. Honorius dies;—[Year of Christ, 1130.]

Melfi, of Troia, and of all the other cities of Apulia, and he was every where proclaimed count of Sicily and duke of Apulia, some cities only insisting upon his confirming the privileges they had enjoyed under their late duke, which he did very readily. In the mean while the pope, hearing at the same time of the death of duke William, and the usurpation, as he called it, of count Roger, flew to Benevento, and there, without any previous notice, thundered out the sentence of excommunication against the usurper of the dukedom of Apulia, and all who should receive, acknowledge, or assist him. The pope pretended that the duke had, by his last will, left his dominions, and whatever else he was possessed of, to St. Peter. But that will was never produced; nor did Roger pay any regard to such a claim. He indeed endeavored to soften the pope with rich presents, and even offered him the cities of Troia and Montefusco, provided he took off the excommunication, and suffered him quietly to enjoy the dominions to which he had an undoubted right as lawful heir to his nephew. But Honorius would hearken to no terms; nay, having gained over to his party Robert prince of Capua, Grimoald prince of Bari, and several other lords in those parts, he held a council at Troia, that city having declared for him, and there excommunicated Roger anew, with all his adherents. Roger, finding the pope inflexible, resolved to make good his claim by dint of arms, since all other means had proved ineffectual; and having accordingly committed the government of the strong places in Apulia to persons in whom he knew he could confide, he crossed over to Sicily, in order to levy an army there. At the same time the pope ordered the princes who had joined him, to raise what forces they could in their respective dominions, and hold them in readiness to take the field, and march against the count upon the first notice of his landing in Apulia. Honorius then returned to Rome to engage the Romans in this quarrel, and procure their assistance. But in the mean time Roger, landing at Reggio with a numerous and well appointed army, reduced several places that had revolted from him, put to flight several bodies of the allies attempting to oppose him, and approaching Benevento, laid waste the neighboring country, and threatened the city itself with a siege. Upon this intelligence the pope hastened back to Apulia with three hundred men, the Romans having yet raised no more, and having assembled, with great expedition, the troops of his allies, he marched, in person, at their head, against the enemy. He was for venturing an engagement, but Roger wisely declined it, sensible that his holiness's army must soon disperse for want of subsistence, as he had laid waste all the neighboring country, and no care had been

taken to supply them with the necessary provisions. And so it happened; a dreadful famine began soon to rage in the camp of the allies, and most of the princes returning thereupon home with their men, the pope was obliged to retire to Benevento, and leave Roger master of the field. As Honorius now found that he could neither by force of arms, nor by his excommunication, oblige Roger to part with so valuable an inheritance, he became more tractable, and began to hearken to the overtures made by that prince. Roger declared in the several conferences he had with cardinal Haymericus, and Cencius Frangipani, sent by the pope to negotiate a peace, that he would, upon no consideration whatever, part with the dukedom of Apulia, as he had not acquired it by conquest, but by right of inheritance; but that he was ready to receive investiture at his holiness's hands, to swear allegiance to him and his successors in the see of St. Peter, and perform all the other duties that had been performed by the other dukes his predecessors. To these terms the pope was forced to agree; and meeting Roger, at a small distance from Benevento, three days after he had signed them, he first received his oath of allegiance, and then invested him, with great solemnity and the usual ceremonies, in the dukedom of Apulia, saluting him with the title of great count of Sicily, and duke of Apulia.¹ Thus by the prudent conduct of Roger ended this quarrel without bloodshed, and he by adding Apulia and Calabria to Sicily became by far the most powerful prince in Italy.

Of Honorius I find nothing else recorded, worthy of notice, besides his excommunicating Conrad, duke of Franconia, for raising disturbances in Germany and Italy against Lotharius, and claiming the crown as nephew to the deceased emperor, though Lotharius had been elected by a majority, and was acknowledged by the apostolic see. With Conrad were excommunicated all who adhered to him, and among the rest Anselm, archbishop of Milan, who had crowned him king of Italy, and the two patriarchs of Aquilea, and Grado, or Venice, who acknowledged him as such, and had persuaded many under their respective jurisdictions to join him. The pope died on the 14th of February, 1130, having governed the Roman church five years, one month, and twenty-five days, and was buried in the Lateran church. Fulco, of Benevento, places his death on the 14th of February, 1129; but with that writer the new year begins on the 1st of March. In the Collections of Councils we have twelve letters of Honorius, written on different occasions, and among them one to the king of Denmark, recommending to him Gregory, car-

¹ Alexander Abbas Cellesin. in gestis Roger. Fulco Benevent. in Chron.

Council held at London in the pontificate of Honorius. Innocent II. and Anacletus II. elected. Characters of the two competitors.

dinal deacon, whom he sent, at his request, into that kingdom with the character of legate, to redress several abuses that prevailed in those churches. By another he acquaints Peter, abbot of Cluny, with the death of Pontius, whom, he says, he had caused to be buried in consecrated ground out of his great regard for the monastery of Cluny, as he had been a monk of that monastery.

In the pontificate of Honorius, and on the first of August, 1129, a great council was held in London, at which presided William, archbishop of Canterbury, with the character of the pope's legate, and were present all the bishops of the kingdom. They met chiefly to enforce the observance of the canons issued by other councils concerning the celibacy of the clergy; and such of them as still kept concubines, that is, as were married, were strictly enjoined to put them

away before St. Andrew's day next following. But as little or no regard had been hitherto paid by the English clergy to canons on that subject, the archbishop and the council recommended the affair warmly to the king; nay, and left him to inflict what punishment he thought fit upon those who did not comply with the injunctions of the council. They flattered themselves that they should thus engage the civil power in the cause. But the king, instead of obliging the married clergy to dismiss their wives, made them pay a sum of money for leave to keep them, and by that means filled his coffers. Thus some of our writers.¹ But the Saxon chronographer only says, that the king disappointed the expectation of the bishops, and gave the married clergy leave to return home, for they had been all summoned to the council, and to live with their wives as they had done before.

INNOCENT II., THE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[JOANNES COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East*.—LOTHARIUS II., *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 1130.] Honorius, dying on the 14th of February, the cardinals who were with him, sixteen in number, to prevent the disturbances which they foresaw would be raised by Peter, cardinal of St. Mary's beyond the Tiber, who aspired to the pontificate, elected, the very next day, Gregory, cardinal of St. Angelo, and vested him with the pontifical ornaments before the death of Honorius was publicly known. This election several cardinals and bishops, and almost the whole body of the Roman people, clergy and nobility, looked upon as uncanonical, and therefore proceeding to St. Marks, they chose there the cardinal of St. Mary's; and both were consecrated on the same day, Gregory in the church of St. Mary the Greater, under the name of Innocent II., and Peter, who took the name of Anacletus II., in the church of St. Peter. Anacletus had certainly a majority, which sways in all elections, and yet is placed among the anti-popes; while Innocent, clandestinely elected by sixteen cardinals only, the rest of the clergy, the people, and the nobility, having had no share in his election, is honored with a place among the lawful popes.

Innocent was a native of Rome, and a regular canon of St. Austin, but made cardinal, as a man of great probity, and uncommon parts, by Urban II., and employed in several legations by his two immediate predecessors Calixtus and Honorius. He is said to have

led a most exemplary life from his infancy, to have been of a most humane and courteous disposition, to have made it his study to oblige all, and to have not had one enemy till the time of his election.² He was with great difficulty prevailed upon to accept the pontifical dignity, and would have resigned it, had he not been dissuaded from it by the cardinals of his party.³ The writers of those times, all zealous partizans of Innocent, paint his antagonist in very different colors. He was the son of Leo, and therefore called in Latin Petrus Leonis. His family was one of the most wealthy and powerful families in Rome. His grandfather was a Jew, possessed of immense wealth, but embraced the Christian religion in the pontificate of Leo IX. who allowed him to take his name. He was sent by his father, while yet a youth, into France, to acquaint himself with the customs and the manners of that nation. We are told that he abandoned himself there to all manner of wickedness and debauchery; that there is no vice of which he was not guilty, no crime which he was ashamed to commit, &c. Thus Arnulphus, who lived at this time, and wrote a short account of the present schism. But how shall we reconcile what we read of Anacletus in that writer, with his embracing a monastic life in the

¹ Huntingd. l. 7. p. 384. Matth. Paris, and Chron. Waverleiens.

² Arnulph de Schismate, &c. c. 4. ³ Idem ibid.

Innocent retires to France. Is owned there. Is waited upon by the kings of France and England.

monastery of Cluny before he returned to Rome, with his being preferred by pope Paschal to the dignity of cardinal, and employed by him as well as by Calixtus in several legations? The same author adds, that he was known to have a criminal conversation with his own sister Tropæa; that he was the father of his reputed nephew; and that in his legations he led about with him a beautiful young woman in the disguise of a clerk.¹ However that be, his party prevailed in Rome, and he was acknowledged not by the populace only, but by several cardinals, by many of the clergy, and the whole Roman nobility except the two families of Corsi and Frangipani: inasmuch that Innocent was obliged to quit the city, and retire to France, the usual asylum in those days of distressed popes. Upon his retreat Anacletus, now master of Rome, stripped the churches, beginning with St. Peter's, of all their rich ornaments, of all the plate and treasure he found in them, that he might thus be enabled to keep the Romans steady in his interest, and ascertain his claim against his rival, and all who should protect or assist him.²

In the mean time Innocent, embarking with the cardinals of his party, on board two galleys, arrived safe at Pisa, and was received there, as well as in all the other cities of Tuscany, for lawful pope. He staid at Pisa the greater part of the present year, and from thence sent his nuncios into France to acquaint the bishops with his promotion and the intrusion of Anacletus, and exhort them to espouse his cause, as he had been elected the first, and had been even forced to take upon him so heavy a charge. The king, Lewis VI. would not acknowledge the one or the other without the advice of the bishops of his kingdom; and he therefore appointed them to meet at Etampes between Paris and Orleans, to examine into the claims of the two pretenders, and declare for him whose title appeared to them the best grounded. At this assembly was present St. Bernard, the famous abbot of Clairvaux, held by all in high reputation for his sanctity, and by him, as he had espoused with great zeal the cause of Innocent, the bishops were all prevailed upon to espouse the same cause; and Innocent was owned by the whole assembly for lawful pope.³ Upon this intelligence the pope left Pisa, and embarking anew, landed at St. Gilles in Provence, went from thence to Viviers, to Pui in Auvergne, and to Cluny, where he was met by Suger, abbot of St. Denis, sent by the king to acknowledge him in his name, and congratulate him upon his safe arrival in his dominions. He staid eleven days at Cluny, consecrated their new church during that time, and at his departure was sup-

plied by the abbot with sixteen horses or mules, properly accoutred, to pursue his journey.⁴

From Cluny the pope repaired to Clermont, and there held a council consisting of several archbishops, bishops, abbots, and the cardinals who attended him. By this council several canons were made, confirming those that had been issued by other councils. At Clermont the pope was acknowledged, to his unspeakable satisfaction, by Conrad archbishop of Saltzburg, and Eribert of Munster, sent for that purpose by king Lotharius. He then proceeded to Orleans, and was met at St. Benedict on the Loir by the king, by the queen, and the princes their children, who prostrating themselves at his feet owned him for the true and only lawful successor of St. Peter, and assured him of their assistance and protection.⁵ In the mean time St. Bernard was using his utmost endeavors with the king of England, who was then in Normandy, to get Innocent acknowledged by him and his subjects, in opposition to his bishops striving to divert him from it. But Bernard prevailed in the end; and the king, attended by a great many lords and bishops, went in person, at his persuasion, to Chartres, where Innocent was with Geoffrey bishop of that place, and throwing himself at his feet promised him all the filial subjection and obedience that was due to the vicar of St. Peter. The king invited him to Rouen, and during his short stay there obliged not only the lords of his court, but even the Jews, to make him rich presents.⁶ In the mean time Lotharius, having assembled a council at Wirtzburg in Germany, the election of Innocent was approved and confirmed by the king and the sixteen bishops who composed that assembly.⁷ St. Bernard, mentioning the kings who adhered to Innocent, says that he was owned by the kings of Germany, of France, England, Scotland, Spain, and Jerusalem.⁸ But if David, at this time king of Scotland, acknowledged Innocent when St. Bernard wrote that epistle, he must afterwards have been gained over to the opposite party; for the king of Scotland is not mentioned by Wlgrin, who lived at this time, and names all the other kings spoken of by St. Bernard.⁹ Nay, Richard prior of Hagustald tells us in express terms, that in 1138 David king of Scotland was persuaded by Alberic, bishop of Ostia and the pope's legate in England and Scotland, to acknowledge Innocent and return to the unity of the church, from which he had been long separated by adhering to the apostate Peter Leo of execrable memory.¹⁰

¹ Petrus Venerab. de Miracul. l. 2. c. 16. Suger. in Vita Ludovici VI. Orderic. l. 13. p. 895.

² Suger. et Ernald. ubi sup.

³ Ernald. ibid. Malmesbur. et Orderic.

⁴ Chron. Magdeburg. inedit. ⁵ Bernard. ep. 125.

⁶ Wlgrin Bituric. in Patriarchu Bituric. c. 63.

⁷ Richard Hagustald. de Gestis Regis Stephan.

¹ Arnulph. de Schismate, &c. cap. 3.

² Idem, ibid. c. 4.

³ Idem c. 5. Ernald in Vita. S. Bernardi.

Roger, count of Sicily, sides with Anacletus, who confirms to him the title of king. Innocent acknowledged by the German bishops;—[Year of Christ, 1131.] Crowns Lotharius. Visits several cities in France.

Anacletus, on the other hand, wrote and sent legates to all the Christian princes to acquaint them with his promotion, and the intrusion of Innocent, who, he said, had been clandestinely elected only by a few cardinals in a corner, and in the dark, before the death of the late pope was publicly known; whereas he had been chosen by the far greater part of the cardinals, by the whole Roman clergy, as well as by the people and nobility, and had been consecrated at the altar of the prince of the apostles, in the presence of several bishops, and in the sight of the whole city. But his legates were nowhere received, nor was any answer returned to his letters. Roger, count of Sicily, and duke of Apulia, had not declared for either of the competitors; and to him therefore Anacletus resolved to apply in person, as one able to support him against the whole power of the opposite party. With that view he set out for Benevento in the beginning of October of the present year, and having, upon his arrival in that city, invited the count to an interview, it was agreed that they should meet, and they met accordingly at Avellino, when the following treaty was concluded and signed by both, namely, that Anacletus should confirm to him and his successors the title of king, which he had already assumed, and with that title all the privileges, immunities, and exemptions enjoyed by his predecessors in Sicily and Apulia; and that he, on his side, should acknowledge him for lawful pope, should support him with the whole strength of his kingdom, should receive investiture at his hands, and pay yearly to him and his successors five hundred schifati (a golden coin) as feudatory of the apostolic see. From Avellino, Anacletus returned to Benevento, and there issued the bull granting to Roger and his heirs the crown of the kingdom of Sicily, Apulia, and Calabria, upon the conditions mentioned above. To the kingdom of Sicily and Apulia he added, in his bull, the principality of Capua, Robert, the present prince, having declared for Innocent; and likewise the city and dukedom of Naples, though they belonged to the emperor of the East, and were governed, at this time, by a duke under him in the form of a republic; thus disposing of the dominions of other princes as if they were his own, and he had a right to bestow them upon whom he pleased. This bull is dated the 27th of September of the present year 1130. With this bull the new king returned to Sicily, and was there crowned at Palermo on Christmas day by cardinal Peter de Comitibus, sent by Anacletus for that purpose with the character of his legate *a Latere*.¹ Roger, thinking himself sufficiently authorized by

the bull of Anacletus to seize on the dominions of the duke of Naples and the prince of Capua, invaded them with a powerful army, and having driven both princes out, added their territories to his own. Thus he became master of the whole country that is now comprised under the name of the kingdom of the two Sicilies; and he thenceforth styled himself, as appears from his diplomas, “king of Sicily and Italy, the defender and the shield of Christians,” his dominions serving as a barrier against the Saracens.¹ From Benevento, Anacletus returned to Rome in the beginning of the following year, 1131, and was there received with loud acclamations by the people, who went out to meet him, and carried him in triumph to the Lateran palace.

In the mean time Innocent, having visited several cities in France, repaired to Liege, being invited thither by king Lotharius, in order to be acknowledged by the German bishops, whom the king had assembled in that city. He was met at the gate by the bishops and the clergy of the place in procession, and conducted to the cathedral, the king walking before him and leading his horse. Innocent was owned first by the king, and afterwards by all the bishops, for lawful pope, and Peter Leo declared an usurper, and a schismatic. In the interview the king had with the pope he proposed the affair of investitures, and pressed his holiness to restore them to him as they had been enjoyed by his predecessors before the dispute concerning them began. Such a proposal alarmed the cardinals, apprehending that Lotharius might treat Innocent as the late emperor had treated Paschal. For he seemed determined to recover that right, and even proceeded to menaces, if the pope did not relinquish it. But St. Bernard, who was present, interposed, appeased the king, and the affair was dropped.² On this occasion the pope crowned the king with great solemnity, though he had been crowned before by the archbishop of Cologne, and promised him the imperial crown, provided he undertook, as became him, the defence of the church.³

From Liege, Innocent went to visit the monastery of Clairvaux, belonging to the Cistercians, an order founded by St. Bernard, at this time abbot of that monastery. The pope was greatly taken with the edifying life led by those monks; but as they observed strict poverty, and his retinue was very numerous, he staid there but one night. From thence he proceeded to St. Denis, near Paris, and being magnificently entertained by Suger, abbot of that wealthy monastery, he celebrated the festival of Easter there, which, in the present year, fell on the

¹ Fulco in Chron. Orderic. l. 13. p. 895. Petrus Diac. l. 4. c. 97. Otto Frising. l. 8. c. 16. et Bulla Anaclet. apud Baron. ad hunc ann.

² Apud Ughellum Ital. Sacra ad ann. 1132, 1137.

³ Bernardi Ep. 150.

³ Ernald in Vita S. Bernard. Otto Frising. l. 7. c. 18.

Council of Reims. Lewis VII. of France crowned by the pope. Innocent returns to Italy;—[Year of Christ, 1132.] The see of Genoa elected into a metropolis;—[Year of Christ, 1133.]

19th of April. He visited several other monasteries and churches in France, supplying, says the abbot Suger, his own wants out of their own abundance;¹ for he received none of the revenues of his see, the Romans, and with them the king of Sicily, and most of the other Italian princes, having declared for his rival. At Paris he was received by the king with extraordinary marks of respect and esteem, and, upon his departure, attended by him and his son Philip part of the way.² In the beginning of October he consecrated the church of St. Medard, at Soissons, and from thence went to Compeigne, and from Compeigne to Reims, where he had appointed a council to meet on St. Luke's day, the 18th of October. The council consisted of thirteen archbishops, of two hundred and sixty-three bishops, and a great number of abbots, monks, and other ecclesiastics, and the pope presided at it in person. By this numerous assembly the election of Innocent was confirmed, and the sentence of excommunication thundered out against Anacletus, and all his adherents. Seventeen canons were issued, of which the fourth strictly enjoined all ecclesiastics, from the degree of subdeacon, to dismiss their wives, on pain of being suspended from all the functions of their office, and forfeiting their benefices. By the fifth all were forbidden to be present at the mass or any other sacred function performed by the married clergy.³ On the 29th of October, the king, Lewis VI., came to the council, attended by most of the great lords of his kingdom, and placing himself, after he had kissed his holiness's foot, in a seat by him, acquainted him with the death of his eldest son Philip, killed by a fall from his horse, and begged he would consecrate his younger son, Lewis, then only ten years old, king in his room. The pathetic speech the king made on that occasion drew tears from the whole assembly. The pope endeavored to assuage his grief by exhorting him to submit to the will of God, and reflect that he had blessed him with other children to remain after him upon the earth, while he had taken his eldest son to reign with him in heaven. The pope, to comfort the king, promised to anoint and consecrate his son Lewis the very day; and the ceremony was accordingly performed on the 25th of October, being Sunday, with the utmost pomp and magnificence, in the presence of the whole council, of the king, of the queen, and the whole French nobility.⁴ Before the council broke up, the pope received a letter from king Lotharius, sent to him by Norbert, archbishop of Magdeburg, promising him anew all sub-

jection and obedience, and assuring him that he was making the necessary preparations to march into Italy with the whole strength of his kingdom. He likewise received letters, while the council was yet sitting, from Henry, king of England, from Alphonsus VI., king of Arragon and Navarre, and from Alphonsus VII., king of Castile, all owning him for the lawful successor of St. Peter.¹ The council ended with the canonization of St. Godehard, bishop of Hildesheim, in Saxony, who died on the 4th of May, 1038, and was said to have wrought many miracles after his death.

Innocent, having visited several other cities in France, set out, at last, about the middle of March, 1132, on his return to Italy, and having crossed the mountains of Geneva, entered Lombardy, and celebrated the feast of Easter, which fell this year on the 10th of April, at Asti: from thence he pursued his journey to Placentia, and held a council there, composed of the bishops of Lombardy, of the province of Ravenna, and the Lower March, now the March of Ancona. But none of the acts of that council have reached our times. In the mean time, Lotharius, arriving with his army in Lombardy, agreeably to his promise, held a general assembly with the pope and the Lombards, to deliberate with them concerning the most effectual means of healing the present divisions in the church. The assembly met in the latter end of August, in a spacious plain, not far from Placentia, called Roncalia, and it was there resolved that the king should march strait to Rome. However, he passed the remaining part of this year in Lombardy, settling his affairs there, as many of the Lombard lords had declared for Conrad, crowned king of Italy by the archbishop of Milan. The pope, therefore, leaving the king in Lombardy, repaired from Placentia to Pisa, in order to terminate some differences that had, for a long time, subsisted between that powerful republic, and the no less powerful republic of Genoa. They were upon the point of coming to an open rupture, and declaring war against each other, but were happily reconciled upon the terms proposed by the pope, which both parties agreed to, and swore faithfully to observe. Innocent, to reward the Genoese for their ready compliance with the conditions he proposed, erected their city into an archbishopric, gave the pall to Syrus, who was then bishop, exempted him from the jurisdiction of the archbishop of Milan, whose suffragan he was, and subjected three bishoprics in Corsica to his see.² The bull granting the dignity of metropolitan to Syrus and his successors to the see of Genoa, is dated the 19th of March, 1133.

¹ Suger in Vit. Ludovic. p. 318.

² Chronograph. Mauriniac.

³ Suger ibid. Usperg. in Chron. et Concil. l. x. p. 982.

⁴ Suger. ibid. Chronograph. Mauriniac. Dodechin in Chron.

¹ Suger, ibid. Chronograph. Mauriniac. Dodechin in Chron. ² Chronograph. Hildensheim ad ann. 1132.

Innocent in Rome. Crowns Lotharius emperor. The emperor returns to Germany, and the pope to Pisa. Council of Pisa;—[Year of Christ, 1134.] Ramirus, monk and priest, made king of Arragon, and marries.

In the mean time, Lotharius, having settled his affairs in Lombardy, came to the pope in Tuscany, and it was agreed between them, that the king, keeping the highway with his army, should march directly to Rome, but that the pope should pursue his journey along the coast, and join the king at Viterbo. They met there accordingly, and proceeding together to Rome, encamped together at St. Agnes at a small distance from the walls. The next day they entered Rome without opposition, the Romans not thinking themselves in a condition to withstand so great a force, and the king, encamping on Mount Aventine, conducted the pope from thence to the Lateran palace, Anacletus having quitted it, and retired to the castle of St. Angelo. In the mean time the Pisans and the Genoese, coming to the assistance of Innocent with a powerful fleet, obliged Civita Vecchia, and all the other cities on the coast to submit to him. Lotharius, having thus put the pope in possession of the Lateran, claimed the promise he had made to crown him emperor; and that ceremony Innocent performed with great solemnity, crowning at the same time the king, and his queen Richilda, whom he had brought with him, that she too might receive the imperial crown at his holiness's hands. The king, when upon the point of receiving the imperial crown, took the following oath, tendered to him by the pope; "I, king Lotharius, promise and swear to you, lord pope Innocent, to preserve your life, limbs, and the lives, limbs, and liberty of your successors; to defend the apostolic see and your honor; to maintain the royalties of St. Peter, which you now possess; and strive to the utmost of my power to recover those that have by violence been taken from you."¹ The ceremony of the coronation was performed on the 4th of June, in the Lateran church, and not, as was usual, in St. Peter's, that church being then held by Anacletus and his partisans. The pope, to reward the emperor's zeal in his cause, and to enable him the better to support the imperial dignity, granted to him, to his daughter, and to his son-in-law, Henry, duke of Bavaria, all the demesnes of the countess Mathilda, to be held by them during their lives, upon their swearing allegiance, and paying yearly an hundred pounds weight of silver to the apostolic see.² As Anacletus had a strong party in Rome, and was protected by the king of Sicily, the emperor, not thinking it advisable to lay siege to the castle of St. Angelo with the forces he had with him, returned, after a stay of seven weeks in Rome, to Germany, and at the same time Innocent, no longer safe in that city, left it, and returned to Pisa.³

At Pisa Innocent held a council, at which all the Western bishops are said to have

been present.¹ By this council Anacletus was again excommunicated with all his adherents; Alexander, bishop of Liege, accused of simony, and refusing to appear and plead his cause in person though three times summoned, was deposed, which so affected him that he died of grief as soon as he heard it; and the doctrines taught by a hermit named Henry, were declared heresies, and condemned, with their author and all who taught or held them. These errors were, that baptism ought not to be administered to infants, but only to the adult or grown persons; and they accordingly re-baptized all who came over to them; that churches and altars owed their origin to superstition, and ought therefore to be destroyed, and this doctrine they put everywhere in execution; that crosses ought not to be worshipped, and should therefore be removed out of the sight of the people and broken in pieces; that mass was a human invention and a superstitious ceremony; and that prayers for the dead afforded them no relief. These doctrines the Hermit first taught in Provence, afterwards at Lausanne, and at last in the diocese of Mans, where he acquired great reputation by his pretended miracles, and was followed by crowds of people of all ranks. But being opposed by Hildebert, bishop of that city, and St. Bernard, sent for that purpose by the pope, he was forsaken by most of his followers; and being apprehended in endeavouring to make his escape, he was delivered up to the archbishop of Arles, who carried him with him to Pisa, where he was condemned as an heretic and obliged to recant.² This council was held on the 30th of May, 1134.

In the same year Alphonsus VI., king of Arragon, dying without issue, the grandees of the kingdom, to avoid a civil war among the many pretenders to the crown, unanimously chose Ramirus, the deceased king's brother, though a professed monk and priest, to succeed him, and taking him by force out of his monastery, crowned him, and obliged him to marry. He had by his wife a daughter named Petronilla, who was no sooner born, than assembling all the lords of the kingdom, he told them that, in compliance with their request, he had left his monastery, and therefore hoped that they, in their turn, would comply with his, and allow him to return to his former state of life, since no man would dispute the kingdom with his daughter, and they consequently could have no further occasion to hinder him from re-embracing the profession which he had chosen, and solemnly vowed to die in. As he expressed great concern and uneasiness of mind at his having quitted that profession, the assembly was prevailed upon,

¹ Apud Baron.

² Idem, ad ann. 1133.

³ Chronograph. Mauriniac. p. 333.

¹ Ewald in Vit. S. Bernard. l. 2. c. 2.

² Acta Episcoporum. Cenomanen apud Mabill. Analect, tom. 3. p. 341.

The king of Sicily seizes on the principality of Capua;—[Year of Christ, 1135.] The emperor returns to Italy;—[Year of Christ, 1136.] And reduces most places in Apulia;—[Year of Christ, 1137.]

in the end, to consent to his abdication. Having therefore betrothed his daughter, with their approbation, to the son of the count of Barcelona, afterwards Raimund IV., he exchanged, with great joy, the crown for the cowl.¹ That it was by a dispensation from the pope, Ramirus or Ramirez quitted his monastery and married, is asserted, in express terms, by Robertus de Monte, who wrote at this time.² But no notice is taken of such a dispensation either by Ordericus Vitalis, or Guillelmus Neubrigensis, both contemporary writers. But it is very certain that the popes, in the preceding century, had taken upon them to dispense with religious vows, and that they who wanted such dispensations, applied to them, as has been shown heretofore in this volume.³ The example of Innocent II., granting to Ramirus, though a priest, leave to marry, was, upon the death of Sebastian king of Portugal, in the sixteenth century, urged in favor of Henry, lawful heir to the crown, though cardinal priest, and at that time archbishop of Evora.⁴ If Ramirus quitted the monastic life and married by virtue of a dispensation from the pope, that dispensation did not entirely satisfy him. For in the speech he made to the grandees, upon the birth of his daughter, he begged they would not oppose his return to the monastery, which they had forced him to quit, that he might thus atone for what he had done against his conscience, and die in peace.⁵ Natalis Alexander, and almost all the modern Spanish writers, will have Ramirus to have been a bishop, and therefore look upon the story of his marriage as a fable, no instance occurring yet in history of a dispensation for a bishop to marry. But by all the contemporary writers he is only called monk and priest;⁶ and Surita assures us, that he had seen an original diploma signed by Ramirus with the title of king and priest, *rex et sacerdos*.⁷

Whilst Innocent was still at Pisa, Roger, king of Sicily, having gained a complete victory over Robert, prince of Capua, and Sergius, duke of Naples, who had revolted from him, seized on their dominions, and added them to his own, as having been granted to him by Anacletus, whom he acknowledged for lawful pope. Robert, thus driven from his principality, had recourse to Innocent, who sent him with cardinal Gerard into Germany to acquaint the emperor with the usurpation of Roger, and implore his protection. The emperor received them in a very kind and obliging manner; assured them of his protection, and ordered every thing to be made ready, without delay, for his march into Italy, in order to reinstate

the prince of Capua in his principality, and Innocent in the possession of his see. However, he did not enter Italy till the year 1136, when he came at the head of one of the most numerous and powerful armies that had been seen for many years in that country. He passed all that year in Lombardy settling his affairs there, and advancing, in the beginning of March 1137, to Viterbo, had there an interview with the pope; and it was agreed, that the emperor should first reduce the March of Ancona, that had declared for Anacletus, and the pope in the mean time march against the cities and strong-holds in the neighborhood of Rome with three thousand horse, which the emperor left with him under the command of his son-in-law Henry, duke of Bavaria and Saxony, surnamed the Proud. With that body the pope and the duke made themselves masters of Albano, and all the forts around Rome, and then marching into Campania obliged the whole country to submit, and drive from their cities those who were known to be the most attached to Anacletus. At Capua they were received by the inhabitants with loud acclamations of joy, and Robert, their lawful prince, was reinstated in the principality. At Benevento they met with some opposition; but Rosceman, whom Anacletus had raised to that see, privately withdrawing lest he should fall into the hands of Innocent, the inhabitants opened their gates and received Innocent as their sovereign and lawful pope.

In the mean time the emperor, having reduced all the March of Ancona, entered Apulia, and laid siege to Bari, where he was joined by the pope, the duke of Bavaria, and the body of horse under their command. During the siege, which lasted forty days, the place being defended by the troops of the king of Sicily, the pope celebrated the festival of Whitsunday, (which fell in the present year 1137 on the 30th of May) with great solemnity, in the camp. Bari surrendered at last, and likewise Salerno with most of the other cities of Apulia, Roger not attempting to relieve them, but saving his men in order to retake them as soon as the emperor returned to Germany. The surrender of Salerno occasioned a misunderstanding between the pope and the emperor. For the popes, ever since the time of Gregory VII. had claimed that city, and excepted it, as belonging to the apostolic see, in the investitures they granted to the dukes of Apulia, as appears from all their bulls. But upon what they grounded their claim history does not inform us. This dispute was left for the present undetermined; but soon after another arose of more importance. As the emperor had reduced the far greater part of Apulia, it was agreed between him and the pope, that a new duke should be created in the room of Roger, who had been

¹ Orderic. ad hunc ann. Neubrig. l. 2. c. 10.

² In Chron. ad ann. 1160. ³ See p. 340.

⁴ Spondanus ad ann. 1578. ⁵ Neubrig. ibid.

⁶ Orderic. Neubrig. ubi supra. Roderic Toletan. l.

6. c. 1. Gaufréd. Vosiens. in Chron. c. 48.

⁷ Surit. Annal. l. 1. c. 53.

Disagreement between the pope and the emperor. Rainulph created duke of Apulia. Anacletus dies;— [Year of Christ, 1138.] Victor, elected in his room, resigns. End of the schism. The tenth general, and second Lateran council;— [Year of Christ, 1139.] The ordinations of Anacletus declared null.

invested in that dukedom by Anacletus. But both claimed the right of naming and investing the new duke. The emperor pretended that as those provinces depended upon the empire, he had a right to invest with them whom he pleased. The pope, on the other hand, maintained, that as they had been taken by the Normans from the emperor of the East, they did not depend upon the Western empire, that the Normans had submitted, of their own accord, to the apostolic see, had owned themselves vassals of St. Peter and his successors, and as such had received investiture at their hands. As the pope could not prevail upon the emperor, nor the emperor upon the pope to yield, the contest lasted a whole month, and it was apprehended they would come to an open rupture and part. But the following expedient was in the end agreed to by the contending parties; namely, that the pope should elect the new duke with the approbation of the emperor, and both should invest him. The pope nominated Rainulph, count of Avellano, who had married Roger's sister, but had, nevertheless, been driven by him from his dominions, and was therefore one of his most inveterate enemies. His election was confirmed by the emperor, and he was solemnly invested, both by the pope and the emperor, with the dukedom of Apulia and Calabria, swearing allegiance to both. The pope afterwards consecrated the duke at Benevento in the presence of the archbishop of Aquilea and many other bishops, and put him, on that occasion, in mind of the tribute he was to pay yearly as duke of Apulia to St. Peter.

The emperor, having put Rainulph in possession of Apulia, left him to defend himself against the king of Sicily, and set out on his return to Germany. Upon his departure the pope retired to Benevento, not thinking it yet safe for him to return to Rome, as his rival still held the castle of St. Angelo. But the death of Anacletus removed all his fears. He died on the 25th of January in the present year 1138, and was privately interred by his relations, who ever kept his burial place concealed, lest his body should be dug up and insulted, as had happened to pope Formosus.¹ The cardinals of his party and his relations sent immediately to acquaint king Roger, their protector, with his death, and beg leave to elect another in his room. As the king was determined to repossess himself of Apulia, he readily complied with their request, in order to keep Innocent employed and divert him from sending any assistance to the new duke. Upon the return of the messenger from Sicily, the cardinals and clergy of Anacletus's party chose, about the middle of

March, Gregory, cardinal priest, under the name of Victor. In the mean time Innocent returned to Rome, and Victor, after he had borne the empty title of pope about two months, was prevailed upon by St. Bernard to quit the ensigns of the pontifical dignity, and throw himself at the feet of Innocent. Hereupon the sons of Peter Leo, the leading men of the party that opposed Innocent, tired of the civil dissensions that had reigned so long in Rome, submitted at length, and acknowledged him for lawful pope on the octave of Whitsunday, which in the present year fell on the 29th of May.¹ Thus ended the schism, and peace was everywhere restored to the church. In the latter end of this year, that is, on the 4th of December, died the emperor Lotharius, at a village in the vale of Trent, in his way back to Germany.² In his room was elected by the princes of the empire, and crowned king of the Romans by Theduin, the pope's legate, Conrad, nephew to Henry V. by his daughter Agnes.

Innocent, having now no enemy to contend with in Rome, appointed a general council to meet in the Lateran on the fourth Sunday in Lent, which in 1139 fell on the 2d of April. All the bishops in the West were summoned to it, and it was the most numerous council that had ever been held. For we are told, that it consisted of a thousand bishops, and an infinite number of abbots and other ecclesiastics.³ From England there came but five bishops, among whom was Theobald, preferred the preceding year to the see of Canterbury, and only four abbots, the king (Stephen) not caring to send more on account of the disturbances, which his kingdom was threatened with at that juncture.⁴ By this council, the tenth general and the second held in the Lateran, the ordinations made by Peter, the son of Leo, who had wickedly intruded himself into St. Peter's chair, were all declared null, and likewise the ordinations made by those whom he had ordained. When this decree was read and approved by the council, the pope calling to him, by their names, all the bishops, who were present and had been consecrated by Anacletus, he snatched their croziers from their hands, their rings from off their fingers, and their palls from their shoulders, upbraiding them, in very sharp terms, with their crimes; and declaring them unordained and incapable of performing any function whatever of the episcopal or sacerdotal office. By the same decree they, who had received any order at the hands of Gerard, bishop of Angoulême,

¹ Fulco in Chron. Bernard p. 320. Anonym. Cassin. ad hunc ann.

² Fulco in Chron. et Chronograph. Magdeburg.

³ Otto Frising. l. 7. c. 23. Usperg. ad ann. 1139.

⁴ Ricard. Hagustald. de Gest. Regis Steph.

King Roger excommunicated. Heretics condemned by this council. Malachy appointed by the pope his legate in Ireland. Roger, king of Sicily, invades Apulia.

and Anacletus's legate in France, were suspended from all sacred functions, and debarred from ever rising to a higher degree in the church.¹ As Roger, king of Sicily, had, upon the retreat of the emperor, invaded with a mighty army the dukedom of Apulia given by the pope and the emperor to Rainulph, and continued to assume the title of king bestowed upon him by Anacletus, the council thundered out the sentence of excommunication against him if he did not quit that title, and, disbanding his troops, leave Rainulph in the quiet possession of his dukedom.² By the twenty-third canon of the present council the opinions of Arnold of Brescia were declared repugnant to the doctrine received by the catholic church, and condemned as such. Arnold was a native of Brescia, had studied in France under the famous Peter Abelard, who held many heterodox opinions, and upon his return to Italy begun to sow his new doctrine, a doctrine very disagreeable to the court of Rome, and the clergy in general. For he maintained that there was no salvation for the monks, ecclesiastics, and bishops who possessed any property; that lordships, estates, and demesnes belonged to the laity, and was robbery in the clergy to hold them; that they ought to lead sober and frugal lives, contenting themselves with the tithes and the voluntary offerings of the faithful; that the titles of worldly grandeur, which they assumed, ill became the disciples of the meek and humble Jesus; and that they should begin the reformation of manners, for which they assembled so many councils, with reforming their own, and parting with the immense wealth they possessed as their own, though the property of the laity. As Arnold was a man of great eloquence and address, and his doctrine was every where applauded by the laity, the clergy and the monks fell into the utmost contempt, and became, in all places where he preached, the public object of ridicule, even the women reproaching them with preaching one doctrine, and practising another; with making it their study to heap up riches, while they recommended to the laity the contempt of riches. He likewise preached, as well as the hermit Henry, mentioned above, against infant baptism, the mass, the eucharist, and praying for the dead. Being therefore accused by his own bishop, and summoned to the council, his doctrines were condemned, and he, as well as his disciples and followers, enjoined silence by the pope on pain of excommunication.³ The same opinions were held and taught by Petrus de Bruis, who had therefore been condemned by Calixtus II. in the council he assembled at Toulouse,

and was again condemned in the present council with his followers, under the name of Petrobrusians.¹ The thirty canons issued by the Lateran council were calculated to abolish the abuses that had prevailed during the schism. In the council of Reims Innocent canonized St. Godehard, as has been related above, and in the Lateran he bestowed the same honor upon Sturmius, the first abbot of Fulda, who was raised to that dignity in 744, and died in 779.

While the council was yet sitting, or soon after it broke up, arrived at Rome from Ireland Malachy, now St. Malachy. He had been made bishop in 1124. But as he had been driven from his see, Celsus, archbishop of Armagh, being upon his death-bed, sent his crosier to him as his successor, "tanquam sibi successuro," says St. Bernard.² Whether he was any otherwise elected we know not; but in the present year he went to Rome for the pall. The pope received him with great marks of respect and esteem, took the mitre from off his own head and put it upon his, and upon his departure, after he had staid a month at Rome, appointed him his legate for all Ireland, but would not grant him the pall till it was demanded by a general council, which he ordered him to convene on his return home. Thus St. Bernard, who wrote the life of this holy bishop.³

In the mean time Roger, determined to recover the kingdom of Apulia taken from him by the pope and the emperor, assembled a powerful army in Sicily, and landing at Salerno made himself master of that city, and advancing from thence to Nocera, Avelino, Capua, and Benevento, struck every where such terror into the inhabitants, threatening to lay their cities in ashes if they did not submit, that they all submitted, except Capua, without opposition. That city held out some time, the people being greatly attached to their own prince. But the king made them pay dear for their resistance: for having taken the place sword in hand, he gave it up to be plundered by his victorious army, who spared neither churches nor monasteries, and used the inhabitants in a most cruel manner. While Roger was thus employed, Rainulph, whom the pope and emperor had invested with the dukedom of Apulia, having drawn together a chosen body of troops, and reinforced them with the garrisons which the emperor had left in several cities, took the field, and marching straight up to the king offered him battle, determined to die rather than tamely suffer his dukedom to be taken from him. Roger did not decline the offer, and, an engagement thereupon ensuing, both armies fought for several hours with a reso-

¹ Collect. Concil. p. 1011, et Chron. Maurinac. p. 367.

² Fulco in Chron.

³ Otho Frising. de Rebus Gestis Frederic. l. 2. c. 20.

¹ Vide Natal. Alexand. Hist. Eccles. Sec. xi. xii. cap. 4. art. 7, 8.

² Bernard. in Vita Malach. c. 20. ³ Idem ibid, c. 16.

The pope marches to the defence of Apulia. Is taken prisoner, with several cardinals. Concludes a peace with the king. Terms of the agreement.

lution and intrepidity scarce to be matched, the two commanders distinguishing themselves, during the whole time of the engagement, above all the rest. In the end the king, having lost the better part of his army, was forced to retreat, which, however, he did in good order, leaving the duke only master of the field. With the troops that remained he garrisoned the places he had taken, while he returned to Sicily in order to raise a new army there. But duke Rainulph dying in the mean time, he no sooner heard of his death, than crossing over into Apulia with what troops he had already raised, he soon recovered all the places he had lost, and meeting with no opposition but at Bari and Troia, both which cities were defended by numerous garrisons, he began to look upon the war as now at an end.

But the pope unexpectedly appeared in Apulia, at the head of an army raised by him in Rome, and greatly strengthened, after his arrival in Apulia, with the troops that had served under the late duke. Innocent was jealous of the overgrown power of Roger, had lately excommunicated him in the Lateran Council, and could not bear to see him possessed of a country in which he had been invested by his rival, Anacletus. Roger, hearing of his arrival, sent immediately deputies to treat of an accommodation, and to declare to his holiness, that as the dukedom of Apulia belonged to him, both by right of inheritance and right of conquest, he was determined never to part with it, but would defend it to the last drop of his blood, and look upon all as his enemies, who should oppose him in recovering what had been so unjustly taken from him; but that he was willing to receive investiture at his holiness's hands, to swear allegiance to him, and pay to the apostolic see the annual sum of six hundred schifati, as he had hitherto done. The deputies were courteously received by the pope, who sent two cardinals to treat with the king. But as they, pursuant to their instructions, insisted upon the king's reinstating Robert, prince of Capua, in his principality, which Roger would not give up, the treaty was broken off, and the king returned to the siege of Troia, which he had begun before the arrival of the pope. On the other hand, Innocent, and Robert, prince of Capua, who was with him, laid siege to the strong castle of Gallucio, which the king no sooner heard, than quitting the siege of Troia, he hastened to the relief of the place, and arrived at St. Germano, in that neighborhood, before the pope had any intelligence of his march. His unexpected arrival so terrified the pope, that he immediately raised the siege, and retired in great confusion. The king had placed in ambuscade a chosen body of a thousand horse under the command of his eldest son, Roger,

with orders to attack the rear of the pope's army, and if, by any means he could, take him prisoner, and bring him to his camp. His orders were executed with all the wished-for success; the rear of the pope's army was put to flight, at the first onset, and he taken prisoner, with cardinal Haimearius, chancellor of the Holy Roman Empire, and several other cardinals and persons of distinction; but Robert, prince of Capua, had the good luck to make his escape. The prisoners were all brought to the king's camp on the 22d of July of the present year, 1139. The king sent some of the chief officers of his army to wait upon his holiness as soon as he heard of his captivity, to beg his pardon in the most submissive terms, and entreat him to hearken to an accommodation.

Innocent, taken with the generous behavior of the king, and at the same time finding his army quite disheartened and dispersed, the prince of Capua fled, and the other princes in those parts, all awed by the army of the conqueror, agreed to the terms which the king had proposed from the beginning. He first absolved him from the excommunication he had thundered off against him in the Lateran council; which he had no sooner done than Roger went in person, with his children, to wait upon him, and throwing himself at his feet, begged forgiveness, and acknowledged him for lawful pope. In the next place the pope caused the articles of the agreement to be drawn up, granting to Roger, to his heirs and his successors, the kingdom of Sicily, the dukedom of Apulia, and the principality of Capua, upon condition they swore allegiance to the vicar of St. Peter in the apostolic see, received investiture at his hands, and owned themselves feudatories of the holy see by the yearly payment of six hundred schifati. Innocent, in thus disposing of the principality of Capua, was guilty of the utmost ingratitude as well as injustice; for Robert, the lawful prince, was still living, and had, with unshaken constancy, adhered to him from the beginning of the schism, and opposed his rival. But the popes, looking upon themselves, ever since the time of Gregory VII., as lords of the universe, thought they had a right to dispose of principalities and kingdoms at their pleasure, and were ever ready to sacrifice all other considerations to the grandeur of their see. The terms I have mentioned being agreed to on both sides, the pope solemnly invested Roger, by delivering to him a standard, the usual ceremony in the kingdom of Sicily, the dukedom of Apulia, and the principality of Capua, acknowledged him for king, and confirmed to him all the honors that were due to the royal dignity. On the other hand, Roger took an oath of allegiance to Innocent and his suc-

Innocent returns to Rome. Naples and the other cities submit to Roger, or are taken by force;—[Year of Christ, 1140.] The doctrine of Abelard condemned in the council of Sens.

cessors lawfully elected, promising to pay the yearly sum agreed on as feudatory of the apostolic see, to assist the pope canonically elected, when his assistance should be wanted, and to maintain the royalties of St. Peter. It is observable that Innocent, in the bull which he issued on this occasion, takes no notice of the grant made by Anacletus, but only mentions the eminent services done to the church by Robert Guiscard, the new king's grandfather, and by his father, Roger, count of Sicily, who had driven the Saracens out of that country, and then adds, that he therefore confirmed to him the dukedom of Apulia, which his predecessor, Honorius, had granted him, and besides allowed him to take upon him the title of "king of Sicily," as that country was formerly a kingdom, governed by its own kings. Innocent, in his bull, makes no mention of the principality of Salerno, and consequently did not invest him in that principality; nay, Anacletus expressly excepted it, pretending it belonged, as well as Benevento, to the apostolic see. But Roger, paying no regard to their claim, restored Benevento, which he had taken, and kept Salerno, which we do not find Innocent complained of, though he did not grant him the investiture of that principality. The Jesuit Giannetasius, in his History of Naples, supposes Innocent to have, on this occasion, invested Roger in that dukedom. But of Naples no mention is made in the bull of Innocent, transcribed by Baronius from the records in the Vatican;¹ and the historian must have confounded the bull of Innocent with that of Anacletus, spoken of above. But, allowing the fact to be true, the Jesuit had no reason to be surprised at the pope's giving away a country that belonged to the empire of the East, as he could not but know that the popes had given Apulia, Calabria and Sicily to the Normans, though they belonged to that empire, and they to whom he gave those provinces had no better title to them than to the dukedom of Naples.

The pope, having thus concluded a peace with Roger to the entire satisfaction of that prince, and thereupon recovered his liberty, took his leave of the king, and repairing to Benevento, drove from thence archbishop Rosce-man, preferred to that see by Anacletus, and hitherto supported by the king of Sicily. From Benevento Innocent returned to Rome, and on the 29th of September entered that city in a kind of triumph. However, the Romans were not at all pleased with the treaty he had made, but pressed him to break it as having been extorted, and not made freely. But the pope declaring, that he was persuaded it was the will of God he should be taken in order to bring about that treaty, and that he was therefore

determined inviolably to observe it, they acquiesced, and Roger was by all acknowledged for lawful duke of Apulia and king of Sicily.¹

Roger, having thus concluded a peace and alliance with the pope, resolved to drive out all the petty princes in those parts, and add their principalities to his new kingdom. The city of Naples, upon the death of duke Sergius, that happened this year, renouncing all allegiance to the emperors of the East, submitted to Roger, and elected one of his sons, some say Roger and some Anfusius, for their duke. The cities of Bari, Troia, Brindisi, and Conversano he reduced by force, putting some of their princes to death, and sending others over to Sicily, where they were kept closely confined. Thus, before the end of the year 1140, he became master of the dukedoms of Apulia, Calabria, Bari, Naples, Sorrento, Amalfi, and Gaeta, of the two Abruzzos, and that whole tract of country now called the kingdom of Naples. These provinces did not at first compose another kingdom, but were parts or provinces of the same kingdom, the kingdom of Sicily, of which Palermo was the metropolis. Hence the emperor Frederic II. in all his constitutions, by the kingdom of Sicily understands not only that island, but all the provinces on the other side of the Faro, or the straits of Messina, which are now comprised under the name of the kingdom of Naples, and mentioning Naples and Capua, he calls them cities of the kingdom of Sicily.² In process of time the kingdom of Sicily, comprehending that island and the present kingdom of Naples, was called the kingdom of Sicily on this and the other side the Faro. Thus Clement IV. in the year 1265, investing Charles of Anjou in the kingdom of Naples and Sicily, called it "Regnum Siciliae citra and ultra Pharum." It was called so afterwards by other popes and emperors, till the time of Alphonus I., who styled himself king of both Sicilies, rex utriusque Siciliae, and this title all the princes who have possessed Sicily and Naples have retained ever since his time.

The rapid progress Roger made in the conquest of Apulia, or of that part of Italy which we now call the kingdom of Naples (for thus was the word Apulia then understood) gave no small jealousy to Innocent. But he was wholly employed in hearing the accusations that were daily brought against Peter Abelard, and his disciple Arnold of Brescia. The chief accusers of Abelard were the monks, and St. Bernard at their head. He was accused of teaching the same doctrines that were taught by Arnold, who was supposed to have learned them of him. As Arnold was a man of uncommon address

¹ Baron. ad ann. 1139.

² Fulco Benevent. ad ann. 1135, 1139. Petrus Diacon. l. 4. c. 117, 1127, 1122. Anonym. Cassin. Constit. Occupatis, l. 1. apud Petr. delle Vigne.

Innocent quarrels with the king of France ;—[Year of Christ, 1141.] Several cities revolt from the pope ;— [Year of Christ, 1142.] He dies ;—[Year of Christ, 1143.]

and eloquence, inveighed with great bitterness in his public speeches against the grandeur, the wealth, and the dissolute lives of the clergy, though he had been enjoined silence by the pope in the Lateran council, the ecclesiastics joined, almost to a man, against him, and at the same time against Abelard, who lived with him in the greatest intimacy ; nay, St. Bernard, the great saint of the age, and therefore more zealous than the rest, was for having them both put to death, and that advice he suggested in a letter to cardinal Guido, the pope's legate in France.¹ The cardinal transmitted the letter to the pope. But as Innocent was not so great a saint as Bernard, he contented himself with ordering them to be apprehended, to be shut up separately, and their books to be burnt. The pope's letter was directed to Samson archbishop of Reims, Henry archbishop of Sens, and Bernard.² In the mean time several propositions being extracted out of Abelard's works by William abbot of St. Theodoric, and sent to Geoffrey bishop of Chartres, as a specimen of the errors he taught, he begged that he might be allowed to defend them in a council against St. Bernard, who had declared them repugnant to the doctrine held and defined by the church. The archbishop of Sens thinking it inconsistent with the laws of justice and the practice of the church to condemn one unheard, appointed, in compliance with his request, a council to meet in that city on the octave of Whitsunday, and summoned to it both Bernard and Abelard. At this council Henry of Sens presided, and were present Samson of Reims, and all the suffragans of both sees. The king, Lewis VII., would assist at it in person, attended by all the great lords of his kingdom. At their first meeting Bernard read to the assembly the propositions said to have been extracted out of Abelard's works. But as it did not appear that he was the author of the book in which these propositions were said to be contained, the council condemned them, but passed no sentence upon him.³ Of this great man, and the various persecutions he underwent, chiefly from the lewd and dissolute monks, the reader will find a full account in Mr. Bayle's Historical Dictionary, and to that work I refer him.

Innocent had always professed the greatest regard for the French nation, and their king, who had received him so kindly, and supported him so generously, when he was driven by his antagonist out of Rome. But in 1141 he quarreled with the king on the following occasion : Alberic, archbishop of Bourges, dying in 1139, some of the clergy, after a vacancy of a whole year and three months, were for electing one Cadurcus,

and the king had given his consent. But others, electing in the mean time, without the knowledge of the king, Peter, a relation of Aimeric, chancellor of the Roman church, and the pope's chief favorite, Innocent immediately ordained him, as he was then at Rome, and suspended Cadurcus. Hereupon the king, highly provoked at the pope's appointing a bishop in his kingdom without his approbation, or even his knowledge, would not suffer the new archbishop to take possession of his see, nor even to set foot in his dominions. On the other hand, the pope, determined to support him against the king and the laws of the kingdom, put all France under an interdict,¹ or rather forbade divine service to be any where performed in the presence of the king.² This interdict lasted till the pontificate of Celestine II., chosen in 1143. The monk Heriman, speaking of this interdict, says that the king was deprived by the pope of his Christianity.³

Innocent was wholly employed, during the last two years of his life, in reducing several cities, attempting to withdraw themselves from all subjection to the apostolic see, and recover their ancient liberty. These were Tivoli, Palestrina, Tusculum or Frascati, and Albano. The Romans undertook the reduction of Tivoli, and laid siege to it. But they were most shamefully put to flight in a sally made by the Tiburtines, which obliged the pope to march against them in person ; and he reduced them at last by famine rather than by force. The Romans themselves, a little before the death of Innocent, shook off the yoke, and refusing to obey Innocent as their prince, restored the senate, created their own magistrates, and would obey no other ; nay, they even invited and pressed Conrad to come and take possession of the capital of the empire, which the popes had no sort of right to. Conrad was rather inclined to espouse the cause of the pope against the rebellious Romans ; but the war he was at that juncture engaged in prevented him from sending any troops into Italy. Roger, king of Sicily, had already ordered a body of troops to march to his assistance. But, in the mean time, Innocent, greatly affected with these disturbances, fell ill, and died on the 23d of September 1143, after a pontificate of thirteen years, seven months, and nine days, reckoning, as he did, in all his bulls, the years he held the see from the day of his election. He was buried in the Lateran, in a marble coffin, which had been the emperor Hadrian's, says Joannes Diaconus the younger ; and adds, that the roof of that church falling in his time, he repaired it with beams sent him for that purpose by Roger, the glorious and power-

¹ Bernard. ep. 196.

² Apud Baron. ad ann. 1140.

³ Bernard. ep. 189. Otto Frising. l. 2. c. 48. Gaufrid. Vita Bernardi, l. 3. c. 5.

¹ Chron. Maurinac. l. 3. p. 386.

² Radulph. de Dicet. in Abbreviat. Chron. p. 509.

³ Heriman. apud Dacher. Spicileg. tom. 12.

Celestine II. elected. Absolves the king of France from the interdict. Dies;—[Year of Christ, 1144.]

ful king of Sicily.¹ His body was afterwards translated from the Lateran to the church of St. Mary, beyond the Tiber, which he repaired, or rather rebuilt from the foundation, as appears from his epitaph that is still to be seen there.² We have many letters of this pope, granting new privileges to several bishops, abbots, and monasteries, or confirming the old ones; which are to be met with in the Collection of Councils. I must not forget the curious picture which Innocent caused to be drawn of the coronation of the emperor Lotharius. In that picture the pope was represented sitting in the

pontifical chair, and Lotharius receiving, upon his knees, the imperial crown at his hand, with the following inscription:

“Rex venit ante fores, jurans prius urbis honores,
Post homo fit Papæ, recepit, quo dante, coronam.”

The words “homo fit Papæ,” he becomes the pope’s man, import that the emperor became the pope’s vassal or feudatory. But this picture was suppressed in the time of the emperor Frederic I. In the pontificate of Innocent, and in the month of April, 1141, died Joannes Comnenus, emperor of the East, after a reign of 24 years, and was succeeded by his son, Manuel Comnenus.

CELESTINE II., THE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[MANUEL COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East.*—CONRAD III., *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1143.] Innocent was succeeded by Celestine, the second of that name, called before his election Guido de Castello. He was a Tuscan, cardinal of St. Mark, and, in the year 1140, legate of the apostolic see in France. For it was to him St. Bernard applied, in that year, against Arnold of Brescia and Abelard, as has been said above. The new pope immediately acquainted Peter, surnamed the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, and the other monks of that monastery with his promotion, telling them, that he was elected, the third day after the death of his predecessor, by the cardinals, priests, and deacons—by his brethren the bishops and sub-deacons, amid the acclamations of the clergy and the Roman people.³

As Innocent died on the 23d of September, and Celestine was chosen on the third day after his predecessor’s death, his election must have happened on the 26th of September.

His promotion was no sooner known in France, than the king sent ambassadors to beg he would take off the interdict, which he had been put under by Innocent. Celestine received the ambassadors with extraordinary marks of kindness, and rising from his chair, as soon as they had acquainted him with the business upon which they were sent, he gave his benediction to the kingdom of France, and to all in it; and thus absolved the king and all his subjects from the interdict.¹ On the other hand, the king was persuaded by St. Bernard to receive Peter, and suffer him to hold the see of Bourges. Celestine is commended by the contemporary writers for his humanity, and many other good qualities; but he had not time to exert them: for he died on the 9th of March of the following year, 1144, having held the see only five months and thirteen days.

¹ Apud Mabill. tom. 2. Musæi Ital.

² It is as follows: “Hic requiescunt venerabilia ossa sanctissimæ memoriæ Domini Innocentii Papæ secundî de domo Paparescorum, qui præsentem ecclesiam, ad honorem Dei Genetricis Mariæ, sicut est, à fundamentis sumptibus propriis, renovavit. S. A. D. MCXLII., et an. D. MCXLVIII.” The work was begun by the pope, as appears from Victorellus, (Ciaccon. in Innocent II.) and completed, after his death, by his brother, Peter bishop of Albano: and thus are the two dates, 1142 and 1148, understood by Giaconius.

³ Celest. ep. apud Dachser. Spicileg. tom. 4. et Concil. tom. 10. p. 1031.

¹ Chron. Maurin.

Lucius II. elected. Roger, king of Sicily, quarrels with Lucius. The Romans persist in their rebellion. Lucius attempts to subdue them.

LUCIUS II., THE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MANUEL COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East.*—CONRAD III., *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1144.] In the room of Celestine was elected, after a vacancy of three days, Gerard Caccianemicus, and called Lucius II. He was a native of Bologna, and a regular canon of St. Austin, was made cardinal by Honorius II., and treasurer of the Roman church by Innocent II.¹ He sent, a few days after his election, Alberic, bishop of Ostia, into France, with the character of legate *a latere*, and Haimerus, bishop of Tusculum, with the same character into England.² But Haimerus staid, it seems, a very short time here, the affairs of the kingdom being then in great confusion; for we find him acting this very year as legate in France, Alberic being recalled from thence to Rome.³

Roger, king of Sicily, quarreling with Lucius, we know not upon what provocation, seized on several places belonging to the apostolic see, and among the rest on Terracina, plundered the monastery of Monte Cassino, and likewise the church, and laid waste all Campania. But in an interview he had with the pope, a peace was concluded, and the king, restoring all the places he had taken, returned to Sicily. Thus Ceccanus, and the anonymous Casinensis, two contemporary writers:⁴ and this is all we know of that quarrel.

The Romans, persisting in the rebellion which they had begun in the time of Innocent, acknowledged Lucius for lawful pope, but would not own him for their sovereign; maintaining, that the clergy, from the highest to the lowest, ought to be satisfied with the tithes and the voluntary oblations of the faithful, and that to possess lordships, estates, or temporal dominions, was inconsistent with their profession. This doctrine the Romans had learned of Arnold of Brescia, and they are therefore frequently called by the contemporary writers Arnoldists. They paid all due regard to Lucius as their bishop, but assembling soon after his election in the capitol, they vested the patrician dignity in one of their own body, namely, in Jordan, the son of Peter Leo, and submitted to him as their prince. At the same time they seized all the revenues as belonging to their prince, put other officers in the room of those who had been appointed by the

pope, and issued edicts in the style of the ancient senate. Lucius, not finding himself in a condition to oppose them, wrote a very submissive letter to Conrad, imploring his protection. The Romans too, on their side, earnestly pressed that prince, both by letters and frequent embassies, to come and take possession of the metropolis of the empire, which they had rescued from the slavery it had long groaned under, and were ready to deliver up to him, as their liege lord and sovereign. In one of their letters they tell Conrad, that they have taken all the fortified houses in Rome, and either pulled them down, or keep them for him; that they have been opposed by the pope, by the Frangipani, the Ptolemies, the sons of Peter Leo, except Jordan, and by many other powerful families in Rome, but were now absolute masters of the city, and would open their gates to him as soon as he appeared before them. They entreat him to fix his residence at Rome, and restore that city, which had been the seat of the empire till it was usurped by the popes, to its ancient splendor. To estrange Conrad from the pope, they added, that they were informed he had entered into an alliance against him with Roger, king of Sicily, granting him the crozier and the ring, and allowing him to wear the dalmatic, the mitre, and the sandals, badges of the imperial dignity. But Conrad paid no kind of regard to their repeated invitations, their letters, and their embassies: on the contrary, he received with the greatest marks of respect Guido, cardinal and chancellor of the Roman church, sent by Lucius to crave his assistance, and expressed great concern at his not being in a condition to lend him any.¹

Lucius, despairing of relief from the king of Germany, whom he looked upon as the protector of the Roman church, and no longer able to bear with the haughty behavior of the senate and their patrician, treating him as their subject, resolved to attempt the recovery of his temporal power with the assistance of the friends he had still remaining in Rome and in that neighborhood. Having accordingly assembled a body of troops, he put himself at their head, and marched to the capitol, while the senate were sitting there with their prince or patrician. His design was to drive them from thence

¹ Sigon. de Regn. Ital. l. 11. et Mabill. in Itiner. Italic. p. 199. ² Chron. Maurin. p. 387.

³ Dacher. Hist. Vezel. t. 1. p. 473.

⁴ Ceccan. ad ann. 1144, et Anonym. Casin. ad ann. 1143.

¹ Otto Frising. l. 7. c. 31. Sigon. de Regn. Ital. l. 11.

Lucius is killed in attempting to subdue the Romans;—[Year of Christ, 1145.] Some of his bulls. Eugenius III. elected. Obligated to quit Rome. Embassadors from the Christians in the East. Lewis of France resolves to go in person to their assistance.

with ignominy, and take possession of the place. But he met with a vigorous resistance from the Roman people, his troops were repulsed, and he, in endeavoring to encourage them, so grievously wounded with a stone, that he died a few days after.¹ His death happened upon the 25th of February 1145, after a pontificate of eleven months and fourteen days; and he was buried in the Lateran church, where he had lived many years regular canon of that order founded by St. Austin.² He was cardinal of the church, called the Holy Cross in Jerusalem, which he rebuilt, while yet a cardinal, and enriched with many possessions.³

Lucius, by a bull dated from the Lateran the 15th of May, confirmed that of Urban II.

subjecting all the bishops of Brittany to the archbishop of Tours, and commanding them to obey him as their metropolitan. However, he allowed Geoffrey, bishop of Dol, who claimed that dignity, to wear the pall as long as he lived, and to be under the immediate jurisdiction of the pope alone. He likewise confirmed to Raimund, archbishop of Toledo, the primacy over all Spain, which had been granted to his see by Urban II., but was disputed by the Spanish bishops. As the monastic discipline was greatly decayed in the monastery of St. Sabas, in Rome, founded by Gregory the Great, Lucius wrote to Peter, abbot of Cluny, ordering him to send thirteen of his monks to reform that monastery, subjecting it by his letter to Peter and his successors for ever.

EUGENIUS III., THE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MANUEL COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East*.—CONRAD III., FREDERICK ÆNOBARBUS, *Kings of Germany*.]

[Year of Christ, 1145.] The cardinals, assembling in the church of St. Cesarius the second day after the death of Lucius, that is, on the 27th of February, chose, with one consent, Bernard, a native of Pisa, abbot of St. Anastasius, monk of the Cistercian order, and disciple of St. Bernard, and enthroning him with the usual ceremonies in the Lateran palace, gave him the name of Eugenius III.⁴ But the Romans flying to arms, and declaring that they would not suffer him to be consecrated, until he resigned all temporal and contented himself with the spiritual dominion, he privately withdrew from Rome, in the night between the 1st and 2d of March, to a castle in that neighborhood called Monticelli, and from thence, the next day, to the famous Benedictine monastery of Farfa in Sabina, distant twenty-five miles from Rome. The cardinals followed him thither; and he was consecrated, in the church of that monastery, on the 4th of March, which in the present year, 1145, fell on a Sunday.⁵ He staid at Farfa only a few days after his consecration, but, not daring to return to Rome, he went to Viterbo, and continued there eight months.

During his stay at Viterbo, ambassadors arrived there, sent by the Christian princes in the East to acquaint him and the Western princes, especially Conrad, king of Germany, or, as he was now called, of the

Romans, and Lewis, king of France, with the taking of Edessa in Mesopotamia by the Turks, and implore their assistance. That city was betrayed to the enemy by one of the citizens; who, to be revenged on Sanguinus, prince of the place, for debauching his daughter, admitted the Turks into a tower adjoining to the walls where he lived. From thence they sallied out on Christmas night, 1144, while the inhabitants were all intent upon their devotions, opened the gates to the rest of the army, and thus by treachery became masters of one of the strongest and most opulent cities in the East, after they had, for several months, attempted in vain to reduce it by force. The inhabitants were all, men, women, and children, put to the sword, or carried into captivity.¹ Some writers, and among the rest Baronius, following Dodechinus, place the taking of Edessa at the year 1145. But with that writer Christmas day was the first day of the new year.

The pope, alarmed at the loss of Edessa, wrote, as soon as he heard of it, to Lewis the VIIth of France, pressing him to go in person to the assistance of the Christians in the East, and confirming to those who should attend him in that expedition, all the privileges that had been granted by his predecessors, especially by Urban II., to such as engaged in that holy war. This letter is dated from Vetralla, in the neighborhood of Viterbo, the first of December. Lewis had

¹ Gotfrid. Viterb. in Chron. p. 512.

² Mabill. Mus. Ital. tom. 2. ³ Idem ibid.

⁴ Anonym. Casin. Otto Frising. Chron. l. 7. c. 31.

⁵ Idem ibid. et Annal. Waverleiens. Collect. Oxiens. tom. 2.

¹ Dodechin. ad ann. 1145. Otto Frising. l. 7. c. 30. Williel. Tyrius, l. 16. n. 3.

The pope obliges the Romans to submit, and returns to Rome. Obligated to leave Rome anew, and fly to France;—[Year of Christ, 1146.] Holds a council at Treves. The pope arrives in France;—[Year of Christ, 1147.] Holds a council at Paris.

been already persuaded by St. Bernard to march in person to the relief of the Christians in the East, had declared this his intention to the lords of his kingdom in an assembly held this year at Bourges on Christmas day, and appointed them to meet again in Vezelay the following year on Easter day, when he was to take the cross, in order to set out for the Holy Land, as soon as he had settled, jointly with them, the affairs of the kingdom.¹ Some writers tell us, that the king undertook this expedition by way of penance, which he imposed upon himself for having set fire to the cathedral church of Vitriacum or Vitri, on which occasion thirteen hundred persons who had taken refuge in that church perished in the flames.²

In the mean time the pope, weary of his stay at Viterbo, resolved to bring the Romans, at all events, back to their duty, and in order to that, employ both his spiritual and temporal arms against them. He began with his spiritual, and thundered out with great solemnity the sentence of excommunication against Jordan, the patrician, and all who adhered to him. But the Romans paying no regard to his excommunications and anathemas, he entered into an alliance with the Tiburtines, their inveterate enemies, raised troops at Viterbo and in the few cities that had declared for him, and marching with them to Rome, reduced that city in a very short time to such straits that they were obliged to submit, and sue for peace; and a peace was concluded upon the following terms: 1. That they should abolish the patriciate. 2. That they should restore the governor of Rome, and the other magistrates to their former dignity and power. 3. That the senate should hold their places and authority of the pope alone. And, lastly, that the authors of the present troubles should be forgiven, and all who had been concerned in them.³ These terms being agreed to, Eugenius entered the city in a kind of triumph, and celebrated the festival of Christmas in the Lateran, attended by a great many bishops, by most of the Roman nobility, and the whole Roman clergy.

A perfect tranquillity now reigned in Rome. But it was short-lived. The Romans, highly provoked against the Tiburtines, pressed the pope to pull down the strong walls of that city; and upon his refusing to comply with so unjust a demand, they began to make such warlike prepara-

tions, and proceeded to such threats against him, as made him resolve to quit Rome anew, and seek an asylum in France, as many of his predecessors had done, against the fury of his enemies in Italy. He accordingly first retired from the Lateran palace, and from Rome to the Transtiberine city, and setting out from thence a few days after, he went first to Siena, then to Brescia, and from Brescia to Treves, where he held a council, at which were present many bishops, and among the rest the archbishop of Mentz, invited by the pope to examine the writings of Hildegardis, foundress of the monastery of Bingen, said to have been dictated to her by the Holy Ghost. The writings were carefully examined by the council, were approved by all who composed it, especially by St. Bernard, and she was allowed by the pope to publish whatever the Holy Ghost should reveal to her.¹ By the same council, Henry, abbot of Fulda, was deposed, being accused by his monks, and found guilty of mal-administration.²

The pope continued three months at Treves, and then entering Burgundy, visited the monastery of Cluny, confirmed to those monks all the privileges that had been granted to them by other popes, and repairing from thence to Dijon, was met there and received with the greatest marks of respect by the king on Mid-lent Sunday, and the following Monday consecrated, in his presence, the cathedral church of that city.³ From Dijon the king returned to Paris; but the pope went first to Auxerre, and from thence to Paris, to keep his Easter there with the king, which in 1147 fell on the 20th of April. Eugenius, during his stay at Paris, held a council, in which was at last determined the dispute that had subsisted ever since the year 1140, concerning the election of the archbishop of York. For Thurstan dying in that year, William, the son of Emma, sister to king Stephen, and treasurer of that church, was chosen by one part of the canons, and Murdach, a Cistercian monk, and abbot of Fountain abbey, by the other. They were both men of untainted characters, both worthy of and equal to that dignity. But William, having the majority on his side, took possession of the see. The opposite party, encouraged by St. Bernard, as Murdach was a monk of his order, applied to Rome, pretending that William had been nominated by the king before he was elected by the chapter. The pall was therefore refused to him, both by Innocent II. and his successor, Celestine II., though he had been consecrated by Henry, the king's brother, bishop of Winchester, and legate of the

¹ Odo de Diogilo de Prefectioe Ludovic VII. l. 1. Chron. Maurin. ad ann. 1146.

² Chron. Cister. in edit. apud Chifflet. in Prefat. ad libros Odon. de Diogil. et Robert de Monte.

³ Valerius supposes the whole city to have been burnt by the king, and to have taken from thence the name of "Vitri le Brulé;" but it was afterwards rebuilt by Francis I. upon the banks of the Marne, and called "Vitriacum," or "Victoriacum Francisci, Vitri le Francois."—(Vales. ch. not. Galliarum.)

⁴ Otto Frising. l. 7. c. 31, 34.

¹ Trithem. in Chron. Theodot in Vit. St. Hildegard. et Concil. tom. 10. p. 128.

² Annal. Trevir. apud Brouver. N. 700.

³ Chron. Divion. apud Labb. Biblioth. tom. 1, et ad ann. 1147.

William, archbishop of York, deposed. Gislebert, bishop of Poitiers, accused of heresy. Council of Reims; [Year of Christ, 1148.]

apostolic see in England.¹ This refusal was chiefly owing to the furious letters, quite unworthy of a saint, written by St. Bernard to both popes against the archbishop of York. His partiality for Murdach, who had been his disciple, inclined him to believe every false report that was spread abroad by William's enemies, and proclaim them to the world for undoubted truths. However Lucius II., better informed than his two predecessors, sent the pall to the archbishop by his legate, cardinal Hicmar. But as he, says the historian, taken up with affairs that were less necessary, according to his custom, neglected to go to London and receive it until Lucius died, and as the dispute about his election was in the mean time revived, the legate thought it advisable to carry the pall back to Rome.² However William kept his see, exercising all the functions of his office without the pall, till the present year 1147, when he was deposed by Eugenius in the council of Paris, (and not of Reims, as some have writ.) because he had been nominated by the king, as was asserted by St. Bernard, before he was elected by the clergy. This was done by the pope against the opinion of the greater part of the cardinals, who were present at the council; and the sentence of deposition was read by Alberic, bishop of Ostia. "We depose William, archbishop of York," were the words of the sentence, "and divest him of the pontifical dignity, because he was nominated by Stephen, king of England, before his canonical election." We shall see him in the sequel not only restored to his dignity, but honored with a place in the calendar. He was a prelate of a most unexceptionable character, but having a monk of the Cistercian order, and a disciple of St. Bernard, for his competitor, he had that saint for his enemy, and by him the pope was entirely governed. Baronius³ and Alford⁴ both own that Bernard was imposed upon, and take a great deal of pains to excuse him. William being thus deposed, the pope ordered a new election to be made, when two were again elected, namely, Murdach, and Hilary bishop of Chichester, and recourse being had upon this double election to the pope, who was gone from Paris to Auxerre, he confirmed that of Murdach, though Hilary had the majority on his side, and performed the ceremony of his consecration himself. William, upon his return to England, repaired to Winchester, and continued there with his friend Henry, bishop of the place, till the death of the pope.⁵

Thus did the pope take the advantage of the unhappy divisions that reigned at this time in England, to extend his authority, and regulate elections at his pleasure.

By the same council was begun the examination of the doctrine of Gislebert of Poirée. He was reckoned one of the most learned men of his time, had spent the best part of his life in teaching philosophy and divinity, which he did in different cities of France with great applause, and was in his old age preferred to the see of Poitiers. He had advanced in his writings, as well as by word of mouth, several propositions that gave offence, and among the rest the four following. 1. That the properties of the three divine persons are not the three divine persons themselves. 2. That the divine essence is not God. 3. That the divine nature was not incarnate, but only the person of the son. 4. That the divine persons can be the predicant of no proposition. Gislebert being charged with having advanced these propositions in a discourse he made to the clergy of his diocese, and with having held and taught them before his preferment, the pope summoned him to the present council, to give an account of his doctrine. He complied with the summons; but after a long, tedious, and unintelligible dispute between him and St. Bernard, concerning the essence, the nature, and the properties of the divinity, and the three divine persons, the pope, tired with their jargon, referred the decision of the points in dispute to a general council, which he intended to assemble the following year at Reims.¹

As great complaints were brought to the pope of the irregular lives led by the secular canons of St. Genevieve, he prevailed upon the king, before he left Paris, to introduce twelve monks of Cluny in their room, allowing the present canons to enjoy their prebends during their lifetime. But the pope afterwards, at the request of the canons themselves, granted their house and their lands, not to the monks, but the regular canons of St. Victor.²

The pope, leaving Paris, visited several cities in France, and repairing, on the 20th of March 1148, to Reims, opened, on the 22d of that month, the council which he had appointed to meet there. It was very numerous, most of the bishops of Spain, of France, and of Germany being present, as they had been all invited to it by the pope's circulatory letters, directed to all primates, metropolitans, and their suffragans. The king of England (Stephen,) greatly provoked at the conduct of the pope in the affair of the archbishop of York, would allow none of his bishops to attend

¹ Hoveden in Steph. ad ann. 1140. p. 485. Guillet. Neubrig. l. 3. c. 17. Hagustaldens. ad ann. 1143; et Serlo in Hist. Fontaens. Cœnob. Monastic. Anglican. p. 733, et 745. ² Hagustald. ad ann. 1146.

³ Baron. in Appendice ad ann. 1140.

⁴ Alford. ad ann. 1143.

⁵ Gervas. in Chron. Hagustald. 1148. Chron. Mailrosens. ad ann. 1147.

¹ Otto Frising. l. 1. c. 50.

² Eugen. ep. 27 et 32, inter Sugerianas.

Eon, a madman, brought before the council. Some of his disciples burnt alive. The doctrine of Gislebert condemned. The pope sets out on his return to Italy.

that assembly, and not only forbade Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury, to stir out of the kingdom, but ordered the ports to be guarded lest he should attempt it. However, the archbishop, fearing God, says Gervasius, more than the king, embarked undiscovered in a crazy boat, and got safe to France,¹ where he assisted at the council. But upon his return to England the king sent him quickly back to France. At the first meeting of the council one Eon was brought before them, a native of Brittany, who hearing these words read in the exorcism, "per eum, qui judicaturus est vivos et mortuos et seculum per ignem," and not distinguishing between Eon and eum, persuaded himself that he was the judge of the quick and the dead, and that he was owned for such by the church. So gross was the ignorance that prevailed at this time among the people, that he found himself followed, in a very short time, by multitudes; and out of them he chose his apostles, his disciples, his angels and archangels, his cherubims and seraphims. The French lords, in whose territories he preached, spared no pains to undeceive the misled people, and apprehend their mad leader. But in spite of all their endeavors the number of his followers increased daily, all ready to defend him at the expence of their lives.* He was, however, arrested in the end, with some of his chief disciples, by the archbishop of Reims, and brought to the council. Upon the pope's asking him who he was, he answered, without betraying the least fear, I am the judge of the quick and the dead, and on the last day shall judge the world by fire. He held with both his hands, when he was presented to the council, a huge forked club, and being interrogated by the pope whether it was mysterious, and what mystery it expressed? It represents, he replied, a very great mystery; for so long as I hold up the forked end, God possesses two parts of the world, and I no more than the third: but if I hold up the other end, two parts of the world will be mine, and the third alone will be left to God. His answer was received by the whole council with a loud laugh, and he declared a madman rather than a heretic. However, to prevent him from continuing to seduce the ignorant multitude, and to undeceive those whom he had already seduced, Suger, abbot of St. Denis, whom the king, who was gone to the holy land, had left regent of the kingdom, was ordered to keep him closely confined, which occasioned his death in a very short time. Some of his disciples recanted, while others chose rather to die in the flames than renounce their errors.² Neubrigensis tells us, that he was informed

by a person worthy of credit, who was present at their execution, that one of them, while they were carrying him to the stake, commanded the earth, with a loud and imperious voice, to open, and swallow up his wicked persecutors, as it had formerly swallowed up Dathan and Abiram.¹ The abbot regent would have acted a more humane and a more Christian part, had he treated them like madmen, and caused them to be confined with their teacher, as no less mad than he, and worthy of no greater punishment.

In this council was resumed the dispute between Gislebert and his accusers, concerning the four propositions mentioned above; Gislebert maintaining, and St. Bernard, his chief antagonist, impugning them with great subtilty and endless passages out of the fathers; till the cardinals, weary of the controversy, put an end to it, saying we have heard what has been offered on both sides, and shall therefore, upon mature deliberation, determine what is and what is not to be believed. As the cardinals seemed, by these words, to take upon themselves the deciding of the controversy, the Gallican bishops highly resented it, and having gained over St. Bernard to their party, they drew up and signed a confession of faith diametrically opposite to that of Gislebert, declaring that they would ever adhere to it without the least addition or alteration. This confession and declaration they sent by Hugh, bishop of Auxerre, and Milo, bishop of Terouane, to the abbot Suger, begging him to present it to the pope and the cardinals. The abbot, finding it signed by ten archbishops, by a great number of bishops and abbots, and, among the rest, by St. Bernard, readily complied with their request; and the pope, after perusing and examining it, jointly with the cardinals, approved all the articles it contained. He afterwards sent for Gislebert, and having made him retract his four propositions, he condemned them, and forbade his book to be read or copied till it was corrected by the Roman church.²

The council being ended, the pope left Reims, and having visited the two monasteries of Clairvaux and Cîteaux, set out on his return to Italy. On his journey he received letters from Roger, king of Sicily, acquainting him with the signal advantages he had gained over the emperor of the East. For having no enemy to contend with in Italy, and being greatly incensed against the emperor Manuel Comnenus, who had caused his ambassador at Constantinople to be arrested and imprisoned, he resolved to revenge that affront. Having, with that view,

¹ Gervas. ad ann. 1147, et Thomas Cantuar. epist. 136.

² Otto Frising. l. 1. c. 54, 55. Guillel. Neubrig. l. 1. c. 19.

¹ Guillel. Neubrig. t. 1. c. 19.

² Idem, c. 55. 57. Vit. St. Bernard. et Bernard. in Cantic. Serm. 80.

Victories of Roger, king of Sicily. The pope returns to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1149.] Is obliged to quit that city anew;—[Year of Christ, 1150.] Privileges granted by Eugenius to the archbishop of Cologne. Four metropolitans established in Ireland;—[Year of Christ, 1151.]

equipped a powerful fleet, he sent it against Corfu under the command of George of Antioch, his high admiral, who soon reduced both the city and the island of that name. From thence the fleet steered, by the king's order, to the coast of Greece; and before the end of the summer made themselves masters of Corinth, Thebes, Athens, and the whole country, except a few inland ports. They brought home with them all the silk manufacturers they found in Greece; and thus was the art of manufacturing silk first introduced into Sicily and Italy.¹ In the two preceding years, 1146, 1147, Roger had made war upon the infidels in Africa, had reduced the cities of Tunis and Tripoli, with all the other strong holds on that coast, and obliged them to submit to the payment of a yearly tribute, which they paid to him and his son William for the space of thirty years. We are told, that being elated with these successes, he caused the following verse to be engraved upon his sword:

Appulus et Calaber, Siculus mihi servit et Afer.²

The pope, pursuing his journey to Italy, arrived at Vercelli in the beginning of June, as appears from a letter he wrote from thence to the abbot Suger.³ From Vercelli he proceeded to the neighborhood of Rome, staid some time at Tusculum, and having subdued the Romans with the assistance of Roger, king of Sicily, he returned to Rome. Thus Ceccanus, a contemporary writer;⁴ and from his words it appears, that the Romans, persisting in their rebellion, would not receive the pope, and that he thereupon applied to the king of Sicily, and with the forces he sent him obliged them to submit. But he was forced to leave Rome again in the beginning of the following year, the Romans being stirred up against him by Arnold of Brescia then in Rome. At his instigation they seized on all the revenues, discharged the prefect and other magistrates whom the pope had appointed, and put others in their room, maintaining, that as the apostles had no lordships, no temporal dominions, their successors ought to have none. The pope therefore leaving Rome abruptly, retired to Campania, and continued there till the year 1152. He was visited soon after his flight from Rome by Peter, surnamed the Venerable, abbot of Cluny, come to complain of a lord of Burgundy, who had built a strong castle over against his monastery. The pope received the abbot with the greatest marks of esteem, and at his request commanded the count, upon pain of excommunication, to level the castle with the ground.⁵ Robertus de Monte writes, that the count,

Hugh, surnamed Discalceatus, or bare-footed, refused to obey the pope's command, and that an anathema being thereupon thundered out by the pope against the castle, it sunk, and a lake of an unfathomable depth sprung up in the place where it stood.¹ This story Baronius has copied, and relates it as a fact not to be doubted.² But from one of the abbot's letters, it appears that the count razed the castle by virtue of an agreement with the monastery, and sold to the abbot the ground upon which it stood.³

While Eugenius was at Segni, Arnold, archbishop of Cologne, came to sue for a confirmation of the privileges that had been granted to his see by the preceding popes. He met with a most kind reception, and obtained not only a confirmation of all the privileges enjoyed by his predecessors, but several new ones, namely, that thenceforth he should be subject to no primate, but to the pope alone; that in all councils and assemblies he should hold the first place after the pope or his legate; that he, and no other unless deputed by him, should crown the king within the limits of his province. All the other privileges he confirmed; and these were, that he should wear the pall at the usual times and functions; that he should have the cross carried before him; should ride upon a white horse caparisoned with a scarlet cloth; and that seven presbyters and as many deacons and subdeacons of the great church of St. Peter at Cologne should be styled cardinals, and be allowed to wear, in celebrating mass, the mitre, the dalmatic, and the sandals.⁴

The following year the pope sent John Paparo, or Papyrius, presbyter, cardinal, and legate of the apostolic see into Ireland, with four palls, for four bishops of that kingdom, namely, of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam. He landed at Tinmouth, and from thence wrote to David, king of Scotland, to acquaint him with his arrival, as well as with the business upon which he was sent, and beg leave to pass through his kingdom in his way to Ireland. The king upon the receipt of his letter, sent his chancellor to wait upon him at Hagustald, in Northumberland, and went in person, with his son Henry, to receive him at Carlisle, entertained him a very magnificent manner the short time he continued in his dominions, and at his departure, appointed some of the chief lords of his kingdom to attend him to the place of his embarkation. On his arrival in Ireland, he disposed of the palls as he had been directed, namely, to the four bishops mentioned above.⁵ And thus were four archbishoprics established this year in the

¹ Otto Frising. de Gest. Frederic. I. l. c. 33. Robert. de Monte, ad ann. 1145.

² Geograph. Nubiens. p. 88.

³ Inter Sugerianas, 32.

⁴ Ceccanus in Chron. ad ann. 1149.

⁵ Petrus Venerab. Epistolar. l. 6. ep. 46.

¹ Robert de Monte, ad ann. 1145.

² Baron. ad ann. 1150. ³ Petrus Venerab. ep. 45.

⁴ Eugen. ep. 10. tom. 10. Concil.

⁵ Joan. Hagustald. ad ann. 1150.

Scandalous behavior of Jordan, the pope's legate. Eugenius returns to Rome. Death of Conrad, and election of Frederic. Treaty of agreement between the pope and the new king.

kingdom of Ireland. The legate, during his stay in that country, introduced the ecclesiastic laws relating to marriage, till then unknown to that people.¹ The legate had come the year before into England, in his way to Ireland; but the king refusing him a safe conduct, unless he promised upon oath to attempt nothing to the prejudice of his kingdom, he was piqued at such a proposal, and returned to Rome, whence he was sent back this year with orders to pass through Scotland.² Upon this legate great encomiums are bestowed by St. Bernard, in a letter to the cardinal of Ostia. But in the same letter he exposes the scandalous conduct of Jordan de Ursini, sent at the same time to Conrad, king of Germany. "Your legate," says the saint, "has passed from one nation to another, leaving everywhere behind him the traces of the most shameful conduct. From the foot of the Alps and the Teutonic kingdom, the apostolic man has filled all the churches, not with the Gospel, but with his sacrileges. In Germany, in France, and in Normandy, as far as Rouen, he has plundered the churches, and preferred comely youths to the first dignities. Some have redeemed themselves, with large sums, from his visits. To those whom he could not visit he sent delegates to extort from them what they could. He has made himself the public talk in the schools, in the courts, and even in the streets. The seculars and the religious, the rich and the poor, the monks and the clergy, all speak ill of him. He is abhorred by all, and by none more than by those of his own profession. John Papero, on the contrary, is praised by all, and he has every where done honor to his ministry. Communicate this letter to the pope, and let him do what he thinks fit to be done with such a man. As for myself, I have discharged my conscience. However, I cannot help adding, with my usual freedom, that the pope would do well to discharge his conscience too by purging his court. I had resolved to be silent upon this subject, but the prior of Mont-dieu has encouraged and pressed me to write, and I must let you know that the public says more than I have done."³

The pope had continued in Campania ever since the beginning of the year 1150; had, with the assistance of the Normans of Capua, reduced several places, and among the rest the cities of Terracina and Albano. But in the latter end of the present year he was, by virtue of an agreement between him and the Romans, allowed to return to Rome.⁴ But what were the articles of that agreement history does not inform us. In

the mean time died Conrad, king of Germany, commonly stiled emperor, though the disturbances that prevailed in Rome as well as in Germany, prevented him from undertaking a journey to that city, and receiving the imperial crown. He had a son, named Frederic; but upon his death-bed he recommended to the princes of the empire his brother's son, called likewise Frederic, and surnamed *Ænobarbus*, or *Barbarossa*, from the color of his beard, as one in every respect equal to so great a trust. He was accordingly elected at Frankfort, on the 4th of March of the present year, and crowned on the 9th, which in 1152 fell on a Sunday. That the institution of the seven electors by Gregory V., in 996, is a mere invention, evidently appears, as we may observe here by the way, from Gualther, surnamed *Ligurinus*, a famous poet who lived at this time. For he tells us that all the chief lords of the kingdom met at Frankfort, and there chose Frederic. The election therefore was not, so late as the twelfth century, yet confined to seven, or to any fixed number.¹ Frederic was no sooner elected than he dispatched Hilinus, bishop elect of Treves, and Everhard, bishop of Bamberg, into Italy, to acquaint the pope, the Romans, and all the Italian princes with his election. But no legate from the pope assisted at this diet, nor had he any share either in the election or the coronation of the new king. He expressed great satisfaction at the choice the German princes had made, and, in order to establish a lasting peace between the church and the empire, desired that a congress might be held, and articles of agreement be drawn up and signed by both parties. To this proposal the king readily consented; and deputies were appointed both by him and the pope to assist at the intended Congress. By the pope were named five cardinals, and one abbot, namely, Bruno, abbot of Claravalla, a famous monastery of the Cistercian order at a small distance from Milan. The king sent five deputies, namely, the two bishops of Hamburg and Constance, and three counts. Where they met, whether in Italy or Germany, we know not, but the articles of their agreement, copied by Baronius from an ancient manuscript in the Vatican library, entitled *Centius Cameralis*, were as follows: 1. That the king should neither conclude a peace nor a truce with Roger, king of Sicily, nor with the Romans, without the consent and approbation of Eugenius or his successors. 2. That he should,

¹ The poet's words are as follow :

"Acturi sacra de successore corona
Convenienti proceres, totius viscera regni,
Sede satis nota, rapido quæ proxima mogo, &c."
(Ligurin. de rebus gestis Fred. I. l. 1.)

By these last words he means Frankfort on the Maine, where all the lords of the kingdom, and not seven only, met to choose a successor to the crown. To this day the electors meet there to elect an emperor.

¹ Joan. Hagustald. ad ann. 1150.

² Idem ibid, et Chron. Mailrosens. ad ann. 1151.

³ Bernard. ep. 290.

⁴ Anonym. Casin. ad ann. 1151. et Ceccan. ad ann. 1152.

Misunderstanding between the pope and the new king. Eugenius dies ;—[Year of Christ, 1153.] He canonized the emperor, Henry I.

to the utmost of his power, oblige the Romans to submit to the pope for the time being, and live in the same subjection to him as they had done to his predecessors, during the hundred years last past. 3. That he should preserve and maintain, against all men, the royalties of St. Peter, and the rights of the Holy Roman Church, and assist her, with the whole strength of his kingdom, to recover what she had lost. 4. That he should grant no territories on this side the sea to the Greek emperor, and should drive him from them without delay, if he happened to usurp any. The pope, on his side, engaged to grant to the king, the imperial crown, when it suited his affairs to come to Rome and receive it; to assist him, as far as in him lay, to maintain the imperial dignity; to restrain, with the censures of the church, those who should presume to disobey him, and even to cut them off from the communion of the church, if they did not submit, and give him due satisfaction; and, lastly, to grant no territories on this side the sea to the Greek emperor; and if he invaded any, to employ the arms of St. Peter against him.¹ These articles were signed by several bishops, abbots, marquisses, and counts, and are dated the 23d of March, 1152.

Thus a lasting peace seemed to be established between the church and the empire. But a few months after the conclusion of this treaty, a misunderstanding, that would, probably, have been attended with very bad consequences, had Eugenius lived, arose between him and the king, upon the following occasion: Frederic, archbishop of Magdeburg, dying, the electors, not able to agree among themselves in the choice of his successor, applied to the king, who, having attempted in vain to reconcile them, in order to put an end to the dispute, recommended a third person, namely, Guicman, bishop of Ceits, and prevailed upon one of the parties to elect him. Hereupon the opposite party had recourse to the pope, pretending that Guicman had not been canonically elected, but intruded by the authority of the prince, contrary to the canons forbidding princes to interfere in elections, and declaring such as have been procured, or influenced by them, to be null. On the other hand, the king maintained, that by the agreement between Paschal II. and the emperor Henry V., the prince was empowered, when the electors were divided, to fill the vacant see by his own authority, and that the elect, by what majority soever elected, was not to be ordained till he had received investiture at the prince's hand by the scepter.² That right the pope would not dispute; but neither would he allow it to be lawful for a prince to translate a bishop from one see to another; and therefore insisted upon their proceeding to a new elec-

tion, and sending Guicman back to his see. But as Frederic had already granted him the investiture, and his election had been confirmed by most of the German bishops and archbishops, he continued, in spite of the menaces of the pope, to keep possession of his see. The pope, therefore, not thinking it advisable to apply immediately to the king, wrote a very sharp letter to those bishops, reproaching them with countenancing a manifest breach of the canons, and commanding them not only to abandon the cause of the intruded bishop, but to divert the king from supporting him, since they could not but know that translations were strictly forbidden by the laws of God, as well as of the church, unless absolutely necessary for the service of God, or the good of the church.¹ The pope's letter is dated the 17th of August, 1152.

This quarrel would, in all likelihood, have ended in an open rupture between the pope and the king, as neither the bishops who interposed, nor the two legates sent by the pope the following year into Germany, could prevail upon Frederic to yield. But Eugenius died in the mean time, on the 8th of July, 1153, after a pontificate of eight years, four months, and ten days. He died at Tivoli, but his body was carried from thence, attended by the Roman clergy, and buried with great funeral pomp before the high altar in St. Peter's church. Eugenius is greatly commended by the contemporary writers, and said by many, who lived in Rome at the time of his death, to have wrought many miracles immediately after it, of which some of them pretend to have been eye-witnesses; nay, Henriques has published a small treatise upon the miracles of Eugenius, "De Miraculis Eugenii," which, he says, were all copied from a contemporary writer and an eye-witness. He has not, however, been honored with a place in the Roman calendar, though the Cistercians have thought him worthy of a place in theirs.

By this pope was canonized Henry, the first emperor of that name, who died 1024. The reasons alleged by the pope for ranking him amongst the saints, and allowing his anniversary to be yearly solemnized, are, that he founded the church of Bamberg, and many others; that he repaired some episcopal sees; was very generous to the poor; had been the chief means of the conversion of Stephen, king of Hungary, and his whole kingdom; had observed, what we read, he says, of very few, a perfect continence even in wedlock, and had wrought many miracles after his death. He adds, that though the church of Bamberg should have applied to a general council, to have the memory of their founder celebrated among the saints, he has thought himself sufficiently authorized by the holy Roman church, from which the

¹ Baron. ad ann. 1152.

² Otto Frising. de Gestis Fred. I. l. 206.

¹ Otto Frising. de Gestis Fred. I. c. 8.

Eugenius instituted the academical degrees. Presbyter John first heard of in the West. Deputies from the patriarch of Armenia. Eugenius a zealous promoter of the crusade.

acts of all councils receive their validity, to grant them their request, after advising with the archbishops and the bishops who were with him at the time. The pope here plainly owns, that the canonizing of saints properly belonged to a general council; but yet the succeeding popes, nay, the very next but one, pretended that to canonize, was the peculiar privilege of the apostolic see, and reserved it as such to himself and his successors, as we shall see in the sequel.

In the time of Eugenius III. was made by Gratian, a native of Chiusi in Tuscany, and monk of the monastery of St. Felix in Bologna, the famous Collection of Canons that form the canon laws. That collection was first published in 1151; and Eugenius ordered all causes to be tried, in the ecclesiastical courts, by the canons it contained. He likewise instituted, in order to encourage that study, the degrees of bachelor, of licentiate, and of doctor; degrees mentioned by no writer before Gratian's time. But they were soon after introduced at Paris by Peter Lombard, commonly known by the name of "the Master of Sentences," and bestowed upon students in divinity as well as in canon law.¹ Gratian collected all the ancient canons, and Lombard all the sentences of the ancient fathers, whence he was distinguished with the name I have mentioned. Both flourished at the same time, but were not brothers, as some have pretended, the one being a native of Chiusi in Tuscany, and the other of Novara in Lombardy. Peter Lombard, whom we may style the author of school divinity, was, after he had taught divinity for several years in Paris, preferred to that see; but he resigned it before his death, which happened in 1164, as appears from his epitaph, that is still to be seen in the church of St. Marcellus, in the suburbs of Paris, written partly in Roman, partly in Gothic letters, as was usual in those days.²

In the pontificate of Eugenius, the name of Presbyter John, or, as we call him, Prester John, was first heard of in the West. The bishop of Gabula, in Syria, sent to implore the assistance of the Christian princes upon the taking of Edessa by the Infidels, as has been related above, gave the following account of him to the pope, namely, that he was a presbyter or priest, a Christian, but a Nestorian; that his subjects all professed the same religion, and were of the same sect; that his kingdom lay beyond Persia and Armenia in the most distant parts of the East; that he had lately made war upon the Persians, Assyrians, and Medes; that he had gained a complete victory over their joint forces in a battle that lasted three days, and made himself master of Ecbatana. He added, that Presbyter John had intended to

lead his victorious army to the assistance of the church of Jerusalem; that he had even set out on his march with that design, and advanced as far as the banks of the Tigris, but not finding vessels to convey his army over that river, he pursued his march far to the north, where he was told that he might cross it in winter upon the ice; that he continued some years in those northern parts, but that the river never freezing, and many of his men dying in a climate to which they were not accustomed, he was obliged to drop his design, and return to his own kingdom. Such is the account the bishop of Gabula gave of the renowned Presbyter John, as related by Otto Frisingensis, who saw the bishop at Viterbo, where the pope received him.¹ Of this prince and priest, I shall have occasion to speak of in the sequel.

With the bishop of Gabula came deputies from the bishops and the patriarch of Armenia, who styled himself "the catholic," that is, the "universal patriarch," having, as he pretended, a thousand bishops and upwards under his jurisdiction. The deputies told the pope that they were sent to consult him concerning some rites, in which they differed from the Greeks, and were all ready to acquiesce in his judgment. But they concealed the more material points, in which they disagreed with the Latins as well as with the Greeks, and by thus imposing upon the pope were admitted to his communion. Being invited by the pope to assist at mass, celebrated by him with great solemnity on the day of the dedication of St. Peter's church, one of them, a bishop, afterwards declared, that he had observed a beam of light upon the pope's head, and two doves ascending and descending, during the whole time of the service, without being able to discover any place through which they could have entered. This vision was of a piece with the tale they told the pope of a nation bordering upon Armenia, where, they said, all the new-born children exhaled an insupportable stench, from which they were delivered as soon as washed with the water of baptism in Armenia, though all other remedies had proved ineffectual.²

Eugenius was a zealous promoter of the crusade—and by him, and St. Bernard, his chief agent and encourager of that unhappy war, to a degree of infatuation, the emperor Conrad, and Lewis VII., of France, were both persuaded to march in person, at the head of numerous armies, against the infidels in the East. They both set out in 1147, the emperor from Ratisbon, and the king from St. Denis, where he received the cross and the standard from the pope's own hand. Relying upon the encouragement given them by St. Bernard, whom they looked upon as divinely inspired, and upon

¹ Sigon. de ep. Bononiens. l. 2. et Bulæus Hist. Universitatis Paris. tom. 2. p. 699.

² Nicæus in Henric. Guniavensi.

¹ Otto Fris. l. 7. c. 33.

² Idem ibid.

Anastasius elected. Composes the difference between Frederic and the apostolic see;—[Year of Christ, 1134.] Restores William, archbishop of York, to his see.

their numerous armies, they promised themselves certain victory, and the utter extirpation of all the enemies to the Christian name. But it happened quite otherwise. For before the end of the year, the emperor lost no fewer than thirty thousand men, chiefly by sickness and famine; and the king's army fared not much better, many dying of the hardships they underwent, and many deserting to avoid them, insomuch that having spent two whole years in the Holy Land and done nothing in all that time, they returned home with the small remains of their two great armies. Thus Odo de Diogelo, who lived at this time, and wrote seven books upon the expedition of Lewis VII. to the Holy Land. And what we read in that writer is confirmed by Gaufridus, who flourished at the same time,¹ and by a letter from the king himself to the abbot Suger, whom he had left one of the regents of the kingdom, during his absence.²

In the year 1151, Eugenius granted a divorce to Lewis VII. from Eleonora, the daughter of William IX., duke of Aquitain,

upon his swearing that she was related to him within the forbidden degrees, though he had lived with her as his lawful wife, ever since the year 1137, and had two daughters by her. She was no sooner divorced from the king, than Henry, duke of Normandy, and afterwards king of England, married her, and had by her a very numerous, and no less illustrious, issue, namely, four sons, Henry, Richard, and John, afterwards kings of England, and Geoffry, count of Brittany, and as many daughters; of whom the eldest married the king of Castile, and from her was descended Blanche, queen of France, and mother to St. Lewis; the second was married to Alexius, emperor of Constantinople; the third to the duke of Saxony, by whom she had Otto, afterwards emperor; and the fourth to the count of Toulouse, whose grand-daughter by her was married to Alphonsus, count of Poitiers, and brother to St. Lewis.¹ Of this pope we have eighty-eight letters in the Collection of Councils, and some besides in other writers.

ANASTASIUS IV., THE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MANUEL COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East.*—FRED. ÆNOBARBUS, *King of Germany.*]

[Year of Christ, 1153.] Eugenius dying on the 8th of July, of the present year, Conrad, bishop of Sabina, by birth a Roman, and the son of one Benedict, was chosen the very next day in his room, and enthroned under the name of Anastasius IV. He was, so far as we can gather from the contemporary writers, a regular canon, and not a Benedictine monk, as is asserted by Trithemius, who flourished long after his time, and died in 1516.³

Anastasius was no sooner consecrated, than being a lover of peace, and desirous to prevent, so far as in him lay, any new quarrels between the church and the empire, he dispatched cardinal Gerard into Germany to terminate the cause depending between Frederic and the apostolic see, with respect to the translation of Guicman from Ceits to Bamberg. The cardinal was received by the king with all the respect that was due to his character, and they celebrated the festival of Christmas together at Bamberg. But Gerard taking upon him to act more imperiously, and talk in a higher strain than the king could bear, he drove him from his presence, and ordered him to quit Germany

that moment. The cardinal obeyed, but died of grief, as is supposed, in his way to Rome. The following year Frederic sent ambassadors to Rome, and with them Guicman himself, to inform the pope, by word of mouth, in what manner he had been elected, and to demand the pall. Anastasius admitted them immediately to his presence, and having heard them with great attention, he not only approved and confirmed the election of the new archbishop, but granted him very readily the pall. This complaisance in the pope gave great offence to many, says the historian, and they began to look upon him as a man of little or no resolution.² But what dreadful disturbances would have been avoided, had the pride and obstinacy of his successors allowed them to follow his example!

William, who had been elected archbishop of York, but deposed in the council of Paris by Eugenius, as has been related above, hearing of that pope's death, and at the same time of the death of his avowed enemy St. Bernard, hastened to Rome, though far advanced in years, to have his cause re-examined before the new pope, who, from the beginning, had stood his friend. Anasta-

¹ Gaufrid. Chron. apud Lubb. tom. 2.

² Inter Sugerianas Epist. ep. 39.

³ Trithem. in Chron. Hirsau.

¹ Nangius in Chron. ad ann. 1152.

² Otto Fris. in Fred. l. 2. c. 10.

Anastasius' bull in favor of the Hospitalers.

sus received him with all possible marks of friendship and esteem, and news being brought, soon after his arrival, of the death of Murdach, whom Eugenius had preferred to the see of York in his room, he was restored to that see, and received, at the same time, the pall, which he had never been able to obtain of Eugenius. On Easter-eve, 1154, he arrived, on his return from Rome, at Winchester, where he had lived ever since the time of his deposition with Henry bishop of that city, and going from thence to take anew possession of his see, was received with the greatest demonstrations of joy by all ranks of people. But their joy was quickly converted into grief by the death of their good bishop, happening soon after his return, that is, on the 8th of June of the present year.¹ He was a prelate of a most unexceptionable character, and all the contemporary writers speak of him as a man of a most exemplary life, of great sweetness of temper, and universal benevolence;² all but St. Bernard, who being strongly prejudiced against him in favor of Murdach, a monk of his own order, represented him to pope Eugenius, whom he entirely governed, as one quite unworthy of the episcopal dignity, and thus procured his deposition. The epithets that saint bestowed upon him in his letters to the pope and to others, especially in his three hundred and eightieth letter, are no proofs of an extraordinary sanctity. As St. Bernard was now dead, Anastasius, sensible of the injustice done by his predecessor to the archbishop, restored him to his see, and as he was said to have wrought some miracles after his death, Honorius III. by way of further reparation, solemnly canonized him in 1226, and his festival is kept to this day in the church of Rome on the 8th of June, the day of his death. Thus was one and the same person judged by one of the infallible popes unworthy of a place among the bishops, and by another worthy of a place amongst the saints in heaven!

In the same year Anastasius issued a bull at the request of Raymund de Podio, master of the knights of the hospital at Jerusalem, commonly known by the name of Hospitalers, confirming to them all the privileges that had been granted to them by his predecessors, and besides exempting their lands at Jerusalem and every where else from the payment of tithes, as those lands were bequeathed to them for the support of the pilgrims and the poor. By the same bull he forbids all bishops to publish interdicts, suspensions, or excommunications in any of the churches belonging to their order, allows them to have divine service performed in their churches with the doors shut, even in places that are under a general interdict; to receive priests and clerks to officiate in their churches, from what diocese soever they come, and to keep them even without the

consent of their respective bishops, as being subject to none so long as they continue with them, but to their chapter and the apostolic see; to have their churches and altars consecrated, their clerks ordained, and the sacraments administered by the bishop of the diocese, if he is willing to perform those functions without fee or reward; but if he requires the least acknowledgement, to employ, by the authority of the apostolic see, what other bishop they shall think fit: and lastly, he confirms to them all the lordships, lands, and territories they possess or ever shall acquire on either side of the sea, in Asia or in Europe, but forbids the knights, after they have taken the cross, and made their profession, to return to the world, or even to embrace any other religious institution, under color of leading a more regular life.¹ This bull is dated the 21st of October of the present year. The order of the hospitalers, now known by the name of the Knights of Malta, which island was given them by the emperor Charles V. had its first beginning on the following occasion. The Amalphant Normans, trading to the East, having with rich presents gained the caliph of Egypt, obtained leave of him to build a church and a monastery for the Latins near the church of the holy sepulchre, which was afterwards called St. Mary of the Latins. In this monastery they placed Latin monks, whose business it was to take care of the poor and sick pilgrims. But as the monastery was not large enough to contain all the pilgrims resorting to the holy places, the abbot built, out of the contributions and voluntary offerings of the faithful, a hospital with a chapel in honor of St. John Baptist. In process of time, when the Christians, in 1099, became masters of Jerusalem, one Gerard, who had long attended the sick and the poor in that hospital, bound himself by a solemn vow to continue in that state of life so long as he lived. His example was soon followed by many others; and they took a white cross which they wore on their breast, for the badge of their order. Such is the account Gulielmus Tyrius and Jacobus de Vitriaco give us of the institution of the religious order of the knights hospitalers,² founded in the latter end of the eleventh, or the beginning of the twelfth century. But those writers were both certainly mistaken in supposing their first chapel to have been dedicated to St. John, surnamed Eleemosynarius, or the almoner, bishop of Alexandria; it being manifest from several donations made to that hospital in the twelfth century, that St. John Baptist, and not the patriarch of Alexandria, was the patron of their order. For they are all said to have been made "to God, to St. John Baptist, and to the Hospital at the Holy Sepulchre."³

¹ Concil. tom. x.

² Tyrius l. 18. De Vitriac. in Hist. Hierosolym. c. 64.

³ Apud San-Marthanos in archiepis. Arclatens. et in Monast. Anglican. p. 509, 510.

¹ Neubrig. l. 2. c. 26.

² Idem ibid.

Anastasius dies. The election of Hadrian IV. His adventures before his promotion.

Anastasius died after a pontificate of one year, four months, and twenty-nine days,¹ and consequently on the 2d of December of the present year 1154, as he was elected on the 9th of July 1153. The continuator of Otto Frisingensis says no more of him than that he was well versed in the affairs of the court of Rome. His readily yielding to Frederic, in the affair of the church of Bamberg, shows him to have been desirous of a good understanding between the church and the empire. He was buried in the Lateran church in a tomb of porphyry of exquisite workmanship, in which had lain the body of St. Helena, mother to the emperor Con-

stantine. But the tomb, that stood in a church which Constantine had caused to be built without the walls of the city, being plundered by thieves, and the body carried off in the time of Innocent II., Anastasius ordered that monument to be brought into the city and placed in the Lateran church, in order to his being buried there, as he was a regular canon of that church.¹ The body of St. Helena is now worshipped in the church of the Franciscans at Rome called *Ara Cœli*; but how they came by it, or when, neither they nor any body else can tell.

HADRIAN IV., THE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MANUEL COMNENUS, *Emperor of the East*.—FRED. ÆNOBARBUS, *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 1154.] In the room of Anastasius was chosen the day after his death, that is, on the third of December, Nicholas Breakspear, an Englishman, born at St. Albans, the son of a clerk named Robert, and at the time of his election cardinal bishop of Albano. He was enthroned and crowned as soon as elected, and on that occasion he took the name of Hadrian IV. William of Newburg, who flourished at this time, gives us the following account of his adventures, and his rise from the lowest condition to the papal dignity. His father, embracing a monastic life in the monastery of St. Albans, left Nicholas, though yet very young, to shift for himself. Being thus abandoned and destitute of all support, he lived upon the broken victuals of the monastery, till his father, ashamed to see him daily in the crowd of common beggars, deprived him even of that support, and reproaching him in very sharp terms with his indolence, bid him betake himself to some profession, and earn his bread with the sweat of his brow. As he was now grown up, and ashamed to dig, or to beg from door to door, in his own country, he went to France to try his fortune there. He travelled from one city to another in that kingdom, but met with nothing that answered his expectation till he came to St. Rufus, a famous monastery of the regular canons, that stood then without the walls of Avignon in Provence. Being admitted into that monastery as a servitor, he soon gained the good will of all the canons by his modest and obliging behavior, and the great readiness he showed, on all occasions, to execute their commands: insomuch that they received him, a few

years after, into the order. As he was a man of quick parts, of great eloquence, and unwearied diligence, he applied himself to the study of the sacred sciences, and distinguishing himself above all the rest, was, in consideration of his extraordinary merit, unanimously chosen by the canons to succeed their abbot William, in 1137. The monastery stood in great need of a reformation, and the new abbot, a strict observer of the rule himself, by rigorously exacting the same strict observance of all the rest, disobligeed them as much as he had obliged them before. They entered into a combination against him, and inventing many calumnies to blacken his character, accused him to pope Eugenius III., which obliged him to undertake a journey to Rome. The pope, taken with his modesty and the moderation he showed in answering the various accusations brought against him, and at the same time fully convinced of his innocence, reconciled his accusers with him, and dismissed them. But the abbot still insisted upon the strict observance of the rules of the monastery, and new calumnies were therefore invented and brought to Rome against him. The pope heard his accusers, and when they had done, "I know," he said, "who raises this storm; it is Satan. Go and choose one with whom you can or rather will live in peace; he, of whom you thus complain, shall be no longer burthensome to you." Having thus dismissed the seditious canons, he kept their abbot with him, preferred him to the see of Albano, and made him cardinal. Thus William of Newburg;² and what he writes we likewise read

¹ Joan. Diac. junior in Lib. de Eccles. Lateranæ Raspon. de eadem Eccles. p. 77.

² Neubrig. t. 2. c. 6.

¹ Codex Vatican. Onuph. Sigon. &c.

Henry II. of England writes to the new pope;—[Year of Christ, 1155.] New disturbances raised in Rome by Arnold and the Arnoldists. Arnold banished, and peace restored. Frederic subdues the rebels in Lombardy, and marches to Rome.

in Matthew Paris, in his lives of the abbots of St. Albans.¹ In 1148 Breakspear, (Brekspere, or Breskpear, as he is called by some) now cardinal and bishop of Albano, was sent by Eugenius III. into Norway and Sweden with the character of legate. In Norway he erected the city of Nidrosia, now Drontheim, into an archiepiscopal see; and it was the first archbishopric established in Norway. In Sweden he raised the see of Upsal to the dignity of a metropolis, that city being then the metropolis of the kingdom, and appointed Henry, then bishop of Upsal, metropolitan and primate of all Finland.² Henry, the seventh bishop of Upsal, was afterwards martyred, and is honored by the church of Rome as a martyr on the 19th of January, the day of his martyrdom. Upon the death of Eugenius, Breakspear returned to Rome, and Anastasius, who succeeded him, dying after a short pontificate, he was preferred, with one consent, by the whole body of the people and the clergy to the vacant see.

The promotion of Hadrian was no sooner known in England, than Henry, the second of that name, who had succeeded Stephen in the latter end of the year 1154, wrote a very obliging letter to the new pope, congratulating him upon his promotion, and expressing great satisfaction to see one born in his dominions judged worthy of, and raised to so high a station. He suggests to his holiness, as being trusted with the care of all churches, to choose such ministers as are capable of assisting him in the discharge of his office, men of known integrity, free from avarice, and lovers of justice, without any regard to their nobility, wealth, or power; recommends to him the bestowing of ecclesiastical preferments only upon men of worth and merit, and exhorts him to exert his whole power and authority in assisting the Christians, engaged in war with the infidels in the East.³

As Hadrian had not yet engaged the protection of any one of the Christian princes, but was, as a stranger, utterly unknown to them all, the Romans, thereby encouraged to revolt anew, refused to acknowledge him for their lawful sovereign, nay, and sent some of the chief men of their party to let him know, that it was his province to administer the sacraments, to ordain priests and bishops, and exercise other spiritual and ecclesiastic functions; but as to the temporal power, it was lodged in the Roman senate, and they were determined to recover it at all events, to shake off the yoke which they had so long groaned under, and reinstate themselves in their ancient privileges and liberties, which had been so unjustly

invaded by his predecessors. They therefore advised him to part voluntarily with his ill-gotten power, lest they should be obliged to proceed to force and violence. But Hadrian, who was not a man to be easily intimidated, drove the deputies from his presence without deigning to return them an answer. Hereupon Arnold of Brescia, who had been obliged to quit the city in the pontificate of Eugenius, was recalled; and by his furious declamations against the power and the wealth of the clergy, and the unhalloved use they made of both, so stirred up and incensed the populace against them, that the pope, not thinking himself safe in Rome, retired to the Leonine city. During his stay there, Gerard, cardinal presbyter of St. Pudentiana, going to wait upon him, was attacked by the populace, and beaten till he was ready to expire. The pope, provoked beyond measure at the insult offered to him in one of his cardinals, put immediately the whole city under an interdict, which lasted till Holy Wednesday, that in 1155 fell on the 23d of March. As no divine service could be performed during that time, the clergy prevailed at last, with much ado, upon some of the leading men to submit; and their example was soon followed by the rest. But Hadrian would not take off the interdict, till the senators promised upon oath to banish Arnold, and all who adhered to him, from Rome and the Roman territories, if they did not return to their duty, and obey him as their sovereign.¹ Thus was Arnold driven again from Rome; and the churches being all opened the next day, Maundy-Thursday, the sacred functions were resumed to the great joy of the people, and a perfect tranquillity restored to the city.

In the meantime Frederic, having reduced several cities in Lombardy that refused to submit to him, and, among the rest, Milan, Asti, Tortona, and Coira, which three last he entirely destroyed, advanced to Pavia, the ancient seat of the Lombard kings, and was there, on the 10th of April of the present year, crowned king of Lombardy by Peter, bishop of that city.² Having thus subdued the rebellious Lombards, he set out from Pavia, as soon as the ceremony of the coronation was over, on his march to Rome, in order to receive there the imperial crown at the hands of the pope. As he advanced with uncommon expedition, and at the head of a numerous and victorious army, Hadrian, apprehending that he came rather as an enemy than as a friend, sent two cardinals, James of St. John and St. Paul, and Gerard of St. Pudentiana, now recovered of his wounds, both priests, and one cardinal deacon, Gregory of St. Mary in Porticu, to discover the king's true design, and treat with

¹ Matt. Paris. in Roberto Abbate.

² Joan. Magnus Hist. Goth. l. 18. c. 18.

³ Petrus Blesens. ep. 163.

¹ Codex Vatican. apud Bar. ad ann. 1145.

² Otto Fris. l. 1. c. 12—19. Ligurin. l. 3.

End of Arnold of Brescia. Interview between the pope and the king. How the pope was received by the king. Embassadors sent by the Romans to the king.

him of an agreement whereof he gave them the heads, or chief articles, in writing. They found the king encamped at St. Quirico in Tuscany, and being received and entertained by him in his tent with the greatest marks of honour, they acquainted him with their commission, and, in the first place, begged the king would cause Arnold of Brescia, who had been taken by Gerard, cardinal of St. Nicholas, but rescued by the vice-counts of Campania, to be delivered up to them. The king complied with their request, and Arnold being sent under a strong guard to Rome, and consigned to Peter, prefect or governor of the city, he was, by his order, publicly executed, and his body being burnt, the ashes were thrown into the Tiber, lest the superstitious multitude should worship them as relics.¹ Gunther, who was at this time with the king, describes the unhappy end of Arnold in the verses which the reader will find at the bottom of the page.²

As the king had sent Arnold and Anselm, the one archbishop of Cologne, the other of Ravenna, to treat with the pope before the arrival of the three cardinals mentioned above, he would not enter upon any negotiation with the Roman deputies till the return of his own. The same circumspection was used by the pope; for he, on his side, declined to treat with the envoys of the king till he had learnt of his own how he was disposed, and in the mean time retired, as he suspected his design, to the fortress of Civita Castellana, deemed, in those days, impregnable. But the deputies of the pope and the king happening to meet on the road, as they were returning to their respective courts, they agreed to go together to the king, then encamped at Viterbo. Frederic received the three cardinals with the same marks of honor as he had done before, and to leave no room for the suspicion that the pope seemed to entertain of him, he caused the relics of some saints, the cross, and the gospels to be brought into his tent, and appointed one to swear upon them in his name, and promise to preserve entire the life, the limbs, the liberty and the honor of pope Hadrian, and the cardinals. The three cardinals returning to the pope, acquainted him with what had passed, and he thereupon agreed to crown Frederic emperor, when his affairs allowed him to repair to Rome for that purpose, but in the mean time desired they might have an interview. The king, therefore, advancing with his army to Sutri, encamped there, and the pope, leaving Civita Castellana, came as far

as Nepi to meet him, whence he proceeded the next day to the king's camp, attended by a great number of cardinals and bishops. At his entering the camp he was received by all the chief princes of the empire and officers of the army, and by them conducted on horseback to the king's tent, where he dismounted. As the king did not, on that occasion, hold the stirrup, the cardinals, distrusting him, left the pope, and flying back to Civita Castellana, shut themselves up in that fortress. Hadrian, thus abandoned by the cardinals and the greater part of his retinue, was not a little disturbed. But dissembling his fear, he entered the tent and placed himself in the chair of state, that was there prepared for him. Being thus seated, the king, prostrating himself before him, kissed his foot, but when he rose up to receive the kiss of peace, the pope refused it, because he had not paid him the honor that was due to him, and had been paid to his predecessors by all the preceding emperors, out of the regard they had for the two princes of the apostles. The king, thinking it inconsistent with the royal dignity to serve the pope himself in the quality of equerry, maintained that he was under no obligation of performing that office. The next day was wholly spent in conferences relating to this point, the ancient records were searched; some men of rank, much advanced in years, who had attended the emperor Lotharius in the interview he had with pope Innocent in 1132, were examined, and it appearing from their testimony, as well as from the records, that it was customary for kings and emperors to hold the stirrup while his holiness mounted his horse, or dismounted, the king, loth to disoblige the pope at that juncture, acquiesced by the advice of the princes of the empire, and the next day complied with that custom, and attended his holiness in the sight of the whole army, for the distance of a stone-cast as his equerry, and he was then admitted to the kiss of peace.¹ Had they gone little more than a century farther back in searching the records, they would have found that the popes, instead of pretending to be thus served by the emperors, thought it their duty to serve and obey them as their liege lords and sovereigns. But the voluntary submissions of some princes were, in process of time, exacted by the popes of all as a duty.

In the mean time the Romans, hearing that the king was advancing with his army to Rome, in order to receive the imperial crown at the hands of the pope, sent a solemn embassy to offer him the empire in their name, pretending that they alone had a right to dispose of it. They met the king between Sutri and Rome, and being admitted

¹ Otto Fris. l. 2. c. 2. Ligurin. l. 3.

² Unde etiam tandem (neque enim reor esse silendum) Ne de funesto repetatur postea sermo, Judicio cleri, nostro sub principe victus, Appensusque cruci, flammaque cremante solutus In cineres, Tiberine, tuas est sparsus in undas, Ne stolidæ plebis quem fecerit improbus error, Martyris ossa nova cineresve foveret honore.

¹ Otto Fris. l. 1. c. 21; et Codex Vatican. apud Baron. ad ann. 1155.

The ambassadors' speech. The king's answer. Frederic crowned emperor.

to his presence, they extolled, in a pompous harangue, the valor of their ancestors, enlarged on the conquests they had made, magnified the wisdom and prudence with which they had governed the conquered world; and then deploring the miserable state they were, in the end, reduced to, that of slaves to priests and clerks, begged he would assist them in shaking off so galling a yoke. They added, that they had made him, though a stranger, a citizen of Rome; that they were sent by the senate and the Roman people to offer him the imperial crown, and to obtain of him, in return, a confirmation of all their ancient privileges, with a promise, upon oath, to restore the senate and the equestrian order to their former splendor and authority; that upon his engaging to defend them to the utmost of his power, against all their enemies, he should be acknowledged by them for their prince, and as such received in the capitol by their officers, paying to the said officers on that occasion, in compliance with the ancient custom, five thousand pounds weight of silver. They were going on, when the king interrupting them, "You have told us," he said, "great things of the valor and the wisdom of your ancestors; but in your harangues I discover no traces of that wisdom which you have so much extolled in them. They have, I own it, performed great feats with their valor. The Romans were, it must be allowed, men worthy of the high encomiums you have bestowed upon them; they *were*, I say, with the words of one of your own poets," (probably alluding to the words in Virgil, "fuius Troes"); "but Rome has experienced, as well as other cities, the sad vicissitudes of fortune. From your Rome, or rather from my Rome, the seat of the empire was translated into the East, and with your plenty the hungry Greek" ("Græculus escurens," Juvenal's words,) "was fed for many years. Your Rome was afterwards subdued by the Lombards, was taken from them by the Franks, and has been transmitted to us by the two glorious emperors, Charles and Otto. Rome, therefore, is mine, and not yours; and it belongs not to you, but to me, to dispose of it. It is true you have invited me to your city; but it was to defend you against your enemies, not being able to defend yourselves. You implored my protection, and I came to protect you. I am, by inheritance, the lawful owner and lord of your city, and you, in offering it to me, only offer me what is, independently of you, my own. You seem to confide in the Sicilian," (or the king of Sicily;) "but he shall, in due time, be made to pay dear for his temerity. As to the oaths you require, it does not at all become subjects to prescribe laws to, or exact oaths of, their sovereigns. I am your lord, and shall never deny you my protection when I

think it my duty to protect you, without binding myself to it by an oath. You say I must pay a certain sum of money to your officers, when you admit me as your prince into the capitol. Here again you forget that I am your lord and master. But I do not; and therefore will not be directed by you in the distribution of my favors; but shall bestow them upon whom I please, without consulting you." The king was provoked at the Romans pretending to be a free people, and to have the power lodged in their senate of bestowing a city which his ancestors had conquered, upon whom they pleased. And it is to be observed, that he speaks all along of Rome as belonging to him alone, of himself as the sovereign lord of that city, and of the Romans as his vassals, without ever taking the least notice of the power claimed by the popes over Rome and the Romans.

The Roman deputies being dismissed by the king, hastened back to Rome, promising to return with the answer of the senate and their fellow-citizens. But, as they were no more heard of, the pope advised the king to be upon his guard, not doubting but they would disturb and prevent, if by any means they could, the ceremony of the coronation. A body, therefore, of a thousand chosen horse were detached from the king's army that very night, with orders to seize on the Leonine city, and the church of St. Peter, where the ceremony was to be performed. This they effected under the conduct of cardinal Octavian, before day-break, without the least opposition. At day-break the pope and the king, marching at the head of the army in battle array, entered the Leonine city, and having placed strong guards at all the gates, they proceeded together to St. Peter's, where the ceremony of the coronation was performed without the least disturbance. "He received the imperial crown," says Otto Frisingensis, "in the fourth year of his reign, in the month of June, and on the 18th day of that month, amidst the loud acclamations of all who were present."¹ And Frederic himself, in a letter to that historian, says, "Mass being celebrated at the altar of the holy apostles Peter and Paul, in honor of the blessed Virgin Mary, because it was Saturday, he placed the imperial crown upon my head."² In the year 1155 the 18th of June fell on Saturday.³

The ceremony of the coronation being ended, the emperor returned with the pope to his camp. They were scarce gone when the Romans, provoked at the pope's dispo-

¹ Otto Frising. l. 1. c. 22. ² Apud Otton. l. 1.

³ Gunther, the Ligurine poet takes notice of the time coronation in the following lines:

"Hos Regi titulos, hos clari nomen honoris
Quartus ab ingressu regnorum contulit annus,
Plusque fere medio Juvenum se mensis agebat,
Ul quarto decimo prodiret Julius ortu.
Postea gemmiferam læta cervice coronam
Ipse ferens, incedit equo, &c."—(Ligurin. l. 4.)

The Romans fall upon the Germans, but are defeated. Takes and destroys the city of Spoleti.

The emperor leaves the pope in possession of Tivoli. Character of Roger, king of Sicily.

sing of the imperial crown without their consent, sallied from the castle of St. Angelo, of which they were masters, fell upon the Germans whom the emperor had left to keep possession of the Vatican, and overpowering them with numbers, drove them from thence, and pursued them to the camp. The Germans flew immediately to arms, and an engagement ensued that lasted several hours with great slaughter on both sides. But the Germans prevailed in the end, and the Romans quitting the field, saved themselves within the gates of the city. In their flight many of them were taken, and brought to the emperor; but the pope interposing in their behalf, they were forgiven and sent back unhurt. The emperor was soon after obliged, by the violent heat of the climate, to quit the neighborhood of Rome, and the pope, not caring to put himself into the power of the Romans, thought it advisable to continue with him. He therefore accompanied him into Sabina, and arriving on the eve of the festival of St. Peter, at the Lucanian bridge, the army halted there, and the festival was celebrated the next day by the pope and the emperor with the greatest solemnity.¹ During their short stay there deputies arrived from Tivoli, sent by their fellow-citizens to offer the keys of their city to the emperor, as their lawful lord and sovereign. Frederic accepted the keys, but the pope claiming the city of Tivoli as belonging to the Roman church, and urging the oath of allegiance they had taken to St. Peter and his successors in the apostolic see, he returned the keys by the advice of the princes who were with him, and bid the Tiburtines obey the pope as their lord and father, but with this clause, "Saving in all things the imperial right." The letter he wrote to the Tiburtines upon the return of their deputies has reached our times, and is as follows:—"Frederic, by the grace of God, emperor of the Romans, ever Augustus, to the citizens of Tivoli, greeting. We will have you to know, that out of our regard for the blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, we leave the city of Tivoli to our beloved and most reverend father, pope Hadrian, saving in all things the imperial right, 'salvo super omnia jure imperiali.' We, therefore, absolve you all and each of you from the allegiance you have lately sworn to us, and command you to assist, serve, and obey the venerable pope, saving in all things the imperial right."² Thus Frederic left the pope in possession of the city, but took care not to yield up the right he himself might have to it. As the Romans were his avowed enemies, he was unwilling, says the anonymous historian, to disoblige the pope, lest his holiness should stir up against him the prince of Capua, the duke of Apulia, and the king of Sicily.³

As in the emperor's army many, not able to bear the heat of the climate in Italy, fell daily sick, and many died, he resolved to march back to Germany. In his way he took the city of Spoleti by assault, in six hours time, though defended by a numerous garrison and near a hundred towers. That city, depending upon its situation, and the strength of its walls, had not only resumed its ancient liberty, but thrown into prison the messengers sent by the emperor to bring them back to their duty. Having, therefore, taken the place by storm, he gave it up to be plundered by his soldiers, who found an immense booty in it, and then levelled it with the ground. At Ancona he was met by two Greek princes, Palæologus and Maroducus, sent by the emperor Manuel Comnenus, to propose an alliance with him against William, who had succeeded his father Roger, in the kingdom of Sicily. The Greek ambassadors offered the emperor an immense sum of money, provided he returned with his army, and entering Apulia, made war upon their common enemy. But the sickness that reigned among his troops not allowing him to comply with their request, nor accept their offers, he dismissed them with many kind expressions, and pursued his march into Germany. Thus the emperor himself in a letter to Otto.¹

William, the only surviving son of Roger, was at this time king of Sicily. Roger died in Palermo, which city he had made the metropolis of his kingdom, on the last day of January 1154, in the fifty-eighth year of his age: a short life for the many noble actions he performed. For not satisfied with the two kingdoms of Sicily and Apulia or Italy, comprising all the provinces that compose the present kingdom of Naples, he added to his Sicilian and Italian dominions the islands of Malta and Corfu, the greater part of Greece, the cities of Tripoli, Tunis, and Hyppo, in Africa, and obliged the Saracen princes in those parts to pay him a yearly tribute. He was no less prudent in council than brave in the field; was a great admirer of all men of merit, of all who had any ways distinguished themselves, whether by the arts of peace or of war, by the sword or by learning, inviting them from the most distant countries to his court, and raising them to the first honors of his kingdom; was by no losses disheartened, by no successes elated; was never known to have departed from the laws of the strictest equity and justice in the government of his kingdom; and, in short, was for his military skill, his wisdom, and other eminent virtues, looked upon, even by his enemies, as the greatest prince of the age he lived in.² Thus the writers who lived in those times, or

¹ Codex Vatican. apud Bar. ad ann. 1155.

² Ibid.

³ Idem ibid.

¹ Ep. ante, lib. 1.

² Falcaud. Hist. de Siciliæ calamitatibus, et Peregrin. p. 260. ad Anonym. Cassin.

Roger is succeeded by his son William. Quarrels with the pope. Is excommunicated. War between him and the pope. The king reduced to great straits.

nearest to them. St. Bernard indeed, in some of his letters, speaks of Roger as a tyrant and usurper. But these names the saint bestowed upon him for no other reason but because he sided with Anacletus, and no longer than he continued to support him. For he no sooner acknowledged Innocent, than of the very worst of princes he became, in the opinion of Bernard, the very best, and was as such commended by him in some of his letters. Roger spent the two last years of his life in erecting a stately palace for his successors in the city of Palermo, and building several churches, which he richly endowed, one especially at Messina and another at Bari, both in honor of St. Nicholas, bishop of Mira. Roger had, by his many wives, a numerous issue; but, to his great grief, all but William died before him. He had appointed William duke of Naples and prince of Capua, but upon the death of his other children he took him, in 1152, for his partner in the kingdom, and caused him to be crowned with the usual ceremonies at Palermo. His father dying in 1154, he became sole master of his extensive dominions, but soon showed, says the historian, that he had inherited his power and not his virtues.¹ For he immediately discharged all his father's ministers, and either banishing or confining them, put his own favorites, men quite unexperienced, in their room; which greatly disobliged and estranged from him some of the most powerful families of his kingdom. He had been crowned in his father's lifetime, but, nevertheless, upon his death, he caused that ceremony to be performed anew in the presence of all the bishops and barons in his dominions, whom he summoned for that purpose at Palermo.

He was crowned by Hugh, archbishop of Palermo, on Easter-day 1154, and Hadrian being in the latter end of that year preferred to the apostolic see, William sent, in the beginning of the ensuing year, ambassadors to Rome, to congratulate his holiness upon his promotion, and at the same time to obtain a confirmation of the privileges granted by his predecessors to the deceased king. The ambassadors met with a very cold reception from the pope, nor could they prevail upon him to grant them their request, Hadrian pretending that the king ought not, as feudatory of the Roman church, to have taken the crown without the consent of the apostolic see. In the mean time the new king, crossing over into Apulia to settle his affairs there, landed at Salerno; and during his stay in that city arrived Henry, cardinal of St. Nereus and St. Achilleus, sent by Hadrian to complain of his having caused himself to be crowned, and assumed the title of king without first

applying to the apostolic see, and taking the usual oaths as vassal of the Roman church. The cardinal brought a letter with him from the pope to the king; but the king, finding himself only styled in that letter, lord of Sicily, returned it immediately to the cardinal, and ordered him to depart that moment his dominions. This Hadrian, the cardinals, and the whole Roman clergy highly resented, as if the king intended to withdraw himself from all subjection to the holy see. The sentence of excommunication was therefore thundered out, with great solemnity, against him; his subjects were absolved from their oath of allegiance, and he declared a rebel and an enemy to St. Peter and his church. On the other hand, the king, being obliged to return to Sicily, to quiet some disturbances there, appointed Asclepinus, archdeacon of Catania, high chancellor and governor of Apulia, with orders to raise an army, and lay siege to Benevento. The chancellor having, in compliance with his orders, drawn together what forces he could, advanced to Benevento, and, destroying all before him with fire and sword, laid close siege to the place. But despairing, on account of the vigorous resistance he met with from the inhabitants, of being able to reduce it with the troops he had then with him, he abandoned the enterprise, and marching into the territories of Rome took and burnt Ceppano, Bacucco, Frusinone, and Acre, and on his march back into Apulia levelled with the ground the walls of Aquino, Pontecorvo, and of several other castles belonging to the monks of Monte Cassino; nay, as those monks had declared for the pope, he obliged them to quit the monastery, leaving only twelve to take care of the church.¹

In the mean time a report of the king's death being spread abroad, the barons who had been banished by him or his father, all returned, and being encouraged by the pope, caused almost a general insurrection in the kingdom of Apulia. As the king was under the sentence of excommunication, his subjects, whom the pope had absolved from their allegiance, flocked daily in such crowds to the rebels, that the chancellor was obliged to quit the field, and leave them in possession of all the open country. Having now no enemy to contend with, they reduced most of the strong holds in Apulia, Calabria, and Abruzzo; insomuch that the cities of Naples, Salerno, and Amalfi, with a few castles, were the only places that still held out for the king. They took care to acquaint Hadrian with their unexpected success, and his holiness thereupon leaving Rome, hastened to Benevento, in order to be at hand to encourage the rebel army, and put himself at their head, should it be

¹ Falcand. Hist. de Sicilia calamitatibus, et Peregrin. p. 260. ad Anonym. Cassin.

¹ Anonym. Vatican. et Cassin. Ceecan. in Chron. ad ann. 1155.

William sues for peace, but in vain. The terms he offered. Gains a complete victory ;—[Year of Christ, 1156.]
Besieges the pope in Benevento, who is obliged to sue for peace.

thought necessary. While he was at Benevento, ambassadors arrived there from Constantinople with proposals of an alliance between his holiness and the emperor Manuel against their common enemy William, who styled himself king of Sicily. The proposals were, that their master should pay to the pope five thousand pounds weight of gold, and send a sufficient number of troops to drive William quite out of Italy, and that the pope, on his side, should cause three maritime cities in Apulia to be delivered up to those troops upon their landing. To these terms the pope readily agreed, being incensed beyond measure against William for ravaging the lands of the church; and he wrote at the same time to the emperor Frederic, inviting him to enter into that alliance.¹

The general revolt of the cities of Apulia, and the powerful confederacy that was negotiating between the pope and the two emperors, so terrified the king, that he resolved to conclude a peace with Hadrian upon any terms; and he sent accordingly ambassadors to Benevento, where the pope then was, with such conditions as he thought his holiness, however provoked, could not reject. For he promised to restore all the places he had taken, to cede the three cities of Padula, Mecerone, and Montefosco to the apostolic see, to be held for ever by Hadrian and his successors, to oblige the rebellious Romans to acknowledge and obey him; and, lastly, to pay to the apostolic see, by way of reparation for the losses it had sustained in the present war, the same sum of money that had been offered by the Greek emperor. The king required no more than that the pope would absolve him from the excommunication, and grant him the investiture of the kingdoms of Sicily and Apulia, upon his swearing allegiance to him and his successors in the apostolic see. These were more advantageous terms than the pope had reason to expect; and he was for accepting them without the least alteration. But he was opposed by the greater part of the cardinals, who would hearken to no terms, and, at their instigation, a resolution was taken to carry on the war with the utmost vigor till William was driven quite out of Italy.² Baronius is of opinion that those cardinals were all partizans of the emperor Frederic, and were, as such, for crushing the king of Sicily, lest the pope should find in that prince a protector in case of a rupture between him and the emperor.³ However that be, had the kingdom of Apulia been recovered from the Normans, a bloody war would have thereupon unavoidably ensued in Italy between the two emperors, those provinces being claimed by both as part of their respective empires. Besides, it was

not the interest of the pope to have either for a neighbor.

The king finding, to his great surprise, that his terms were rejected, resolved to die in the field rather than to part with so many rich provinces, which his ancestors had acquired at the expense of their blood. Having therefore raised, with incredible expedition, a powerful army in Sicily, he embarked at Messina, and landing without opposition at Salerno, marched straight to Brundisium, now Brindisi, where the troops sent by the Greek emperor were encamped, and putting himself at the head of the veterans that had served under his father, attacked the Greeks with such fury, that, not able to stand the shock, they fled at the first onset. The king then laid close siege to Brundisium, whither many of the Greek officers had fled with some of the rebellious barons; and, having soon made himself master of the place, put all the Greeks in irons, and either deprived the barons of their sight, or caused their heads to be struck off. The king got on this occasion an immense booty, all the money the Greeks had brought with them for the pope, and to defray the expenses of the war. From Brundisium the king led his victorious army against the city of Bari, that had revolted and rased the magnificent castle which his father had built there. As he approached the city, the inhabitants went out unarmed to meet him, and sue for mercy. He spared their lives, and would not suffer the city to be plundered. But, observing the ruins of the castle, "I shall not," he said, "spare your houses, as you have not spared mine." He then ordered them to depart with their effects in two days time. They implored the king's mercy with floods of tears; but he was inflexible, and setting, at the end of two days, his whole army to work, the famous city of Bari was in a short time reduced to a heap of rubbish; its strong walls, that had stood so many sieges, its stately palaces, and even its magnificent churches being levelled with the ground. The fate of Bari struck such terror into the other cities, that they all returned, of their own accord, to their duty.¹

In the mean time Hadrian kept himself shut up, with several of the rebel barons, in the city of Benevento, not daring to venture out, lest he should fall into the hands of some of the king's parties, that made frequent incursions to the very gates of that city. At last the king appeared, with his whole army, before the place, and investing it on all sides, began to batter the walls night and day with such violence, that the pope, sensible they could not hold out much longer, and despairing of relief, thought it advisable to capitulate. He therefore sent three cardinal priests to the king's camp to

¹ Anonym. Vatican.

² Idem an. ann. 1155. Guill. Tyr. l. 18. c. 2.

³ Bar. ad ann. 1155.

¹ Guillelm. Tyr. l. 18. c. 8. Anonym. Vatican. et Cassin.

Terms upon which the peace was granted. Complaints against the hospitalers.

sue for peace, namely, Hubald of St. Praxedes, Julius of St. Marcellus, and Roland of St. Mark, chancellor of the Roman church. The king received them with the greatest marks of respect, and declaring himself ready and desirous to live in peace with the apostolic see, he appointed five persons to settle the articles jointly with them, namely, Majo, his high admiral, or, as he was styled, Magnus Admiratus Admiratorum, Hugh archbishop of Palermo, Romuald archbishop of Salerno, William bishop of Calano, and Marinus abbot of Cava. After several conferences the following conditions were agreed on: That the pope should absolve the king from the excommunication; that he should grant him investiture by delivering to him three standards, one for the kingdom of Sicily, another for the kingdom of Apulia, and the third for the principality of Capua; that he should acknowledge him for lawful lord of the dukedom of Naples, of the principality of Salerno, (which the popes had hitherto claimed as belonging to their see,) of the March of Ancona, and of all the cities, lands, and territories, which he was possessed of at that time. On the other hand the king was to forbear all further hostilities, to swear allegiance, as his predecessors had all done, to the apostolic see, and to pay yearly, as feudatory of the Roman church, six hundred schifati for Apulia and Calabria, and five hundred for the March. To these some other articles were added, that gave great offence to the cardinals who were not shut up with the pope in Benevento, that is, who were out of all danger. These articles were, that from the kingdom of Sicily no appeal should be made to Rome without the king's leave; that no apostolic legate should be sent, without his leave, into that kingdom; and that in elections the clergy should be free to elect whom they pleased, but should notify the election, before it was made public, to the king, who should confirm it, if the elect was not in confederacy with his enemies, nor thought by him, on other accounts, unworthy of the station to which they had preferred him. By this article the king became absolute master of all elections; and I do not find that either the pope, or any of the cardinals who were with him, objected to any of these articles, however derogatory to the pretended rights of the apostolic see. The conditions upon which peace was to be restored between the pope and the king, being thus settled, Hadrian confirmed them by a bull, dated at Benevento in the month of June 1156, and in that bull he bestows great commendations upon the king, and declares over and over that it has not been extorted from him by fear or by force, but was issued while he was quite free and safe in the city of Benevento. This the king probably insisted upon, lest the concessions should be

afterwards declared void and null, as not being voluntary; for so it had happened in the dispute between Paschal II. and the emperor Henry V. The terms being thus agreed upon, the king coming to the church of St. Marcan, without the walls of Benevento, was there received by the pope, and prostrating himself before him was first absolved from the excommunication, and then solemnly invested with three standards in the kingdoms of Sicily and Apulia and the principality of Capua.¹ With the pope were many of the rebel barons, who, at his instigation, had taken up arms against their lawful sovereign. But his holiness was too anxious about his own safety to insist upon any terms for them, and he left them to the mercy of the king, who either put to death such of them as fell into his hands, or deprived them of their sight. Among the latter was Robert, the brave prince of Capua, who had been unjustly driven from his dominions by king Roger, and had recovered them on occasion of the present disturbances. He had the good luck to make his escape out of Benevento undiscovered, but was apprehended by one of his own vassals as he was crossing the Garigliano to get into the territories of the church, and delivered up to the king, who, having caused his eyes to be put out, confined him to a prison in Palermo, where he soon died.²

During these disturbances in Apulia landed at Hydruntum (now Otranto) in Calabria, Fulcher, patriarch of Jerusalem, with six other bishops, come to remonstrate against the privileges granted to the knights hospitalers by the late pope, and in particular against their being exempted from paying tithes. As they were going to Rome, which city the pope had not yet left when they landed, the king of Sicily would not grant them a safe-conduct; so that they were obliged to re-embark, and pursue their voyage by sea to Ancona. There they landed, and travelling to Rome found that the pope had set out a few days before for Benevento. They followed him, and overtaking him at Ferentino, acquainted him with the motives of their long journey, which the patriarch told him he had undertaken, though near a hundred years old. They charged the hospitalers with abusing, in a strange manner, the privileges granted them by the apostolic see; with openly insulting the bishops, and the patriarch himself, as having no power over them; with engrossing to themselves all the benefactions and offerings of the faithful, &c. They therefore entreated his holiness to revoke or at least curtail the many unprecedented immunities and exemptions, which they had surreptitiously obtained of his predecessor. The affair was disputed,

¹ Guill. Tyr. l. 18. c. 8. et apud Baron. ad ann. 1156, in actis Hadrian.

² Falcand. et Anonym. Cassin. ad ann. 1156.

Beginning of the quarrel between the pope and the emperor;—[Year of Christ, 1157.] The pope's letter to the emperor, gives great offence to the German princes.

for several days, in the presence of the pope, but left undetermined, Hadrian having been gained over, says the historian, with rich presents, to the party of the hospitalers, as well as all the cardinals but two, namely, Octavian of St. Cecilia, and John of St. Martin. "Of all the cardinals these two alone preferred justice to money: the rest, all sons of Bosor, followed Balaam." Thus William archbishop of Tyre.¹ But that writer was, perhaps, not a little prejudiced in favor of the patriarch against the hospitalers. For Petrus Blesensis, who lived at this time, speaking of cardinal Octavian on occasion of his assuming the pontifical dignity in opposition to Alexander III. in 1159, says, that he had spent his whole life in heaping up wealth to disturb the peace of the church.² It is to be observed, that the archbishop of Tyre, jealous of the privileges enjoyed by the hospitalers, betrays throughout his history no small prejudice against them, and all who favored them.

The peace concluded by the pope with the king of Sicily was highly displeasing to the emperor; and he no sooner heard of it, than, provoked at his entering unknown to him into a treaty with an avowed enemy of the empire, he forbid all archbishops, bishops, and other ecclesiastics in his dominions to accept of the pope any dignity or benefice, or to go to Rome upon any pretence whatsoever. In the mean time the see of Verdun becoming vacant, Albertus de Mercy, the bishop elect, applied, pursuant to that injunction, to the emperor for investiture, and received it at his hands, without so much as acquainting the pope with his election. This Hadrian as highly resented as Frederic had done his making peace with the king of Sicily. The pope was at the same time displeased with Frederic on another account. Eskilus, archbishop of Lunden in Sweden, had been taken, as he returned from Rome, by robbers in the territories of the empire, had been stript of all he had, and was by them still kept in captivity. As the emperor had taken no notice of so notorious a breach of the law of nations, had caused no search to be made after the criminals in order to bring them to condign punishment, and deliver the archbishop out of their hands, Hadrian sent the two cardinals, Roland of St. Mark, chancellor of the holy Roman church, and Bernard of St. Clement, to complain to him, in his name, of the remissness with which he had acted on that occasion, and to get the archbishop immediately set at liberty, and all his effects restored to him. The two cardinals being admitted to the emperor's presence, and by him very graciously received, addressed him with the following words: "Our blessed

father pope Hadrian and the whole college of cardinals of the holy Roman church, salute you, he as your father, and they as your brethren." They then delivered a letter with this address, "Hadrian bishop, servant of the servants of God, to Frederic illustrious emperor of the Romans, health and apostolic benediction." To some expressions in this fatal letter was owing the rupture that ensued between the church and the empire, and the endless mischiefs that arose from thence to both. For in that letter the pope taxed the emperor, in very sharp terms, with conniving at the sacrilege, as he called it, committed in his dominions; with granting impunity to the criminals, and, in a manner, countenancing so atrocious a crime, instead of employing, as he ought to have done, the sword that was put into his hand for the punishment of evil-doers. "And in what," added Hadrian in his letter, "have we ever disoblged you? We are not conscious to ourselves of having done any thing whatever that could give you the least offence. We have ever loved you, with the greatest tenderness, as our son and a most Christian prince. You cannot have forgot with what joy your mother the holy Roman church received you; with what kindness and affection she entertained you, and how willingly she conferred upon you the imperial crown, and with it the plenitude of all power and honor. We do not repent our having complied in all things with your desire; nay, we should rejoice, had we conferred greater benefits upon you, considering the many advantages that would accrue from thence, both to us and the church. As you seem therefore to overlook so heinous a crime, to the reproach of the church universal as well as of your empire, we apprehend some evil-minded persons have made it their business to sow the seeds of dissension between us."¹

This letter being read aloud, and faithfully interpreted by Rainald, chancellor of the empire, for the sake of those who understood not the Latin, the German princes, who attended the emperor, were all greatly shocked at the harsh terms and the acrimony which they thought they discovered in it, but much more at the pope's saying, that "the holy Roman church had conferred the imperial crown upon the emperor with the plenitude of all power and honor, and that he should rejoice had he conferred greater benefits upon him." They understood these words as if the pope pretended the imperial crown to be his gift, and the empire to be a fief of the church. They took that to be the pope's meaning, says the historian, because they knew it was rashly asserted by some Romans, that the city of Rome and the kingdom of Italy were held by the German

¹ Guill. Tyr. l. 18. c. 3, et c. 8.

² Petrus Blesens. ep. 45.

¹ Roderic in Frederic. l. 1. c. 8.

The emperor complains of the pope in a letter to the German princes and bishops. The pope writes to the German bishops.

princes as a gift of the popes, and they had taken care to transmit that notion to posterity, not only in their writings, but in pictures, representing the emperor Lotharius receiving the imperial crown, on his knees, with an inscription importing it to be a gift of the pope.¹ The German lords therefore, understanding the words of the pope's letter in the sense I have mentioned, were all filled with the utmost indignation, and one of the pope's legates, instead of softening those expressions and striving to appease the emperor and the princes, added fuel to the fire, addressing the princes, in the height of their resentment, with the following words: "Of whom then does your emperor hold the empire, if he holds it not of our lord the pope?" Words that so provoked Otto, count Palatine of Bavaria, that drawing his sword he would have made the legate pay dear for his presumption, had not the emperor, who kept his temper, interposed and saved him. However, he sent immediately both the legates back to their lodgings, attended by some of his guards to screen them from any further insults, and ordered them to depart next morning and return to Rome without turning any where to the right or the left, or calling upon any bishop or abbot in their way.²

The legates being thus dismissed, the emperor wrote a circulatory letter to all the princes and bishops of the empire, to acquaint them with what had passed at this conference or interview with the pope's legates. "As the Almighty," said he in his letter, "from whom all power is derived in heaven and in earth, has committed to us, his anointed, the government of the empire, and commanded us to maintain with our arms the peace of the church, it is with great grief we are forced to complain to you, that the disagreement between the church and the empire, with which we are at present threatened, is to be charged upon the head of the church, and that from thence flows the venom that is likely to infect the whole body." He then informs them of the contents of the pope's letter; of the arrogance of the legates, whom he styles "iniquitous priests;" of the danger to which one of them exposed himself by his unheard of insolence, of being killed upon the spot, and his being delivered by him from present death. The emperor assures the princes and bishops of the empire, that several letters were found upon the legates sealed and signed, but all mere blanks, to be filled up by them as they thought fit, and made use of to plunder with impunity, according to their custom, the churches of Germany, to strip the altars, to carry off the sacred vessels, and flay the crosses, "cruces excoriare," that is, to pull off the gold and silver that covered them:

and it was to prevent this sacrilegious practice, says the emperor, and to leave them no opportunity of poisoning the minds of his loyal subjects, that he had commanded them to return to Rome the way they came, without ever turning out of the high road. He closes his letter with these words: "As by the election of the princes we hold the kingdom and the empire of God alone, as St. Peter commands all to "fear God and honor the king," whoever shall say, that we have received the imperial crown of the pope *pro beneficio*, as a benefit or gift, he impugns the Divine institution, contradicts St. Peter, and is a liar."¹

In the mean time the two legates having acquainted the pope, on their return to Rome, with the treatment they had met with from the emperor and the German princes, the cardinals and the whole body of the Roman clergy were divided into two opposite parties. Some declaring for the emperor, laid the whole blame upon the legates; while others excusing them, encouraged the pope to resent, as he ought, the affront offered to his legates, and in them to him. But Hadrian not thinking it, on the one hand, advisable to break with the emperor, whom he found determined to maintain the rights of his crown; and, on the other, unwilling to condemn his legates, only guilty of indiscretion in the transport of their zeal, resolved to try whether he could, by some means or other, pacify the emperor, and thus divert the impending storm. To obtain that desirable end he bethought himself of writing to the German bishops, who were then with the emperor, and engage them to interpose their good offices with their sovereign in behalf of the apostolic see. He wrote accordingly to these prelates, giving them, in the first place, an account of the reception his legates, two of the most respectable cardinals of the Roman church, had met with from his beloved son the emperor. He tells them, that the legates were received the first day with all the respect that was due to their character, but that the next day, when the letters they had brought were read, his highness, exasperated beyond measure by some expressions they contained, threw out, in his wrath, such reproaches upon him and his legates, as he was ashamed to repeat, drove them with ignominy from his presence, and ordered them forthwith to depart his dominions; nay, and issued upon their departure an edict, as he was informed, forbidding any in his dominions going to Rome, and had even placed guards upon the frontiers, with orders to stop those who should, upon any pretence whatsoever, undertake that journey. He therefore exhorts, and earnestly entreats, the bishops to exert their zeal in a cause

¹ See p. 475.

² Radevic. in Frederic. l. 1. c. 8.

¹ Radevic. in Frederic. l. 1. c. 8.

The German bishops answer the pope's letter. The pope sends legates with another letter to the emperor;—
[Year of Christ, 1158.]

that concerned them as much as him, to divert his beloved son Frederic from hearkening to the counsels of those who delighted in nothing so much as in strife and contention, to demand satisfaction, in his name, for the blasphemies that Reinald, chancellor of the empire, and Otto, count Palatine of Bavaria, had vomited out against his legates, and their common mother the holy Roman church, and to let them all know that the Roman church is founded upon a rock, that, in defiance of all the storms that may be raised against her, will remain unshaken to the end of the world.¹

To this letter the bishops returned a no less strong than respectful answer: "We know," said they, "that the Church of God is founded upon a solid Rock, and that no storms will ever shake it. But our courage, we own, fails us when such storms arise as that which we are at present threatened with. We are not a little disturbed at what has lately passed between your holiness and your most religious son, our lord and emperor; and, if Providence does not interpose, it may be the source of endless evils. The whole empire was shocked at the expressions contained in your letter. The emperor could not hear them with patience, nor could the princes of the empire. As for us, we dare not, nor can we defend them, as they contain things never before heard of. However, we have received your letter with due respect, and, pursuant to your command, admonished our lord the emperor, who returned us the following answer, an answer worthy of a truly catholic prince.

"Two things are to be religiously observed in the government of our empire, the holy laws of the emperors, and the good customs of our predecessors and forefathers. We will keep within these bounds; we will yield all due respect to the pope, but our crown we hold of God alone. The archbishop of Mentz votes the first in the election, and after him the other princes every one according to his rank. We receive the royal unction from the archbishop of Cologne, and the imperial from the pope. Every thing else is superfluous, and proceeds from evil, or from the evil one, *ex abundantia est, a malo est*. We have not, out of contempt for our most beloved and most reverend father, obliged the cardinals to depart our territories, but have not suffered them to proceed to other parts of our dominions with the scandalous papers found in their custody. We have not, by edict, stopped such as go to, or come from Italy; nor will we stop any going to Rome in pilgrimage, or for their necessary affairs, with the testimony and permission of their bishops. We only intend to obviate the encroachments, that the churches of our kingdom all groan under, and the entire decay

of monastic discipline is owing to. God exalted the church by means of the empire, and the church wants to destroy the empire; which we believe comes not from God. They began with a picture; (the picture of Lotharius, spoken of above;) from the picture they proceeded to writings, and the writings are quoted as a sufficient authority. But such things we will not suffer; we will forfeit our crown rather than suffer it to be thus vilified and debased. Let the picture therefore be effaced; let the writings be retracted, lest they should afford matter of eternal discord between the empire and the priesthood."

"All this," add the bishops, "we have heard from the emperor himself, and many things besides concerning the peace you have made with the king of Sicily, and other treaties, which we dare not enlarge upon. As for the satisfaction," continue the bishops, "which you require of the chancellor and the count palatine of Bavaria, the latter is gone into Italy to make the necessary preparations there for the emperor's Italian expedition, and the chancellor never said any thing but what tended to maintain peace and concord; nay, he screened your legates from the fury of the populace, as all who were present have attested, and thus saved their lives." The bishops, in the close of their letter, beg and conjure his holiness to write anew to the emperor, and by all means to soften the expressions that had so offended him in his former letter, that the church might enjoy a lasting peace and tranquillity, and the empire, at the same time, retain its ancient dignity.¹

As Frederic was then upon the point of marching with a powerful army into Italy, the pope readily embraced the advice of the German bishops, and in compliance with it wrote another letter in a very different style from that of the former, and sent it by Henry and Hyacinth, the one cardinal priest, and the other cardinal deacon, both men of great prudence and discretion, and by long experience thoroughly acquainted with matters of that nature. The two legates went first to Ferrara, being informed that the envoys, sent by the emperor to the states of Lombardy, were in that city. But finding they were gone from thence to Modena, they followed them thither, and upon their acquainting them with their commission, which, they said, was to negotiate a peace, were allowed to pursue their journey. From Trent they took along with them Albert, bishop of the place, a man universally respected, as a safeguard, apprehending that as the pope and the emperor were at variance, they might, under that pretence, be plundered and otherwise ill used by robbers, as they passed the mountains. But the bishop was no protection. For two powerful

¹ Radevic. in Frederic. l. 1. c. 8.

¹ Radevic. l. 1. c. 16.

The pope's legates are robbed and taken, but rescued. Hadrian retracts in his second letter what he had writ in his first, and appeases the emperor. They quarrel anew. Occasion of their quarrel.

counts in those parts, Frederic and Henry, falling upon the legates among the mountains, stript them of all they had, put them and the bishop too in irons, and kept them thus confined till the brother of cardinal Hyacinth, a nobleman of Rome, came and delivered himself up to them, as a hostage for the payment of the ransom they required for the legates. As for the bishop, he was miraculously delivered out of their hands, says the historian, but has not thought fit to let us know in what manner. The two counts were soon made to pay dear for this robbery: for Henry, duke of Saxony and Bavaria, thinking it reflected disgrace upon the empire to let such an open violation of the law of nations pass unpunished, entered the territories of the counts, destroying all before him with fire and sword, rescued the hostage, and obliged them to restore all they had taken, and give the legates full satisfaction for the ill usage they had met with.¹

The legates pursued their journey, as soon as they were set at liberty, to Augsburg, where the emperor was assembling his forces, in order to pass into Lombardy, and reduce some cities that had revolted there. Being admitted to the emperor's presence, and asked what tidings they brought, they answered, with great modesty and respect, "The bishop of the Holy Roman Church, the father in Christ of your excellence, salutes you, as the most dear and most favorite son of St. Peter; our venerable brethren, your clergy and the cardinals salute you as lord and emperor of the city and the world, 'tanquam dominum et imperatorem urbis et orbis.'" They then presented their letter to the emperor, who delivered it to Otto, bishop of Frisingen, to read and interpret it to him. The contents of the pope's letter were, that he was greatly concerned to hear that his excellence had taken amiss, and resented, without just cause, some expressions in his former letter; that by the word "beneficium," though understood by some as importing a fief, he meant no more than "bonum factum," a good deed, the two words of which that one word is composed; and that by using that word in speaking of the ceremony of the coronation, he did not mean that the imperial crown was a gift or benefit of his, but that to crown him was a good deed. He in like manner explained the words, "we have conferred upon you the imperial crown," pretending he only meant that he put the crown upon his head, the words "contulimus" and "imposuimus" being, according to his holiness, synonymous terms. That the sense in which the emperor understood the words "contulimus tibi insigne imperialis coronæ," "we have conferred upon you the imperial crown," is the plain, natu-

ral and obvious meaning of those words, is very certain; the person that confers a dignity being evidently the disposer or the fountain of the dignity he confers; and it is no less evident from the context, that the pope used the said words in the sense that the emperor put upon them: for in his letter he boasted of his having "conferred the imperial crown upon him, and with it the plenitude of all power and honor," words that plainly import more than his barely performing the ceremony of the coronation. However, as the pope had thus explained his words, the emperor, looking upon that explanation as a tacit retraction of what he had said in his former letter, (and so it really was,) acquiesced, and after mentioning some articles to the legates which he thought should be settled, and I shall have occasion to speak of hereafter, he gave them the kiss of peace for themselves, and for their absent brethren, the clergy of the Roman church, and the cardinals, and dismissed them, overjoyed at the success of their negotiations, with many rich presents.¹

The good understanding between the pope and the emperor was but short-lived; and they quarrelled again the very next year, 1159, on the following occasion: The emperor, entering Italy, obliged all the lords in those parts, as well as the bishops, to supply his army, according to ancient custom, with forage; to acknowledge him for their liege lord, of whom they held their lordships, and to do homage to him as such. At the same time the see of Ravenna, becoming vacant by the death of Anselm, Guido, the son of count Guido, one of the emperor's favorites, was unanimously elected by the clergy of the place and the people in his room. The emperor, therefore, dispatched the bishop of Vercelli to the pope, to acquaint him with the election, and beg his holiness to confirm it. But Hadrian, offended at the emperor's requiring the bishops to supply his army with forage, and much more at his insisting upon their doing homage to him as their liege lord, would not grant the confirmation he sued for; nay, he declared the election to be null, because the elect was subdeacon of the Roman church, and could not be translated, without his previous permission, to any other church. This refusal offended the emperor; but dissembling his discontent, he sent Herman, bishop of Verdun, to satisfy the pope that such a translation was not forbidden by the canons, and to persuade him to consent to it. But Hadrian, instead of granting the emperor's request, though pressed to it with great earnestness by the bishop, wrote a letter to him, mild in appearance, says the historian, but in effect very sharp, complaining of the homage he exacted of the

¹ Radevic. c. 17. 21.

¹ Radevic, l. 1. p. 23.

The pope writes anew to the emperor ;—[Year of Christ, 1159.] The emperor's answer. Terms of agreement proposed by the pope. Rejected by the emperor.

bishops, and reproaching him with ingratitude. This letter the pope sent by a mean and unknown person, who disappeared before it was read. Such treatment was highly resented by Frederic, and to be even with the pope, he ordered his secretary to place his own name before the pope's in all the letters he should thenceforth write to him, and to address him in the singular, and not in the plural number, as was then usual in speaking or writing to persons of great distinction. The emperor's answer to the letter that was delivered to him by an unknown person, has not reached our times, but Hadrian's answer to that letter has ; and he bitterly complains in it of his beloved son as wanting in the respect that was due to St. Peter and the holy Roman church, by placing his own name before that of the apostle's vicar upon earth, which, he says, cannot be excused from insolence, or rather arrogance. He tells the emperor, that as God has promised long life to those who honor their parents, so has he threatened with death the man that shall curse his father or his mother, meaning himself and the Roman church ; puts him in mind of the fealty he had promised and sworn to St. Peter and to him at the time of his coronation ; pretends his requiring homage of the bishops to be inconsistent with their rank and dignity, as well as with the royalties of St. Peter, they being all called in scripture Gods and the sons of God ; complains of his excluding the legates of the apostolic see not only from the churches, but even from the cities of his kingdom, and concludes with exhorting him to repentance, and even threatening him, if he does not alter his conduct, with the loss of his crown.¹

To this letter Frederic returned the following answer, still placing his own name before the pope's : " We have ever honored our parents, that is, those to whom we owe our life and our crown, and therefore fall not under the sentence pronounced in Scripture against the man that shall curse his father or mother. As for the homage we require of the bishops, which you pretend to be derogatory to the royalties of St. Peter, I should be glad to know what royalties pope Silvester had or claimed in the time of the emperor Constantine. That prince gave peace and liberty to the church ; and what has your papacy that is not owing to the generosity of the emperors ? Consult the annals, and you will there find what we say to be true. We see no reason why we should not exact our royalties, and homage, and allegiance of the bishops. They are gods, and the sons of God, but they hold of us what they possess. He, who had received nothing from men, paid tribute for himself and St. Peter ; and you would have

the bishops and the clergy, who hold of us all they have, to be free from all tribute. But they shall either return what they have received and hold of us, or give to Cæsar what is Cæsar's. We shut our churches and our cities against your cardinals and legates, because we have found them to be not preachers, but free-booters ; ' non prædicatores sed prædatores ;' not lovers of peace but of prey, not reformers of the world, but insatiable collectors of gold. When we shall see them behave as they ought, we shall not grudge them their salary and necessary subsistence. Your quarrelling with the laity about matters that concern not religion, is inconsistent with true meekness and humility, and too plainly shows that pride hath found its way even to the see of St. Peter."²

In the mean time several German bishops, and among the rest Everard, archbishop of Bamberg, apprehending that the present misunderstanding between the pope and the emperor would soon end in an open rupture, wrote most respectful letters to Hadrian, entreating him, as he tendered the peace of the church, to send proper persons to negotiate a reconciliation before the emperor proceeded, as they believed he would, to extremities. Hadrian, in compliance with their advice, sent four cardinals to treat with Frederic, who was still in Lombardy. But the terms they proposed were such as they themselves could not well expect he would ever agree to. These were, I. That the emperor should send no officers or magistrates to act, in his name, at Rome, that city and all its royalties belonging to the apostolic see. II. That no forage should be exacted of the bishops in Italy, except on occasion of the emperor's coming to receive the imperial crown at Rome. III. That in Italy the bishops should swear allegiance to the emperor, but should not be required to do him homage. IV. That the messengers and envoys sent by the emperors should not lodge in the palaces of the bishops. V. That he should restore all the possessions of the Roman church, and pay tribute for the cities of Ferrara, Massa, Figuroula, for the demesnes of the countess Mathilda, for the dukedom of Spoleti, and the islands of Corsica and Sardinia.²

The emperor, however provoked at such exorbitant demands, kept his temper, and with great calmness returned the following answer to the legates : " I am, by the grace of God, Roman emperor, and as such must have power and authority in Rome, else the name of Roman emperor would be but an empty title. I shall not oblige the bishops of Italy to do me homage, if they choose to hold nothing of me. If the pope tells them that they have nothing to do with the king,

¹ Radevic. l. 1. c. 18.

¹ Radevic. l. 1. c. 18.

² Idem ibid.

Death of Hadrian. His writings. His letter to Henry II., king of England.

they must not take it amiss, if I tell them, that they have nothing to do with fiefs and territories, with lands and possessions. We shall not complain if our envoys are excluded from the palaces of bishops, that stand upon their own ground. But if they stand upon our ground, they are ours, all edifices belonging to the owner of the ground upon which they have been erected." At the same time Frederic renewed his complaints against the pope for entering into an alliance with the Greek emperor, and concluding a peace with the king of Sicily unknown to him, when he had promised to do neither without his consent.¹ However, he readily agreed to a proposal that was made by some of the German bishops, namely, that a congress should be held, at which six bishops should assist chosen by him, and six cardinals appointed by the pope; that the points in dispute should be settled by them, and both parties should acquiesce in their judgment and decision. But the proposal was rejected by the pope, declaring, that he would stand to the agreement concluded between the emperor and his predecessor pope Eugenius, and hearken to no other. By one of the articles of that agreement Frederic solemnly promised to defend and maintain, against all men, the rights of the Roman church, and the royalties of St. Peter. But that treaty, he said, was no longer binding, the pope having, by a manifest breach of one of the articles, made peace, unknown to him, with the king of Sicily, and an alliance with the emperor of Constantinople, both his avowed enemies.² Thus all intercourse was broken off between the pope and the emperor, and no hopes left of a reconciliation. But Hadrian in the mean time died, and left to his successor the difficult task of composing the troubles which he had raised. Such is the account Radevicus, canon of Frisingen, who lived and wrote at this very time, and is generally looked upon as addicted to no party, gives us of the first seeds of discord between the emperor Frederic and the apostolic see, that rent the Roman church into two opposite parties, and produced four different schisms, of which I shall have occasion to speak in the next pontificate.

Hadrian died on the 1st of September of the present year 1159, after a pontificate of four years, eight months, and twenty-nine days. He died at Anagni, but his body was brought from thence to Rome, and buried on the 4th of the same month in the church of St. Peter.³ His death was occasioned by a squinancy,⁴ which probably gave rise to the fable related by Conrad of Ursperg, namely, that having excommunicated the emperor Frederic, a few days after a fly got

into his throat as he was drinking at a fountain, and could by no remedies be removed till he expired. But no notice is taken by any of the contemporary writers of his having excommunicated the emperor; nay, Dodechinus tells us, in express terms, that Hadrian designed to excommunicate the emperor for his unlawful marriage, but was prevented by death from pronouncing that sentence. Frederic had dismissed his lawful wife and married Beatrix, daughter to Rainald, count of Burgundy; and by that marriage, the marriage Dodechinus speaks of, Frederic acquired the county of Burgundy.¹ Hadrian exhorted him, but in vain, to dismiss Beatrix, and recall his lawful wife, and would have excommunicated him, says that writer, had he lived longer.

Of all the writings of Hadrian, which I have not had occasion to speak of in his life, the letter he wrote to Henry II., king of England, is, perhaps, the most worthy of notice. That prince being invited by the inhabitants of Ireland to take possession of that island, acquainted the pope with his design of invading it, in order to extend the bounds of the church; to have that ignorant and unpolished people instructed in the truth of the Christian religion; to extirpate vice, and plant virtue in its room; and to facilitate that undertaking, he begged the advice and favor of the apostolic see, promising the yearly pension of a penny to St. Peter from every house in the island. The pope in his answer to the king greatly commended so pious and laudable a design, told him that not only Ireland, but all the islands that had received the Christian faith, undoubtedly belonged to St. Peter and the holy Roman church, as the king himself well knew, and that he, therefore, granted him his petition, and approved his design of invading Ireland for the above purposes, and making himself master of that island, upon condition of his causing a penny a house to be yearly paid to St. Peter, and his preserving entire the rights of those churches.² From the pope's letter it does not appear that the king applied to him as supreme lord of all the Christian islands, for leave to invade Ireland. He only begged the advice and the favor or countenance of the apostolic see, or desired to be advised and favored, or countenanced, in that undertaking, by the apostolic see, that the execution of his design might by that means be facilitated—"ad id convenientius exequendum, consilium apostolicæ sedis exigit et favorem," are the words of the pope's bull or letter. However, Hadrian construed, it seems, the king's begging his favor and advice into his acknowledging him for lord of all the islands converted to the Christian

¹ Auctar Affigemens.

² Cod. Vatican. apud Bar. ad ann. 1159. tom. x. Concil. Radulph. de Dicet. in Imagin. Hist. p. 529. Matth. Paris ad ann. 1159. Girald Cambrens. 1. 2. c. 10, &c.

¹ Radevic. 1. 2. c. 31.

² Idem ibid.

³ Ceccan. in Chron. ad ann. 1159. Chron. Reicher-sperg.

⁴ Guill. Tyr. 1. 18. c. 26.

religion, and applying to him as such, for leave to invade Ireland. It were to be wished that Hadrian had told us upon what he grounded his undoubted claim to Ireland, and to all the other islands that had embraced the Christian faith. But neither he nor his successors have, to this day, thought fit to let the world into that secret. What the king and the pope meant by saying that the end of the intended expedition against Ireland was "to extend the bounds of the church," I know not. The Christian faith had been planted in Ireland many ages before, and they had at this time a settled church, governed by its proper bishops and metropolitans, who had, a few years before, received their palls from Rome, and they were, for aught appears to the contrary, as orthodox in their faith, as regular in their discipline as most other nations. As the pope's letter bears no date, De Diceto supposes it to have been written in 1154. But as Henry II. was crowned king of England in the latter end of December 1154, he could not possibly receive letters from the pope that year. M. Paris places it under the year 1155, and it might have been written that year, though the king did not undertake the intended expedition till sixteen years after, that is, till the year 1171, which induced the Jesuit Alford to question the authenticity of the letter, especially as no notice is taken of it, as he supposes, by M. Paris, nor by some of the more ancient English writers. But Alford had not it seems read M. Paris, or had forgot what he had read in that author. For he mentions the letter in express terms as written in 1155, and De Diceto, as well as Giraldus Cambrensis, both contemporary writers, speak of it, nay, Giraldus sets it down at length,¹ and takes notice of it in several places of the account he gives us of his transactions in England, and in his book on the Conquest of Ireland. The authenticity therefore of Hadrian's letter, or privilege, as Geraldus calls it, cannot be disputed. Hadrian is said to have written a catechism for the use of the people of Norway and Sweden; a book upon his legation into those countries, and another upon the conception of the Virgin Mary.

I cannot omit here the account we read in the famous John of Salisbury, afterwards bishop of Chartres, of a conversation he had with this pope, as it will give us an insight into the manners of the Roman clergy and the court of Rome in his time. John went into Apulia to see Hadrian, his countryman, while he was carrying on the war there with William, king of Sicily, and staid three months with him at Benevento. As the pope admitted him to his intimacy, he desired him one day to tell him freely what

opinion the world entertained of him and the Roman church. John, using the liberty the pope allowed him, told his holiness that since he wanted to know what the world thought of the Roman church he would not dissemble, but tell him with all the freedom of a friend what he had heard in the different provinces, through which he had travelled, and began thus: "They say, holy father, that the Roman church, the mother of all churches, behaves towards other churches more like a step-mother than a true mother; that scribes and pharisees sit in her, laying heavy weights upon men's shoulders, which they themselves touch not with a finger; that they domineer over the clergy, but are not an example to the flock, nor do they lead the right way to life; that they covet rich furniture, load their tables with silver and gold, and yet, out of avarice, live sparingly; that they seldom admit or relieve the poor, and when they relieve them, it is only out of vanity they do it; that they plunder the churches, sow dissensions, set the clergy and the people at variance, are not affected with the miseries and sufferings of the afflicted, and look upon gain as godliness and piety; that they do justice, not for justice sake, but for lucre; that all things are venal; that for money you may obtain to day what you please, but the next day you will get nothing without it. I have heard them compared to the devil, who is thought to do good when he ceases from doing mischief—I except some few who answer the name of pastors, and fulfil the duty. The Roman pontiff himself is, they say, a burden to all almost insupportable. All complain, that while the churches that the piety of our ancestors erected, are ready to fall or lie in ruins, while the altars are neglected, he builds palaces, and appears gorgeously attired in purple and gold. The palaces of the priests are kept clean, but the church of Christ is covered with filth. They plunder whole provinces, as if they aimed at nothing less than the wealth of Cræsus. But the Almighty treats them according to their deserts, often leaving them a prey to the very refuse of mankind; and while they thus wander out of the way, the punishment they deserve must and will overtake them, the Lord saying, 'with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.' This, holy father, is what people say, since you want to know it. When I had done," continues our author, "the pope asked me my opinion. I answered, that I was at a loss what to do; that I should be deemed a liar, or a sycophant, if I alone contradicted the people; and that on the other hand it would be no less a crime than treason for me to open my mouth against heaven. However, as Guido Clemens, cardinal presbyter of St. Pudentiana, agrees with the people, I will

¹ Girald. Cambrensis. de Rebus à se Gestis, l. 2. c. 11.

Some particular actions of Hadrian. Alexander III. elected.

not presume to disagree with him; and he says, that double-dealing, contrary to the simplicity of the dove, prevails in the Roman church, and with it avarice, the root of all evil. This he said not in a corner, but publicly in a council, at which pope Eugenius presided in person. However, I will take upon me to say, that I have no where met with ecclesiastics of greater probity, or who abhor avarice more, than in the Roman church. Who can but admire the contempt of riches and the disinterestedness of Bernard of Rennes, cardinal deacon of St. Cosma and St. Damian? The man is not yet born, of whom he received any trifle or gift. What shall I say of the bishop of Præneste, who, out of a tenderness of conscience, would not receive even what was his due. Many equal Fabricius himself in gravity and moderation. Since you press and command me, and I must not lie to the Holy Ghost, I will speak the truth: we must obey your commands, but must not imitate you in all your actions, &c. Why do you inquire into the lives of others, and not into your own? All applaud and flatter you, all call you lord and father; if father, why do you expect presents from your children? If lord, why do you not keep your Romans in awe and subjection, &c.? You are not, father, in the right way. Give freely what you have received freely. If you oppress others, you will be more grievously oppressed yourself. When I had done speaking," adds John of Salisbury, "the pope smiled, commended me for the liberty I had taken, and ordered me to let him know immediately whatever I might hear amiss of him."¹ Hadrian owned many

things his friend had told him to be true, excused others, and to justify the enormous contributions exacted by the Roman church of all other churches, he had recourse, not to Scripture, but to the fable in Æsop of the members mutinying against the stomach. But his holiness would have found it a difficult task to show, that the Roman church, like the stomach, kept little or nothing for herself, but distributed what she received amongst her members, and only employed it for the good of the whole body.

Hadrian purchased some territories and several castles for the Roman church, repaired some churches, made rich presents to others, but, far from enriching his relations, he suffered his mother, even while he was pope, to be maintained, among the other poor, by the church of Canterbury.¹ He attempted a reconciliation between the Roman church and the churches in the East, and sent legates to the emperor Manuel to negotiate with him and his bishops the intended union. But Basilus Acridanus archbishop of Thessalonica, a prelate, at that time, in great repute all over the East for his piety and learning, was of opinion that the pope and the emperor might remove all the obstacles to a perfect union, without troubling the bishops, as the two churches agreed in the main points, and only differed with respect to some rites that were not at all material.² But the pope was diverted from proceeding in this affair by his quarrel with the emperor. Hadrian, in the beginning of his pontificate, appointed the bishop of Lunden primate of all Sweden, and that dignity was confirmed to the see of Lunden by pope Innocent III.³

ALEXANDER III., THE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MANUEL COMNENUS, ALEXIUS COMNENUS, *Emperors of the East.*—FREDERIC ÆNOBARBUS, *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1159.] The cardinals and bishops at this time in Rome, having performed the exequies of the deceased pope on the 4th of September, met the next day in the church of St. Peter, and having deliberated three days about the election of a proper person to succeed him, all but three, at the end of the third day, unanimously elected Roland, chancellor of the Roman church, a native of Siena in Tuscany, and cardinal presbyter of St. Mark; so that the see was vacant only six days. Brompton, saying it was vacant twenty days, must have computed the vacancy from the death

of Hadrian on the 1st of September, to the consecration of Alexander (for he took that name at his election) that did not happen till the 20th of that month. Alexander was originally canon of Pisa, but Eugenius III. being taken with his parts, his eloquence and learning, during his stay in that city, carried him with him to France, and on his return to Italy made him first cardinal deacon of St. Cosmas and St. Damian, afterwards cardinal presbyter of St. Mark, and lastly chancellor of the Roman church. He was

¹ Epist. XXIV. Alexandri III., ad Thom. Cantuariensem.

² Hadrian. Epist. VII. et Jus Græco-Roman apud Baron.

³ Innocent III. l. I. c. 421.

Victor III. elected in opposition to Alexander III. Both consecrated. Excommunications thundered out on both sides. Victor's letter to the German bishops, &c.

one of the three cardinals, sent by Hadrian in 1156, to conclude the ignominious peace I have spoken of above with William, king of Sicily.

The cardinals, who dissented from the rest, were Octavian of St. Cæcilia, John of St. Martin, and Guido of St. Calixtus, and by the two last the first was elected under the name of Victor III. The other cardinals, paying no regard to their opposition, ordered the senior deacons, whose province it was, to clothe Alexander, as lawfully elected, with the scarlet mantle, one of the badges of the pontifical dignity. Hereupon Octavian, who had all along aspired at the pontificate, falling upon Alexander, tore the mantle, in a great rage, from off his shoulders. But a senator of the opposite party snatching it that moment from him, he called to his chaplain for the mantle he had brought with him: for he had prepared one beforehand, and he appareled himself with it in such a hurry, that the cape, instead of covering his head, hung down behind; which made the whole assembly break into a loud laughter, and pleasantly compare the mantle, put on the wrong way, to his election. In the mean time the church-doors being opened, which the senate had caused to be kept shut till the election was over, a troop of armed men, hired by Octavian, whom I shall henceforth call Victor, broke in sword in hand, and struck, with dreadful menaces, such terror into the cardinals and bishops, that they all fled, with the elect, into a strong tower of the church, and there they were kept nine days closely besieged by Victor and some of the senators, whom he had gained with rich presents to his party. Victor, having in the end made himself master of the tower, caused all who were shut up in it to be conveyed from thence to a more painful prison on the opposite side the Tiber, flattering himself that he should thus oblige them to annul the election of Alexander and elect him. This raised a general outcry among the people; and ballads were sung in the public streets by the women and children, exposing Victor, whom they nicknamed *Smanta Compagno*, because he had dismantled Alexander, to contempt and ridicule. This encouraged Hector Frangipani, and some other noblemen of Rome, to attempt the rescue of Alexander and his cardinals. The people seconded them in the attempt; and Victor was forced, on the third day of their confinement, to set them at liberty. They passed through Rome, Alexander not thinking it advisable to be consecrated there, as many of the senators adhered to his rival, by birth a Roman, and descended from one of the most noble and powerful families of the place. He was attended to the gate by vast crowds of people with loud acclamations and the ringing of

bells, and there dismissing the multitude, he pursued his journey to Nympha, about the distance of ten miles from Rome, accompanied by the cardinals and bishops who had elected him, by several Roman senators, and by all the officers of the apostolic see. He arrived at Nympha on the eve of St. Matthew, or the 20th of September, and the 20th of that month falling, in 1159, on a Sunday, he was consecrated the same day by the bishop of Ostia and five other bishops in the presence of many other cardinals, of bishops, abbots, and priors, of many Roman senators, of all the officers of the papal court, and an infinite multitude of people. On the other hand Victor, having with great difficulty gained over to his party three bishops, namely, Imar cardinal bishop of Tusculum, Ubald bishop of Ferentino, and the bishop of Melfi in Apulia, who had fled from his see, and lay concealed in the neighborhood of Ancona, he was by them consecrated in the monastery of Farfa, on the first Sunday of October, that is, on the 4th of that month. Such is the account we read of this double election in a manuscript lodged in the Vatican library, and supposed to have been written at the time; and with that manuscript the contemporary writers all, or almost all, agree, only differing in some circumstances quite immaterial.¹

Alexander was no sooner consecrated than he published a monitory, threatening Octavian, usurper of the apostolic see, and all who adhered to him, with excommunication, if they did not return to the unity of the church before the octave of his consecration, that is, before the 27th of September. A monitory to the same purpose was issued by Victor against Alexander, and they both thundered out the sentence of excommunication at the same time against one another, Alexander styling Victor an apostate and a schismatic, and Victor retorting the same names upon Alexander. Victor well knew, that the emperor Frederic was no friend to Alexander, but bore him a grudge on account of his having advised pope Hadrian to make peace with the king of Sicily. He therefore took care to acquaint him immediately with his own election, and implore his protection by a letter with this address: "Victor, servant of the servants of God, to our venerable brethren, the patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, abbots, dukes, marquises, counts, and all the princes in the court of the most serene and invincible emperor of the Romans, our lord Frederic, health and apostolic benediction." In that letter he gives a very different account of his election from that we read in all the contemporary writers. For he says that he was elected

¹ Codex Vatican. apud Bar. ad ann. 1156. Alexand. III. in Epistola ad Bononiens. Chron. Reichersperg. Anonym. Cassin. Radevic. l. 2. c. 54. Neubrig. l. 2. c. 9.

Letter of the cardinals of Victor's party. Legates sent by Alexander to the emperor. How received. The cardinals of Alexander's party write to the emperor.

by the cardinals, priests, and deacons, by the bishops, by the Roman clergy, senate, and people, and that on the first Sunday of October he was as canonically consecrated as he had been elected; entreats them to acquaint the emperor therewith, as he is the fountain of all power and dignity, and by all means to divert him from receiving any letters, or hearkening to any envoys, that may be sent by Roland, heretofore chancellor of the Roman church, an open enemy to the empire, and a sworn friend to William, king of Sicily, who had wickedly, and in defiance of the canons, intruded himself into the apostolic see, when he had possessed it during the space of twelve days, quite undisturbed.¹

At the same time the cardinals, who adhered to Victor, wrote a letter with the same address, namely, "To the patriarchs, archbishops," &c., and the substance of their letter was, that in the time of the late pope the cardinals, that is we, say they, were divided among ourselves on occasion of the peace made with the king of Sicily, some disapproving it, and others, whom the king had gained with rich presents, declaring for it; that the partisans of the king were very pressing with the pope to have him excommunicate the emperor under some pretence or other; and pretences, they said, plausible enough were not wanting, but that being therein strongly opposed by the emperor's friends, they acquiesced till Victor, then cardinal Octavian, was sent on a legation into Germany, when the pope retiring, in his absence, to Anagni, with no other cardinals but the king's avowed friends, and the emperor's declared enemies, they bound themselves by a solemn oath to oppose the emperor on all occasions, as an enemy to the church, and to prefer none to the apostolic see who had not taken that oath, nay they obliged all the neighboring bishops to swear, that they would not consecrate the elect, be who he would, unless he was of the king's party; that Hadrian dying soon after, the cardinals of the king's faction, fourteen in number, mindful of their oath, chose the chancellor Roland; and the opposite party, consisting of nine cardinals, unanimously concurred with their suffrages in the election of cardinal Octavian, as the most proper person to procure and maintain peace and concord between the church and the empire. They added, that their election was approved and confirmed by the greater part of the Roman clergy, of the senators, nobility, and people, and that the elect was enthroned and put in possession of the apostolic see with the usual ceremonies amidst the loud acclamations of all ranks of men.² Thus the cardinals of Victor's party; and it is to be observed that even according to their ac-

count Alexander had a majority, fourteen cardinals against nine. But, if the contemporary historians are to be credited, he was elected by two cardinals only, the two I have mentioned above. Had he had nine cardinals on his side, it is not to be doubted but they would have all signed the above letter; and it is only signed by five, of whom three are said by the writers I have quoted above to have been afterwards gained over by the counts of Tusculum, to whom Octavian was nearly related.

On the other hand, Alexander despatched, immediately after his election, legates to acquaint the emperor with his promotion as well as the intrusion of Octavian, and put him in mind of the obligation he lay under, as Roman emperor, to maintain the unity of the Roman church. As Frederic was strongly prejudiced against Alexander, and looked upon him as wholly attached to the king of Sicily, whose Italian dominions he intended to invade as soon as he had quieted the disturbances in Lombardy, he would not, at first, admit the legates to his presence, nor receive the letters with which they were charged; nay, if what Baronius has transcribed out of the Vatican manuscript written at this time be true, he was so transported with rage to hear Roland was elected, that he ordered the legates, who brought him that unwelcome intelligence, to be hanged, and his order would have been executed before he returned to himself, had not duke Welfo and the duke of Saxony interposed, and not only appeased him, but prevailed upon him to grant the legates an audience, and even hear their letters read: but he returned no pleasing answer to them.¹

The cardinals of Alexander's party, not discouraged by the reception the legates had met with, wrote to Frederic, giving him, in their letter, an account of the election of Alexander, and the intrusion of Victor, the very same account that I have given above from the contemporary writers. They recommend the elect to him as one equal to the high station to which he has been raised, and worthy of his protection, which they most earnestly implore, to prevent the unspeakable evils that arise from parties and factions in the church as well as the state. In the close of their letter they complain of Otto count Palatine, who had, it seems, openly espoused the cause of Victor, and obliged the inhabitants of Campania and the patrimony of St. Peter to acknowledge him for lawful pope. This letter was signed by twenty-two cardinals; which plainly shows, that of the cardinals Alexander had a great majority on his side.²

The emperor, finding the accounts of the two opposite parties so contradictory, would

¹ Radevic. l. 2. c. 50.

² Idem ibid.

¹ Apud. Baron. ad ann. 1159.

² Idem ibid, et Authores ut supra.

Frederic resolves to have the affair determined in a council, and sends two bishops to summon the competitors to it. Alexander's answer to the two bishops.

not take upon him to determine whose claim was the best grounded, says Radevicus; but resolved, in compliance with the advice of the bishops and princes who were with him, to leave the decision of so important a point to the church, to assemble for that purpose a council, which he was persuaded he had power to do, as it had been done by his predecessors, Justinian, Theodosius, Charlemagne, &c., and to summon the two competitors to plead their cause in person before the bishops who should compose that assembly. Pursuant to this resolution the emperor dispatched the two bishops, Daniel of Prague, and Herman of Verdun, with letters to acquaint both pretenders with his design of assembling a council at Pavia on the octave of the Epiphany, and require them to be present at the time and place appointed, that the schism, which the church was threatened with, might thus be stifled in its birth. The address of the emperor's letter to Alexander was, "Frederic, by the grace of God, emperor of the Romans, ever Augustus, to Roland, chancellor, and the other cardinals, who have elected him Roman pontiff." The two bishops found Alexander at Anagni, and he was sitting in council with the cardinals at the time of their arrival. They entered the place where the council was held, and showing him no particular mark of distinction, acquainted him with their commission, and delivered to him the emperor's letter, commanding him, in the name of the church, to attend the council that was to meet at Pavia, on the octave of the Epiphany, and finally to determine whose election was, and whose was not canonical. They added, it was the emperor's will and pleasure, that both parties should acquiesce in the judgment and decision of that assembly. So unexpected a message, and so bluntly delivered by the two bishops, threw Alexander and his cardinals into the utmost confusion. On the one hand, they were afraid to disoblige so powerful a prince, and on the other they apprehended, that to obey his commands was to betray the liberty of the church. This they thought the greater evil of the two, and therefore, after a long consultation among themselves, they agreed, all to a man, to stand by Alexander, even at the expense of their lives, and not suffer his title to be questioned or disputed by any man or any assembly of men whatever. Hereupon Alexander, encouraged by the unanimity and steadiness of the cardinals, returned the following answer to the two bishops: "We acknowledge the emperor for the patron and defender of the Holy Roman Church, and we intend to honor him, as such, above all the princes of the earth, so far as is consistent with the honor of the King of kings. But if the honor he requires is incompatible with the honor we owe to

the Lord of lords, he must not take it amiss if we choose to obey God rather than man. He intends, you say, to assemble a council, in order to inquire into the lawfulness of our election, requires us to repair it, and will have us to acquiesce in the decision of that assembly. But in thus summoning a council without the knowledge of the Roman pontiff, he has departed from the custom of his predecessors, and gone far beyond the bounds of his power in commanding us to repair to it, as if he had any authority over us. Our Lord granted to St. Peter, and in him to the Roman church, this privilege, that she should judge the causes of all churches, and be judged by none herself; and this privilege has been hitherto maintained inviolable. It is therefore to us matter of the greatest surprise and astonishment, that of all men he, upon whom it is incumbent to defend that privilege, should be the first to attack it. We cannot bear it, nor will we. Canonical tradition and the authority of the fathers will not allow us to appear before a lay court, and be judged by it. It would be criminal in us, capable of provoking the divine vengeance, to suffer, through ignorance or pusillanimity, the church to be enslaved, when our lord has made her free; and we are, therefore, determined to maintain her freedom at the expense of our lives, as our fathers have done before us."¹ Could Alexander be ignorant of the many incontestable instances that occur in history of both parties applying, upon a double election, to the secular princes, and standing to their judgment, or the judgment of the councils, which they convened on the occasion? The dispute between Boniface and Eulalius, in 419, was decided in favor of the former by a council, which the emperor Honorius assembled in Ravenna, where he then resided.² In like manner was the schism, occasioned by the double election of Symmachus and Laurentius, in 498, terminated by Theodoric, then king of Italy. Both parties agreed to appeal to him, though an Arian, and to stand to his judgment; and he, after examining into the pretensions of both, adjudged the see to Symmachus.³ It was not, therefore, "inaudium a seculo," a thing never heard of since the beginning of the world, that in contested elections the parties should apply to and be judged by secular princes. Boniface, though lawfully elected, did not decline the judgment of Honorius, nor did Symmachus that of Theodoric, pretending that the pope can be judged by no power upon earth. Were that maxim admitted, divisions, arising in the church from a double election, could never be healed; for the competitors would both pretend, and so would their successors,

¹ Cod. Vatican. et Radevic. ubi supra.

² See vol. I. p. 162.

³ See vol. I. p. 296.

The two bishops acknowledge Victor. The emperor appoints a council to meet at Pavia;—[Year of Christ, 1160.] The chapter of St. Peter write to the council in favor of Victor. Several witnesses appear in favor of Victor.

to have been lawfully elected, and plead the privilege of being judged by no power upon earth. In speaking of the general councils held in the first eight centuries, I have shown that they were all assembled by the emperors, some with and some without the knowledge of the pope, and consequently that Alexander departed from the truth in saying that Frederic departed from the custom of his predecessors in summoning a council without the knowledge of the Roman pontiff.

The two bishops, highly provoked at Alexander's answer and haughty behavior, went straight to Segni, where Victor was, and prostrating themselves before him, acknowledged him for lawful pope. Their example was followed by Otto, count Palatin, who commanded a body of German troops in the neighborhood of Rome, which greatly encouraged the partisans of Victor. In the mean while the bishops assembled at Pavia on the 12th of January, the time appointed by the emperor for the meeting of the council. But they did not sit till the 5th of February, Frederic being engaged in the siege of Crema, which city he took and burnt on the 27th of January. He then repaired to Pavia, and the sessions began on the 5th of February. To this council the emperor invited all the bishops of the empire, and those likewise of France, England, Hungary, and Dacia. But fifty only, and they from his German or Italian dominions, complied with his invitation. As to the number of abbots and other dignitaries of the church, they were too many to be counted, says Radevicus, who was present. The emperor, on his arrival at Pavia, assembled the bishops, and having exhorted them to implore the Divine assistance, in an affair that so nearly concerned the church, with fasting and prayer, he fixed the 5th of February for their first meeting. On that day he came in person to the assembly, attended by most of the princes of the empire, and having taken his place, he spoke thus, addressing himself to the members of the council: "Though I have an undoubted right to assemble councils, especially when the church is in danger, (for the emperors Constantine, Theodosius, and Justinian are known to have done so, and in latter time Charlemagne and Otto,) yet I leave the determining of this great affair to your prudence and discretion. God has vested you with the power of judging us, and you are not to be judged by us in matters that relate to God. As you are therefore responsible to God alone for your conduct in the present affair, behave yourselves accordingly." Having spoken thus he withdrew, lest he should influence the judgment of the bishops with his presence.¹

¹ Radevic. c. 62. 64.

The emperor being retired, deputies appeared before the council, sent by the chapter of St. Peter's in Rome, with a letter to the emperor and the fathers of the council, containing pretty much the same account of what had passed at the election as the five cardinals of Victor's party had given in their letters, which I have spoken of above. They say, that the cardinals being shut up in the church of St. Peter, and not able to agree among themselves, at the end of the third day Otto, deacon of St. Gregory, Adebald, cardinal of the holy apostles, and John the Neapolitan, starting up, offered the scarlet mantle to the chancellor Roland; but they were stopt by the wiser and better cardinals—"saniori et meliori parte cardinalium:" that at the noise this occasioned, the Roman clergy breaking into the church, and surrounding Otto, cried all with one voice, "Choose lord Octavian, who alone can give peace to the church:" that thereupon, at the request of the Roman people, and with the consent of the whole Roman clergy, and the chapter of St. Peter, cardinal Octavian was elected a saniori parte cardinalium, was clothed with the scarlet mantle, and placed in the chair of St. Peter, all who were present singing, in the mean time, the Te Deum, and crowding to kiss his foot: that the elect was carried in triumph to the Lateran palace, the people crying aloud in their language, (the same that they speak now,) "Papa vittore santo Pietro lo elegge." They added, that the election of Octavian was not opposed nor contested by the chancellor, nor by any of his friends till twelve days after, when the cardinals of his party arriving with him, in their flight from Rome, at a place called Nero's Cistern, they there delivered to him, as if he had been elected and not Octavian, the scarlet mantle with the pall and the stole. For the truth of what they asserted in their letter they appealed to Otto, count Palatin, to Guido, count of Blanderata, and to Herbert, the emperor's envoy, men, said they, whose testimony could not be questioned.¹ The contents of this letter were attested by nine archpriests, by a great many priests, deacons, and subdeacons of the Roman church, by the prefect of the city, by several senators, and men of the first rank in Rome. At the same time other witnesses appeared and declared, that they had heard pope Hadrian say, "Cardinal Octavian, whom I have sent into Lombardy, will excommunicate the Milanese; but I have ordered them to pay no regard to his excommunications, and to withstand the emperor to the utmost of their power." The city of Milan revolted from the emperor in Hadrian's time, and, as was believed, at his instigation. But Frederic reduced it in 1162, and levelled it with

¹ Radevic. c. 67.

The election of Victor approved by the council. The emperor requires his German and Italian subjects to acquiesce in the decision of the council.

the ground. The same witnesses deposed, that Hadrian had said in their hearing, "The cardinals have all given me their word, that upon my death they will not elect cardinal Octavian." They added, that two cardinals (whom, by the way, they should have named) refused to vote for Octavian, saying, "They had promised upon oath to elect none but the chancellor Roland."¹

The council spent seven days in examining these and other witnesses, and Alexander not appearing in the mean time, though thrice summoned, as was required by the canons, they confirmed the election of Victor, and declared that of the chancellor Roland, as they styled him, to be null; since he, distrusting his cause, had declined the judgment of the church. This sentence they immediately communicated to the emperor, who not only approved of it, but went that moment, attended by all the bishops of the council, to the monastery where Octavian lodged, conducted him from thence to the church of St. Syrus, held his stirrup as he dismounted from his horse, led him by the hand to the altar, and there, falling down before him, kissed his foot; and the bishops of the council, as well as the princes of the empire, followed his example. This happened on the 12th of February, the first Friday in Lent, and the next day the council met again, and with burning torches excommunicated, anathematized, and delivered up to Satan the chancellor Roland, as a schismatic, with all who adhered to him. Thus the bishops of the council in their circulatory letter, signed by the patriarch of Aquileia, and eleven archbishops with their suffragans.² But these subscriptions are not to be relied on. For amongst the names of the archbishops, who are said to have signed the decree of the council, we find that of the archbishop of Treves. But in a private letter from the archbishop of Bamberg to the archbishop of Saltzburg it is expressly said, that the archbishop of Treves did not consent to the decree of the council, though his suffragans all did.³ From the same letter it appears, that the deputies from the kings of France and England declared in the council, that their masters were determined not to acknowledge the one nor the other till they had heard from the emperor; and yet we find the decree, as it was published by the council, subscribed by the deputies of Henry king of England.

The emperor took care to acquaint the whole world with what had passed at the council; and messengers were immediately dispatched, with the sentence they had pronounced to the kings of Spain, France, England, Denmark, Hungary, Bohemia, and even to Manuel, emperor of Constanti-

nople. At the same time he wrote to the bishops of Germany, who had not been present at the council, requiring them to acquiesce in the judgment of their brethren who had examined the affair, during the space of seven days, with the greatest attention, and decided it upon the maturest deliberation. In that letter he lays great stress upon the conspiracy formed against the empire by Hadrian, and most of the cardinals, with Roland the chancellor at their head; assures the bishops, that the cardinals, two or three excepted, had bound themselves by a solemn oath to oppose him on all occasions, to adhere to the king of Sicily, and to prefer none to the apostolic see who had not taken that oath; that, pursuant to their oath, they had stirred up the cities of Lombardy, and Milan in particular, to rebel against him, and encouraged them to persist in their rebellion. This, he said, he knew to be true; for having promised to pardon the Milanese upon condition they submitted and swore allegiance to him, and sent the archbishop of Tarantasia, the abbots of Clairvaux and Morimond, and ten other abbots to conclude an agreement with them, they did not dissemble, but openly declared, that they were bound by an oath they had taken to the pope and the cardinals, to make no peace with the emperor unknown to them. The emperor added, that the rebels being told by the archbishop and the abbots that pope Hadrian was dead, and consequently that their oath was no longer binding, they immediately replied, if the pope is dead, we are bound to the cardinals, and they to us. Frederic further told the bishops, that several letters had been intercepted, undoubted evidences of the wicked designs and intrigues carried on by Roland, and the cardinals his associates, against the empire. He owns, that the chancellor was elected by the greater part of the cardinals, most of them being bound by oath to elect one who should oppose the emperor and adhere to the king of Sicily.¹ It is to be observed, that though pope Nicholas II. in a council held at Rome in 1059, issued a decree confining the election of the pope to the cardinals, as has been related in the life of that pope, yet the Roman people and the inferior clergy still continued to claim a share in all elections, maintaining that the pope could not deprive them of a privilege which they had enjoyed ever since the foundation of the apostolic see; and they were not wholly excluded from concurring with their suffragans in the election of a new pope till the pontificate of Lucius III., raised to the see in 1181. The majority therefore of the cardinals was no proof, at least at this time, of the canonicalness of an election, and it is hard to determine, in the present case, which

¹ Radevic. c. 67.

² Apud Baron. ad ann. 1160.

³ Radevic. l. 2. c. 72.

¹ Radevic. l. 2. c. 71.

The bishops who did not conform to the council driven from their sees. The Cisterian order driven out of the empire. Alexander gains several kings. Excommunicates the emperor. Alexander acknowledged by the kings of France and England;—[Year of Christ, 1161.]

of the two competitors had a majority of the clergy and the people, that is, of the inhabitants of Rome, on his side. Besides, the emperor and his friends maintained the election of Alexander to be null on another account, namely, because it was not free, the cardinals being bound, by an unlawful oath, to elect one who should adhere to the king of Sicily against the empire. For that such a conspiracy, or compact, was a mere invention, as some have pretended, is altogether incredible.

The election of Alexander being declared null, and that of Victor being confirmed by the council, the emperor ordered an edict to be issued, as soon as the assembly broke up, commanding all his German and Italian subjects to acknowledge Victor, and no other, for lawful pope, on pain of perpetual banishment. With that edict great numbers of the German and Italian bishops readily complied; and they who did not were driven from their sees, and sent, as enemies to the empire, into exile. The Cistercian order was, at this time, one of the most flourishing orders of the church, had many archbishops and bishops, seven hundred abbots and upwards, and an infinite number of monks, dispersed over all the kingdoms in the West; and in a general assembly held at Cistercium, or Cisteaux, the whole order resolved to espouse the cause of Alexander. This resolution was chiefly owing to Peter, one of the order, and archbishop of Tarantasia in the Aples Penninæ, which see has been since translated to Monasterium, now Montiers en Tarantaise. As they declared all to a man for Alexander, they proved a great support to his cause. But Frederic drove the whole order out of his dominions, seized their monasteries, and disposed of their estates to men of other religious orders.¹ Ecclesiastics of all ranks, who adhered to Alexander, met with no better treatment, which occasioned great confusion and endless disturbances throughout the empire.

In the mean time Alexander, by the advice of Arnulph bishop of Lizieux, dispatched legates *a Latere* into all parts, to contradict the false reports that were every where spread of his election by the envoys of the emperor. By these legates the kings of Spain, Denmark, Hungary, Bohemia, Jerusalem, and even the emperor Manuel, with the whole body of the clergy of the imperial city, were gained over to Alexander; and in a council, held this year at Nazarat, he was acknowledged by the churches of Antioch and Jerusalem.² The kings of France and England declined espousing for the present the cause of either of the competitors. Henry, king of England, was inclined to favor Alexander; but being then at

war with Lewis, king of France, he apprehended that should he declare openly for him, the emperor might resent such a step, and join in the alliance against him. However he did not forbid his subjects to write to Alexander, or to receive letters from him.¹

Alexander wrote several letters to the emperor, striving to persuade him to abandon the protection of Victor. But Frederic returning no answer to them, resolved, being thereunto encouraged by all the cardinals of his party, to thunder out the sentence of excommunication against him; and accordingly on Maundy Thursday, which, in 1160, fell on the 24th of March, he declared Frederic, styled emperor of the Romans and king of Germany, a persecutor of the church, and an enemy of St. Peter, and as such solemnly excommunicated him with all his adherents, and absolved his subjects, after the example of Gregory VII., from the oath of allegiance they had taken to him. At the same time Octavian was excommunicated and anathematized anew, and all were delivered up to the devil who acknowledged him, or any ways countenanced him in his wicked usurpation.²

The following year, 1161, a peace being concluded between the kings of France and England, a council was assembled by the former at Beauvais, and another by the latter at Neuf Marché, or Newmarket, in Normandy, about six leagues distant from Beauvais, to examine the pretensions of the two competitors to the papal chair, and by both assemblies Alexander was received for lawful pope; the king of England, who had been long at a loss which of the two he should acknowledge, having, in the end, been gained over to his party by Arnulph, bishop of Lisieux, and the abbot Philip, held in great esteem for his sanctity.³ However, as few bishops were present at the council of Beauvais, and at that of Neuf Marché none but the bishops, abbots, and barons of Normandy, both princes agreed to assemble another at Toulouse, and invite to it all the bishops of their respective dominions. At this council both kings assisted in person, and were present, besides an hundred bishops and a great number of abbots, legates from the two pretenders and ambassadors from the emperor and the king of Spain. The two cardinals, Guido of Crema, and John of St. Martin, were sent by Victor, and the cardinals Henry of Pisa, John of Naples, and William of Pavia, by Alexander. Guido of Crema spoke the first, and pleaded with great eloquence the cause of Victor. But all he said being, in the opinion of the whole assembly, fully answered and confuted by William of

¹ Epist. Abbat. Philip. apud Dacher. Spicileg. tom. 2. p. 458; et Epist. Arnulph. Luxoviens. Episcop. apud Baron ad ann. 1159.

² Acta Alexandri. apud Baron. ad ann. 1160.

³ Spicileg. Dacher. tom. 2. p. 458.

¹ Helmold. Chron. Flavor. c. 91.

² Guill. Tyr. l. 18. c. 29; et Concil. tom. 10. p. 1404.

Alexander is excommunicated by the council of Lodi. Retires to France;—[Year of Christ, 1162.] The emperor endeavors to divert the king of France from receiving him. The election of Victor approved by the German bishops. Alexander at Paris; how received there;—[Year of Christ, 1163.]

Pavia, Alexander was, with one consent, proclaimed, by all but the emperor's ambassadors, lawful pope, and the sentence of excommunication at the same time thundered out against Victor and all his adherents.¹

About the same time Victor, supported by the emperor, appointed jointly with him a council to meet first at Pavia, afterwards at Cremona, and lastly at Lodi, where it was held on the festival of St. Gervasius and Protasius, that is, on the 20th of June. At that council the emperor assisted in person with all the lords of his court, with all the chief officers of his army, and a great number of German princes, bishops, abbots, and other dignitaries of the church, and by all the election of Victor was confirmed, that of Alexander was declared null, and he excommunicated as an usurper of the apostolic see. At the same time were excommunicated the archbishop of Milan, and the bishops of Placentia and Brescia, for adhering to Alexander, and for the same reason the consuls of those three cities.²

In the mean time Alexander not thinking himself safe at Rome nor even in Italy, where the party of Victor, supported by the emperor, was by far the stronger of the two, resolved to fly for refuge to France, as several of his predecessors had done before him. However, before he left Italy he solemnly canonized Edward, surnamed the Confessor, at the request of the king and the people of England. That ceremony he performed at Anagni,³ and repairing from thence to Palestrina embarked there with his retinue on board four galleys, sent by the king of Sicily to convey him to France by sea, as he could not travel thither by land without passing through the territories of the empire. The galleys were, by a violent storm, driven against some rocks and greatly damaged at their first putting to sea. But being soon refitted, Alexander pursued his voyage, and arriving at Genoa on the 21st January, 1162, was there received with all possible marks of honor and respect. He continued at Genoa till Passion-Sunday, that, in 1162, fell on the 25th of March; and being obliged by a storm to put in at a small island, he celebrated there the feast of Easter, and on the 11th of April, arrived at Maguelone, and from thence repaired to the neighboring city of Montpellier, which he entered on a white horse in his pontifical ornaments, attended by all the nobility of the country, and among the rest by the lord of Montpellier, who, on that occasion, attended his holiness as his enquiry. During his stay in that city two archbishops and six bishops came to wait upon him, and in a council, consisting of these prelates and other bishops who had

attended him from Italy, he again excommunicated his rival with all his adherents.¹

In the mean time the emperor, hearing that Alexander was arrived in France, wrote to Hugh, bishop of Soissons and chancellor of that kingdom, in the following terms; "Frederic by the grace of God emperor of the Romans, and ever August, to his beloved friend Hugh, bishop of Soissons and chancellor to the king of the Franks, greeting. We have been informed, that Roland, heretofore chancellor, being driven by our faithful subjects from Rome and all the places in that neighborhood, has exposed himself with his schismatic followers to the dangers of the sea, in order to infect the kingdom of the Franks with his schism, and extort from the inhabitants immense sums for the payment of his immense debts. We therefore beg you will by all means divert the king from receiving him, as he is an avowed enemy to God and the empire; or any of his cardinals or nuncios, lest an enmity, attended with fatal consequences, should thence arise between the two nations."² Frederic, finding that his menaces had not the wished-for effect, proposed the assembling of a council, at which he and the king should assist in person, with all bishops and chief lords of their respective dominions; that he should bring Victor with him to the council, and the king Alexander; and that both should stand to the decision of that assembly. To this proposal the king agreed, and they were to meet on the 29th of August, at St. John de Laune in Burgundy, then a frontier town. But Alexander refusing to appear at, or be judged by a council, consisting of the bishops of two nations only, the king took occasion from the emperor's not coming at the precise time to recede from his agreement, and to leave the place with all his bishops. The German bishops however met, and by them the election of Victor was confirmed, and Alexander declared an intruder into the apostolic see, and as such solemnly excommunicated.³

In the mean time Alexander having passed the winter in Aquitaine, set out from thence in the beginning of Lent for Paris, being invited thither by the king, Lewis VII., who met him at the distance of two leagues from the city, attended by all the chief lords of the kingdom, dismounted from his horse as soon as his holiness appeared, and having kissed his foot, walked about a hundred paces holding his stirrup. At the gate of the city he was met by the clergy in a body, and by them conducted, in procession, to the chief church amidst the loud acclamations of an infinite multitude of people, flocking from all quarters to receive his blessing. During his stay at Paris he consecrated the

¹ Guill. Neubrig. l. 2. c. 9. Gerhohus de Investigat. Antichristi, l. 1. et Concil. tom. 10. p. 1406.

² Otto Morena in Chron. Ludens. ad ann. 1161.

³ Bulla Canonizat. apud Surium. l. 3.

¹ Alex. Epist. 31.

² Apud Duchesm. l. 4. p. 579.

³ Idem ibid, p. 412.

Council of Tours. Decree of this council against the Albigenses. Quarrel between Henry II. of England, and Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury.

golden rose, according to custom, on midlent Sunday, and sent it to the king, celebrated the festival of Easter with great solemnity, and then taking leave of the king, repaired to Tours, where he had appointed a council to meet on the 19th of May of the present year 1163. At this council were present most of the bishops of France and England, and many from Spain, Italy, Scotland, and Ireland, in all one hundred and twenty-four, with seventeen cardinals, and four hundred and fourteen abbots. Among those from England was Thomas of Canterbury, preferred the year before to that see. He came three days before the meeting of the council, and was received at some distance from the city by all the other bishops, nay, and by all the cardinals but two, who remained with the pope, that his holiness might not be left quite alone.¹

We know no more of the acts of this council than that the decrees of the council of Pavia were annulled by it; that the election of Alexander was approved, with one consent, by all the bishops, who composed it; and Victor excommunicated with all who acknowledged him, or should thenceforth support him in his unjust usurpation. By one of the ten canons of this council all were forbidden, on pain of excommunication, to have any intercourse with those, "who taught or professed a damnable heresy long since sprung up in the territory of Toulouse." In the decree, that pretended heresy is said to have spread like a cancer, to have infected all the neighboring country, and to gain daily ground. All are therefore forbidden to harbor them in their houses, to suffer them in their cities, to buy any thing of them, or sell any thing to them; that being thus deprived of all the comforts of life, they may be compelled to repent of their errors and renounce them.² These are, it must be owned, convincing arguments; and yet those heretics were not convinced by them, as we shall see in the sequel. We have the following account of them in the annals of the abbey of Margan: "Some false prophets arose about this time, and retired to the territory of Perigord, pretending to lead apostolic lives, and imitate the manners of the apostles; they preach without intermission, walk barefooted, kneel seven times a day, and as often in the night; they receive money of nobody, eat no meat, drink no wine, use with sobriety the food that is given them: to give alms is not, they say, meritorious, because none should possess what enables them to give any; they decline receiving the holy communion, despise the mass, are ready to die, and suffer any tortures for their law; they seem to work some miracles, for they change water into wine, restore the blind to their sight, and make the

deaf hear: they who come to them, be they ever so illiterate, acquire such wisdom in eight days time as to be convinced by no arguments or examples; they have twelve masters besides their prince or chief, who is named Poncius."³ This account agrees with that we read in the monk Heribert of the heretics of Perigord, with this difference only, that they are said by Heribert to kneel a hundred times a day, and in the annals of Margan but seven times.² These heretics, to speak in the style of the writers of those times, were first called Waldenses from Peter Waldus, a citizen of Lyons, and a leading man among them, but were afterwards known by the names of Cathari, Patarini, Publicani, Apostolici, Boni Homines, Agennenses, the Perigordian Heretics, the Poor of Lyons, and lastly, the Albigenses, from the city of Albi in Languedoc, where they chiefly prevailed. That name was first given them by the prior Guafredus, who speaking in his chronicle, finished in 1184, of pope Alexander III., says that a little before his death he sent Henry, bishop of Albano, against the Albigensian heretics or the Albigenses,³ the name they are now commonly known by.

Upon the return of the archbishop of Canterbury from this council to England, a grievous quarrel broke out between him and the king, Henry II., which greatly disturbed the peace of the kingdom, and after a seven years' contest ended in the death of that prelate. The point in dispute was the liberty of the church; that is, in other words, whether the clergy were a body separate and independent on the civil power, or whether the king had any authority over ecclesiastical persons, and in ecclesiastical causes. For the clergy, availing themselves of the weakness of the preceding reign, that of king Stephen, and of the civil disturbances, that made it necessary for both parties to court their favor and connive at their encroachments, had confined every cause in which they were concerned to their own courts. This exemption from all civil justice naturally produced the most grievous disorders. For as the church disclaimed the power of condemning to the loss of life or limbs, as unbecoming the ministers of the mild Jesus, they could only fine and imprison the greatest offenders, or punish them with the loss of their benefices, and degradation; punishments not adequate to the crimes that many of the clergy committed at this time, nor sufficient to restrain others from committing them. They frequently escaped even these punishments, the prelates of the church being more intent upon screening the offenders from civil justice, than correcting their vices. No wonder,

¹ Inter Scriptores quinque Hist. Anglican.

² Mabill. Analect. l. 3. p. 467.

³ Gaufred. in Chron. p. 326.

¹ De Dico in imaginib. Hist. p. 535. Vita S. Thom. c. 14.

² Concil. tom. x.

Henry resolves to subject the clergy to the civil power. Alexander resides at Sens. Victor dies;—[Year of Christ, 1164.] Paschal III. chosen in his room. Alexander invited back to Rome. His return and reception;—[Year of Christ, 1165.]

therefore, that as in these days the clergy were, for the most part, men of no birth or education, orders being conferred upon all who asked them, Henry should have found, in 1163, that above a hundred murders had been committed by ecclesiastics since his accession to the throne in 1154, that is, in the space of nine years. This evil, now become quite insupportable, the king resolved to redress, and, in order to that, subject the clergy to the civil power, from which they had withdrawn themselves, and make no distinction between them and the laity when guilty of the same crime. But as the work I am engaged in is of too great an extent to admit of a full detail of the various steps the king took and steadily pursued for the space of near seven years to carry so laudable a design into execution; of the opposition he met with from the invincible obstinacy of the archbishop; of his negotiations at Rome, and the artful proceedings of that court in the course of so long a dispute, I shall refer my readers to the "history of the life of Henry II. by a noble and very eminent writer." They will there find that famous controversy, and the many curious events attending it, displayed at length and set in the clearest light, with some very interesting particulars, not yet communicated to the public by any historian.

To return therefore to Alexander at Tours; as it was not safe for him to go back to Rome, Lewis left him at full liberty to choose for his residence which city he liked best in all his dominions, and to all the rest he preferred Sens, in Champagne, on account of its pleasant situation, and the fertility of the neighboring country: and there he resided, governing the church as if he were at Rome, from the 30th of September, 1163, till his return to Italy in 1165.¹ During his stay at Sens, his rival Victor died at Lucca on the 22d of October 1164, and was buried by his friends in a monastery without the walls of the city, the canons of the cathedral and those of St. Fridian declaring that they would rather quit their churches than suffer one to be buried in them, whom they believed to be buried in hell.² He is painted by those of Alexander's party in the blackest colors; but his friends speak of him as a saint, and will even have him to have wrought miracles after his death. We are told that Alexander wept when news was brought him of his death, and severely reprimanded the cardinals for expressing joy on that occasion.³ Victor died, but the schism did not die with him. For the cardinals whom he had created, meeting as soon as they had performed his exequies, chose Henry,

bishop of Liege, to succeed him; and, upon his declining the offered dignity, Guido, cardinal of Crema, who very readily accepted it, and took the name of Paschal III. The emperor confirmed his election, and he was thereupon enthroned by Rainald, archchancellor and archbishop elect of Cologne, and consecrated by the above mentioned bishop of Liege on the 26th of April, which in 1164 fell on a Sunday.¹

In the mean time Alexander's affairs took a very favorable turn in Italy. For Julius, cardinal bishop of Palestrina, whom the pope had appointed his vicar in Rome, dying this year, John, presbyter cardinal of St. John and St. Paul, who succeeded him in that office, found means, as he was a man of uncommon parts and great address, to gain over several of the Roman nobility to his party. At the same time news being brought to Rome of the death of Victor, the whole Roman clergy, and with them the greater part of the people, declared for Alexander, flattering themselves that they should thus at last put an end to the schism, and the disorders that attended it. The cardinal vicar, therefore, finding the clergy thus disposed, as well as the people and the nobility, assembled them in the Lateran palace, and it was there agreed that a solemn embassy should be sent, in their name, to assure Alexander of their submission, and invite him back to Rome. With that invitation the pope, tired of his exile, readily complied, and having caused a collection to be made all over France, to defray the expenses of his journey, as the emperor had seized the revenues of his see, he set out from Sens after Easter, 1165, arrived at Montpellier in the latter end of June, and remained there till the 23d of August, when he embarked for Italy.² The emperor had laid every where snares for him, wanting to get him into his power. But he happily escaped them by steering his course to Sicily without touching at any port in Italy. He arrived at Messina in November of the present year, and was there received by William, king of Sicily, with all possible marks of honor, was entertained, during his short stay there, with the greatest magnificence, and supplied, on his departure, with five well-appointed galleys, that conveyed him safe to Ostia. He landed there on the 22d of November, and from thence was attended the next day to the Lateran palace by the clergy, in a body, by the senators, and immense crowds of people, flocking from all parts to see and acknowledge him.³ Alexander being thus restored to his see, wrote a few days after to Henry, archbishop of Reims, and his suffra-

¹ Neubrig. l. 2. c. 15. Chron. Petri Vivi ad ann. 1163.

² Epist. ad Thom. Cantuar. apud Baron. ad ann. 1161.

³ Ibid.

¹ Trithem. in Chron. Hirsang.

² Petrus Blesens. Ep. 170. Epist. Alexand. Concil. t. x. p. 1347.

³ Acta Alexand. apud Baron. ad ann. 1165.

Council of Wirtzburg. Embassadors from England at the diet of Wirtzburg. Take the same oath as was taken by the rest.

gans, to acquaint them with his safe arrival at Rome, and the reception he had met with from men of all ranks and conditions. He tells them in that letter that he had escaped many great dangers, and that the senators, the nobility, the clergy, and the people, had done to none of his predecessors more honor than they had done to him.¹

The emperor, hearing that the Romans had declared for Alexander, and invited him back to Rome, resolved to have his new pope, cardinal Guido, of Crema, or Paschal III., acknowledged, at least by all his German subjects. With that view he appointed an assembly to meet at Herbipolis, or Wirtzburg, inviting to it all the princes, bishops, and abbots of the empire. The emperor assisted at it in person, and with him about forty bishops and princes of the empire, and all were required, after they had owned Paschal for lawful pope, to swear upon the gospels and relics brought into the assembly for that purpose, that they never would acknowledge Roland, meaning Alexander, for lawful pope, nor any of his party that might be chosen to succeed him; that upon the death of Paschal they would elect one, who had adhered to him and opposed the usurper Roland, and that when the emperor died they would prefer one to the crown who had taken that oath, and never consent to the election of any other. This oath the emperor himself took the first, and after him all the bishops and princes of the empire who were present; and it was decreed, that it should be taken by all ranks of men throughout the empire, on pain of their being deemed public enemies, and forfeiting, as such, all the honors and possessions they enjoyed. This decree the emperor notified in a circulatory letter to all the princes, bishops, and abbots of the empire, insisting on their unreserved compliance with it, and commanding the bishops to exact of all under their jurisdiction the oath as prescribed by the council.²

While the diet was yet sitting, John of Oxford and Richard of Ivelchester, embassadors from the king of England, arrived in Germany, and hearing that the emperor was holding a diet at Wirtzburg, they both repaired to it, having been sent by the king, provoked beyond measure at the pope's espousing the cause of Becket, to treat of an union with the emperor against him. They were introduced to the assembly by Reinald or Reginald, archbishop of Cologne, a leading man of the anti-pope's party; and it is not, I think, to be doubted that they took the same oath that was taken by the emperor and the rest of the diet. For the emperor, in the circulatory letter which he wrote to the whole empire as an authentic account of what passed on this important

occasion, after naming several princes of the empire, who had bound themselves by the above-mentioned oath, adds: "Besides, the embassadors, sent to us by our illustrious friend Henry, the glorious king of England, have publicly sworn to us in the presence of the whole diet, and upon the relics of saints, in their master's name, that he will ever adhere to us with his whole kingdom, will ever acknowledge lord Paschal, whom we acknowledge, and will do nothing more to support the schismatic Roland."³ In a letter written to the pope by a person that was present at the diet, but did not, it seems, think it safe to set his name to his letter, and therefore sent it with this direction, "To pope Alexander a certain friend of his"—*Alexandro papæ quidam amicus ejus*—a very minute account is given of the transactions of that assembly, and among other things it is there said, that "the embassadors of the king of England took publicly, in their master's name, the same oath that the emperor had taken."⁴ They are reproached with the same oath in the life of Becket,⁵ and Becket himself, in the letter he wrote to the pope to let him know that he had excommunicated by name the two embassadors, mentions, among the other motives that had induced him to it, "the oath, which his holiness knew they had taken at the emperor's diet."⁶ On the other hand the archbishop of Rouen pledges his word in a letter he wrote to Henry, cardinal presbyter of the saints Ne-reus and Achilleus, "that, neither by himself, nor by his embassadors, had the king given any oath or promise to the emperor, that he would acknowledge the anti-pope and leave the church." He adds, that both he and the empress had written to the king, desiring him to clear himself from that imputation as soon as he possibly could.⁵ And the bishop of London in a letter to the pope assures his holiness, that "the king persevered unshaken in his fidelity to St. Peter and to him, and had declared that he had not withdrawn his regard from his holiness, nor ever intended to do it."⁶ Thus the two bishops. But it is to be observed that they knew only by report what they asserted; and I am inclined to believe, that the embassadors, finding, upon their return home, that the king thought they had gone too far, and did not approve what they had done, they publicly denied it, and thus imposed upon the two prelates. They were not ordered by the king to take that oath; for he could know nothing of such an oath when they received their instructions. But being sent to treat of an union between their master and the emperor against Alexander, they thought they might take the same oath that was taken by all who joined the emperor

¹ Concil. t. x. p. 1370.

² Codex Vatican. l. 1. Ep. 70. apud Bar. ad ann. 1166. Chron. Reichersperg. et Trithem. in Chron. Hirsang.

³ Codex Vatican. Ep. 70. apud Bar. ad ann. 1166.

⁴ Ibid. Ep. 72. ⁵ L. 2. c. 20. ⁶ Epist. 139.

⁵ Epist. 102. ⁶ Ep. 70, 71.

The emperor reduces several cities in Italy, and arrives with his army before Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1167.]
 Embassadors from the new king of Sicily to the pope. Alexander flies from Rome.

against him. As the taking of that oath was therefore their deed and not the king's, he was not bound to observe it; and as he did not approve of such an oath nor confirm it, the two bishops might have said with truth, that "neither by himself, nor by his ambassadors, had the king sworn or promised to acknowledge the anti-pope, or to withdraw his regard from his holiness." As for the testimony of John of Oxford, one of the ambassadors, denying the fact upon oath to the pope, he was too good a minister, too true to the interest of his master and his own, to speak the truth when it interfered with the one or the other; and instances are not wanting to justify Becket and his friends, calling him, as they commonly did, "John the liar of Oxford."

As many cities of Italy had revolted at the instigation of the pope, Frederic, apprehending a general revolt, resolved to march in person against them, to drive Alexander from Rome, and put Paschal in possession of that city and the apostolic see. With that view he set out in the month of November of the present year for Italy, and arriving at Roncaglia, held there a general diet of the states of Lombardy, in which Roland was declared an usurper, and it was decreed that he should be driven from the see he had usurped, and Paschal be placed in it in his room. The emperor kept his Christmas in Lombardy; and on the 18th of January 1167, began his march to Rome. As he passed through the cities of Bologna, Imola, Faenza, and Forli, he exacted large sums of the inhabitants, thus punishing them, though they made no resistance, for espousing the cause of Alexander. The city of Ancona stood a long siege, but capitulated in the end and was spared, when reduced to the utmost distress, upon their promising to pay a very large sum, and delivering up fifteen hostages for the payment thereof. From Ancona the emperor pursued his march to Rome, being pressed by messengers upon messengers from Paschal, who resided at Viterbo, to advance with his army to that city, and take him with him to Rome, still held by his antagonist, the usurper Roland. Frederic had sent, in the month of June of the preceding year, part of his army under the command of Christian, chancellor of the empire and archbishop of Mentz, to block up the city of Rome, and prevent the inhabitants from being supplied with provisions by the neighboring country. At the approach of that body, the Romans unexpectedly sallying out, fell upon them with great resolution and intrepidity; and a bloody engagement thereupon ensued. But the Romans were, after a most obstinate resistance, forced to give way, and driven back into the city with the loss of six thousand killed upon the spot, and many thou-

sands made prisoners in their retreat.¹ In the beginning of August 1167, the emperor arrived with his whole army before Rome, which obliged the pope to retire from the Lateran palace to a tower belonging to the family of the Frangipani, by far the most powerful family, after that of the Leoni, at this time in Rome.

In the mean time arrived at Rome, ambassadors from William II., king of Sicily, who had succeeded his father, William I., the preceding year. They were sent by the young prince, who was then only in the fourteenth year of his age, to acknowledge Alexander for lawful pope, and do homage to him, as such, in his name. They brought with them very large sums from their master to relieve the pope in his present unhappy circumstances, and came with several galleys to convey him safe to Sicily, or to whatever other kingdom he chose to repair to. The money he distributed among his friends, in order to its being employed by them in gaining over his enemies, but sent back the galleys, not doubting but the emperor would soon be obliged, by the extraordinary heat of the season and the climate, to quit the neighborhood of Rome, and retire to Lombardy. But he continued in his camp, harassing the Romans with daily attacks, and when he had thus quite tired them out, he caused the following proposal to be made to them in his name; namely, That both pretenders should be obliged to lay down the dignity they both claimed; and a third person be elected with the approbation and consent of the two opposite parties. The emperor promised, upon their agreeing to this proposal, to grant a lasting peace to the Roman church, to set at liberty the prisoners he had taken, and thenceforth to leave the Roman clergy for ever free to choose whom they pleased. The proposal was well received by the people, and many among them even thought that the pope ought to agree to it for their sake, seeing they had already suffered so much in his cause. This disposition in the people, and not in the people alone, but in some of the clergy, and most of the nobility, so alarmed the pope, that he escaped from Rome by night in the disguise of a pilgrim, and arriving undiscovered at Gaeta, he there reassumed the pontifical habit, and pursued his journey to Benevento. But before he left Rome, he solemnly excommunicated the emperor in a council, convened for that purpose in the Lateran, divested him of the royal and imperial dignity, and absolved his subjects from their allegiance, till he repented of his wickedness, and was reconciled with the church.² Baronius places this council at the year

¹ Acerbus Morena ad ann. 1167. Anonym. Cassin. Ceccan. ad eund. ann. ² Joan. Salisb. Ep. 89.

Contagion in the emperor's army. He returns to Lombardy. Embassy from the emperor of Constantinople to the pope;—[Year of Christ 1168.] Death of Paschal III., and election of Calixtus III.

1168. But from the contemporary writers it is manifest that Alexander left Rome in August, 1167, and did not return to that city till the year 1172.

The flight of Alexander was no sooner publicly known, than Paschal, leaving Viterbo, repaired to the emperor's camp before Rome, and was there received with all possible marks of honour by the emperor, by the bishops and princes who attended him, and the whole army. As Frederic had reduced the Leonine city, and had got possession of the church of St. Peter, Paschal celebrated mass there with great solemnity on Sunday, the 30th of July, and on the following Tuesday, the 1st of August, crowned, with the usual pomp and ceremonies, the emperor as well as the empress Beatrix, who had attended her husband in this expedition.¹

The Romans, finding that Alexander had fled and forsaken them, thought it advisable to accept the terms offered by the emperor, and all accordingly, except the family of the Frangipani, and some few more, took the oath of allegiance to Frederic, and acknowledged Paschal for lawful pope. But in the meanwhile the emperor was obliged by a great mortality, or plague, that broke out in his army, suddenly to quit the neighborhood of Rome. For on the 2d day of August, the day after the coronation, fell a most violent shower, and the sun shining out with an extraordinary heat after the shower, such a mortality began to prevail in the army that the living were scarce able to bury the dead. Many dropped down dead while they were walking about seemingly in good health, and many were found every morning dead in their tents. Persons of distinction fared no better than the common men; for of the same contagion died Frederic son of the late emperor Conrad, duke Guelph son of duke William, the archbishop of Cologne, Alexander bishop of Liege, and with them many other bishops and princes of the empire.² Thus the continuator of Acerbus Morena. For Morena himself was seized with the raging distemper, and having obtained leave of the emperor to return to Lodi, his native country, he died at Siena in his way thither.³ Frederic finding the contagion continued to rage with the same violence, and apprehending the loss of his whole army, left Paschal in the Leonine city, and decamping from before Rome on the 6th of August, set out on his march to Lombardy. But most of the cities in that country having, at the instigation of the pope, entered into a confederacy against him, and seized on the passes in the mountains, he was obliged to march a great way about, having the marquis Malespina for his guide, and he did not reach Pavia till the

11th of September. From Pavia he led the small remains of his army against the Milanese, who were at the head of the conspiracy, and then employed in rebuilding their city, which he had levelled with the ground five years before, and had forbidden any building to be ever raised on the same spot. But the Milanese, meeting him as he approached the place, put the few troops he had with him to flight, and obliged him to lay aside, for the present, all thoughts of interrupting them in the work they had begun.¹

While Alexander resided at Benevento, he received a solemn embassy from Manuel Comnenus, emperor of Constantinople, who hearing of the quarrel betwixt him and the emperor Frederic, of his having excommunicated and deposed that prince, sent one of the chief officers of his court, promising to assist his holiness with all the forces of his empire, and even to bring about an union between the two churches, provided he conferred upon him the empire of the West, which he had taken from Frederic. This proposal the pope communicated to the bishops, cardinals, and Roman noblemen who were with him, and by their advice returned the following answer to the Greek ambassador: That he was greatly obliged to his master, and returned him his most sincere thanks for so kind an offer; that he wished for nothing so much as to see a perfect harmony restored between the two churches; but as to what he desired, it was an affair of the utmost importance, would be attended with insurmountable difficulties and endless dissensions, whereas he was bound by his office to be the author of peace, and not of discord. With this answer he dismissed the ambassador, refused the very rich presents he had brought with him, and soon after sent two cardinals to negotiate a reconciliation between Constantinople and Rome.² But their negotiations proved all unsuccessful.

On the 20th of September of the present year died Paschal of a cancer after a few days illness. He died at St. Peter's; for he kept possession of that church and the Leonine city even after the retreat of the emperor; many of the Romans having declared for him, and taken an oath of allegiance to the emperor.³ In the year 1165 the emperor caused Charlemagne to be canonized by Paschal at the request, as we read in the emperor's diploma, of Henry, king of England.⁴ And he is honored in most places as a saint; but as he was canonized by an anti-pope, the Roman church only connives at the honours that are paid him. In the room of Paschal was immediately substituted, by those of his party, one John, abbot

¹ Epist. 26. l. 2. inter Epist. Thomæ Cantuar.

² Acta Alexandri. apud Baron. ad ann. 1168.

³ Seeccan. in Chron. ad ann. 1168.

⁴ Apud Bolland. ad Diem 28. Jan.

¹ Acerb. Moren. ibid. Chron. Reichersperg.

² Morena ibid. ³ Continuator Moren.

The emperor obliged to leave Italy;—[Year of Christ, 1169.] Alexandria built. Alexander sets out from Benevento on his return to Rome. Murder of the archbishop of Canterbury.

of Strum, and bishop elect of Albano, to whom they gave the name of Calixtus III. His election was confirmed by the emperor, and he was acknowledged by all who had acknowledged Paschal. But the Romans soon after declared again for Alexander, being no longer awed by the emperor, who, having lost his whole army in Lombardy, was obliged to hasten back to Germany. As his troops were either cut in pieces by the confederates of Lombardy, or swept off by the plague that still raged among them, he was forced to fly in the disguise of a valet, and having obtained leave of Hubert, or Humbert, count of Morienne and Savoy, to pass through his territories, he got thus disguised, with great difficulty, back to Germany. He left Italy in the month of March of the present year, and the people of Cremona, Milan, and Placentia, meeting upon the news of his flight at a place called Rovereta, resolved to build a city there and fortify it, in order to stop the Germans upon their first entering Italy. That work they began on the 1st of May this year, and being assisted by the inhabitants of all the neighboring villages, they carried it on with such ardor and alacrity, that, before a twelvemonth was at an end, it became a complete city, and had no fewer than fifteen hundred inhabitants. They gave it, out of respect to pope Alexander, the name of Alexandria. The inhabitants boasted of the strength of the place: but the Germans, in opposition to them and by way of contempt, called it *Palæaris*, or “a fortress of straw,” and it is known in Italy to this day by the name of *Alessandria della Paglia*.¹

The pope's last letters concerning the affair of Becket are all dated at different places, his holiness being then on the road from Benevento to Rome, whither he had been invited by the greater part of the citizens and the nobility. Before he left Benevento the inhabitants of the new built city of Alexandria sent their consuls, or chief magistrates, to subject themselves, their city, and its territory to the apostolic see, and to promise the payment of a yearly tribute to Alexander and his successors for ever. The instrument of this donation, as it is called, was signed by the consuls in the name of the inhabitants, and by sixteen cardinals.² The pope was met at Veroli, his first stage from Benevento, by the niece of the Greek emperor Manuel Comnenus, attended by a great number of Greek bishops and other persons of the first rank in the empire. She was to be married to Odo Frangipani, one of the chief lords of Rome, and the emperor had desired that the marriage ceremony might be performed by the pope, who performed it accordingly with great solemnity.³ Upon

Alexander's arrival at Tusculum, the inhabitants, who had driven out Rayno, their lawful lord, for adhering to the emperor Frederic, made a free gift of their city to St. Peter and his lawful successors in the apostolic see, which was afterwards confirmed by Rayno himself.¹ As the emperor had still a powerful party in Rome, Alexander remained at Tusculum all this and great part of the following year. For, from his letters, it appears that he kept his Easter there, which, in 1171, fell on the 28th of March.

At Tusculum Alexander received the news of the death of the archbishop of Canterbury, inhumanly murdered in his own cathedral. As that obstinate prelate continued, even after his reconciliation with the king, and his return to England, to act in the same arbitrary manner as before, Henry, who was then in Normandy, being informed of his furious proceedings, broke out, in the transport of his passion, into these words:—“I am very unhappy that among the many whom I have obliged and maintain, there is not one that has courage enough to revenge the affronts I daily receive from a turbulent priest.” From these hasty expressions his servants concluding that he really wanted to get rid of the man who gave him so much uneasiness, and reproached them with ingratitude and cowardice in tamely suffering him to be so grossly insulted by one of his subjects, four gentlemen of his bedchamber, Reginald Fitz-Urse, William de Tracy, Hugh de Moreville, and Richard Brito, resolved to make the archbishop atone with his blood for the trouble he had already given to his sovereign, and prevent his creating him any further uneasiness. Pursuant to this resolution, they crossed over to England, unknown to the king, at least without communicating to him their design, and being there joined and assisted by some of Becket's most inveterate enemies, they rushed into the cathedral, where he was assisting at Vespers, or evening prayers, and paying no regard to the sacredness of the place, dispatched him with repeated blows at the high altar. As for the particular circumstances attending so horrid and shocking a murder, some of them not commonly known, and the resolution, firmness, and constancy truly heroic, and worthy of a much better cause, with which the archbishop encountered death, I shall refer the reader to the full detail he will find of the whole in the life of Henry II. quoted above, and here only exhibit the portrait of so famous a prelate in the colors in which it has been drawn by the noble author of that work.

“Thus fell” (these are his lordship's own words, after relating the inhuman and barbarous manner in which he fell) “Thomas Becket, archbishop of Canterbury, on the

¹ Acta Alexand. apud Ughel. Italia Sacra, l. 4.

² Idem ibid.

³ Ceccan. in Chron.

¹ Acta Alex. Anonym. Cassin.

Character of the archbishop of Canterbury. The news of his death; how received by the pope;—[Year of Christ, 1171.] The king sends ambassadors to Rome to vindicate his innocence. The reception they met with.

29th of December in the year 1170, being the fifty-third of his age, a man of as great talents as any of the age he lived in, and for courage, fortitude, and intrepidity inferior to none we read of in the annals of the church. As to his character in other respects, every reader may judge of it from his conduct, a conduct not only inconsistent with, but diametrically opposite to that subjection to the higher powers which is so much recommended to all in Holy Writ. The haughty prelate, possessed with a notion of the sacerdotal and archiepiscopal dignity, had, it seems, nothing less in his view, than to share the sovereignty with his sovereign, and to make himself, under his lord the pope, as absolute a monarch over the clergy of all ranks and degrees, as the king was over the laity. Had he shed his blood in the cause of God and religion, the resolution, courage, and resignation with which he suffered, would entitle him to a place among the most illustrious martyrs. But as he laid down, or rather threw away, his life to maintain the papal usurpations, in direct opposition to the laws of his country, and his duty as a subject, he ought rather to be looked upon as a traitor and a rebel than a martyr, the title with which Rome, in whose service he died, has honored and distinguished him; for it is not what a man suffers, but the cause, in which he suffers, that makes him a martyr—*non martyrem facit pœna, sed causa*. Had Becket coolly thought it his duty to support, even at the expense of his life, the exorbitant power claimed by Rome, which seems altogether incredible in a man of his understanding, that would indeed excuse his opposing all means calculated to reduce that power. But what can be alleged to justify or excuse the methods he pursued in his opposition, the cunning and falsity with which he acted on several occasions, as we have seen, his haughty and insolent behavior not only to his brethren, but to his sovereign, and the spirit of revenge, scarce governable by the pope himself, which he betrayed throughout the course of this long dispute?"

The death of the archbishop was first notified to the pope by the French king, Lewis VII., who no sooner heard of it than he dispatched messengers to Rome with letters containing an account of so barbarous a murder with all its aggravating circumstances, and exciting his holiness to draw the sword of St. Peter and revenge it. Alexander was so affected with it, that, shutting himself up for the space of near eight days, he would transact no business, nor admit any person whatever to his presence except his domestics. William, archbishop of Sens, the pope's legate in France, and Thibaut, or Theobald, earl of Blois, wrote much to the same purpose as the king, being both

most zealously attached to Becket and his cause.¹ On the other hand Arnold, bishop of Lizieux, wrote strongly in favor of the king, assuring the pope that the murder was committed altogether unknown to him; that far from commanding or approving so wicked an attempt, he expressed the greatest sorrow when he was informed of it, betook himself to his room, and there, abstaining for the space of three days from all nourishment, would admit none to comfort him; insomuch that they began to apprehend that the death of the archbishop would be the occasion of his. He closed his letter with entreating his holiness to punish the guilty according to the enormity of their crime, but to spare the king, who, he assures him, was free from all guilt.² This letter was written in an assembly of bishops, and signed by all who were present.

At the same time the king, not doubting but his enemies would charge the death of the archbishop upon him, dispatched a solemn embassy to the pope to vindicate his innocence, and divert his holiness from proceeding, at their instigation, to any censures against him or his kingdom. The ambassadors with great difficulty got, some sooner, some later, to Tusculum, having been obliged to take different routs after their entering Italy, and to travel over rocks and mountains at a distance from the highway, the public roads being all strictly guarded by the imperialists under the command of count Macarius, who suffered none to pass that were going to the pope or to Rome. The ambassadors, sparing no fatigue, had travelled night and day, and exposed themselves to the greatest dangers, in order to reach Tusculum before Maundy Thursday, as they apprehended that the pope would on that day (the day on which excommunications were then, as they still are, thundered out) excommunicate the king, if they arrived not in time to prevent it. But upon their arrival they found the pope so prejudiced against the king, that he would neither see nor hear them. However, he was in the end with great difficulty prevailed upon by the king's friends in the college of cardinals to grant an audience to two of them, the abbot Wallace and the archdeacon of Lizieux, as less suspected of partiality to the king than the rest. They were heard in a full consistory, but when they mentioned the king in saluting the pope in his name, the whole assembly cried out, "forbear, forbear," as struck with horror at hearing his name, and they were immediately dismissed. However, they obtained, by means of the cardinals in the king's interest, a private audience of his holiness in the evening of the same day, when they ingenuously owned that

¹ Epist. 78, 81, 82. l. 5.

² Epist. 79.

The pope resolved to excommunicate the king. By what means diverted from it. Two legates a Latere sent into Normandy. Their first interview with the king.

from some hasty expressions, dropt by the king in his wrath, the assassins might have concluded that he wanted to be delivered from one who created him so much uneasiness, but assured his holiness, that their master was no otherwise accessory to his death. At the same time they confirmed all the bishop of Lizieux had said in his letter. The same things they repeated in a full consistory. But in spite of all their remonstrances, of all they could offer to vindicate the king's innocence, it was resolved by a great majority in the consistory, that on the approaching Thursday the sentence of excommunication should be solemnly pronounced against the king by name, and that all his dominions in France as well as in England should be put under an interdict. This resolution was privately communicated by some of the king's friends in the consistory to the English ambassadors, who, dreading the consequences that would attend it if carried into execution, left nothing in their power unattempted to divert the pope from proceeding to such extremities. But their endeavors proving all ineffectual, they resolved, after much consultation among themselves, to save the king and the kingdom at their own peril, pretending that they had orders from their master to swear in his name, that in this affair he would stand to the judgment of his holiness, and would personally take that oath, if his holiness required him to take it. This they imparted to such of the cardinals as they could confide in, who, highly approving of it, immediately notified the pretended order to the pope; and a consistory being thereupon called, it was determined, that the ambassadors should take that oath, and that the sentence of excommunication against the king, and of interdict against the kingdom, should be suspended for the present. The pope and the cardinals well knew, that they should reap much greater advantages from the king's submitting to their judgment, than from any sentence they could thunder out against him or his kingdom; and therefore upon the ambassadors taking the above mentioned oath in the king's name, which they did in the presence of the pope and all the cardinals, the pope, sparing the king and the kingdom, contented himself with solemnly excommunicating all, who had been any ways concerned in, or had consented to the death of the archbishop, and all who should knowingly receive them into their territories, or afford them any relief or assistance whatever.¹ This sentence was pronounced on Maundy Thursday, which in the present year, 1171, fell on the 25th of March.

The bishops of Worcester and Evreux, two of the ambassadors (for they were in all

nine) did not reach Tusculum till after Easter, having been obliged to travel a great way about to avoid the Germans that guarded the roads. They had a public audience of the pope soon after their arrival, and upon their confirming what the others had said to exculpate the king, the pope resolved, with the advice of the cardinals, to send two legates *a Latere* into Normandy, with full power to absolve the king from any censure he might have incurred if they found him innocent of the murder; and if guilty, to proceed to the censures of the church against him and his kingdom. The persons chosen for this legation were Theodine cardinal presbyter of St. Vitalis, and Albert cardinal presbyter of St. Lawrence in Lucina, at this time chancellor of the holy Roman church, and afterwards raised to the apostolic see under the name of Gregory VIII. The legates arrived early next year in Normandy, and the king, who was then engaged in the conquest of Ireland, no sooner heard of their arrival than he hastened back to England, and from thence to Normandy, where he met the legates at a place called Gorne, and was received by them with all possible marks of respect and esteem, nay, and with the kiss of peace. The next day they proceeded together to Savigni, where the king had appointed the archbishop of Rouen, and all the other bishops as well as barons to meet him. At this assembly the legates, in the first place, required the king to take the oath that his ambassadors had taken in his name at Tusculum. The ambassadors had writ to the king to acquaint him with the oath they had taken, and to beg he would excuse their taking it, as they could by no other means divert the pope from excommunicating him, and interdicting all his dominions. Whether the king approved of what they had done we know not. But at this assembly he peremptorily refused to take that oath, and finding that the legates as peremptorily insisted upon his taking it, he abruptly left the assembly, saying, he would return to Ireland, whither he was called by affairs of the greatest importance. The legates, alarmed at his sudden departure, and wanting to bring the affair, upon which they were sent, to a happy issue, applied to the bishops of Lizieux and Salisbury, and the archdeacon of Poitiers, in whom they knew the king entirely confided; and he was by them prevailed upon to suspend his return to Ireland, and meet the legates again. He met them accordingly at Avranches; and at this second meeting there appeared a change in his whole conduct as remarkable as it was unaccountable, such a change as surprised the legates themselves, and all the bishops and barons who were present. For, tamely complying with every thing the legates required of him, he not only swore upon the gospels, at their request, that he

¹ Epist. 83. l. 5. See the Life of Henry II.

The king is absolved by the legates. Becket canonized;—[Year of Christ, 1173.]

had neither commanded the death of the archbishop, nor consented to it, nor approved of it, but took, without the least hesitation, without betraying the least unwillingness, the very oath, which he had rejected with the utmost indignation but a few days before, namely, that he would perform what penance soever the legates should impose upon him, and give them what satisfaction they should think fit to require.

As Becket lost his life in the cause of Rome, the legates, availing themselves of the present disposition of the king to make him pay dear for the blood of their martyr, imposed upon the penitent prince, now at their mercy, the following penance, than which they could scarce have imposed one heavier, had he owned himself guilty of the crime, of which they had made him swear he was innocent. I. That he should maintain, at his own expense, for the space of a twelve month, two hundred men, to be employed against the infidels in the Holy Land, and that the sum necessary for that purpose should be settled by the knights templars. II. That he should take the cross at Christmas next ensuing, should go in person to the Holy Land, should serve there three years, unless dispensed with by the pope. III. That he should abolish all the evil customs that had been introduced into the church in his time. IV. That appeals should be made freely to the pope in ecclesiastical causes; that the king should neither hinder them himself nor permit others to hinder them; but if any should be suspected of having evil designs against the king or the kingdom, they should give security before they departed out of his dominions. V. That he should never forsake pope Alexander nor his lawful successors, so long as they behaved towards him as a catholic king. And, lastly, that he should make full restitution of all the possessions enjoyed by the church of Canterbury a twelvemonth before the archbishop incurred his displeasure; should receive into favor all the archbishop's friends, the laity of both sexes, as well as the clergy, and restore to them whatever they had forfeited on his account. These articles were all agreed to by the king, and he not only bound himself by a solemn oath upon the Holy Gospels to observe them, but obliged king Henry, his son, to take the same oath, and promise to fulfil the enjoined penance, so far as it was not personal, if he himself should be prevented by death from completing it. And now the legates, highly satisfied with the behavior of the king, absolved him from the censures he was supposed to have incurred by being in some degree accessory to the death of the archbishop. All this happened on the Sunday preceding the festival of the Ascension, 1172, and the king, as well as his son, renewed the same oath and the same promises in a council of all the bi-

shops and abbots of Normandy, assembled at Avranches, on the 27th of September of the present year.¹ It is to be observed that the king only promised to abolish the unlawful customs that had been introduced in his time, which no ways affected the customs that were the original cause of the quarrel between the archbishop and him. For these customs had obtained long before he came to the crown, and were only revived and confirmed in his reign. Indeed the important article of appeals, to which Rome had, till this time, but a very precarious title, was given up; so that in the end, the pope gained more, as has been observed by the learned author of King Henry's Life, by the death of Becket, than he probably would have done by all the attempts of his life.

The affair being thus ended, the legates, entirely satisfied with the behavior of the king, returned triumphant to Rome, carrying with them part of the brains of their new martyr that was scattered over the floor of the church, and his bloody cassock, which are supposed to be still preserved, and on the day of his festival are exposed to public view in the basilic of St. Mary the Greater, at Rome. He had deserved too well of the church, or rather of the court, of Rome, not to be honored with a place in their calendar. To make the world therefore believe that the cause of that court was the cause of God, miracles without number, more stupendous than any wrought by our Savior or the apostles, were said and believed to be daily wrought at the tomb of the new martyr. Of these miracles the legates gave the pope a particular account on their return from Normandy, and upon their report, though it was but a hearsay report, for they never set foot in England, the pope, being then at Segni, assembled all the bishops and abbots of Campania, and with their consent and approbation, declared Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, worthy of a place in the calendar, said mass in his honor on the 21st of February, and ordered his festival to be kept yearly on the 29th of December, the day of his death. On that day it is still kept with great solemnity at Rome, and the cardinals, with all who belong to the congregation of the ecclesiastical immunity, assist at high mass in the church of the English College dedicated to St. Thomas of Canterbury, whose picture is there to be seen over the high altar with a sabre stuck in the crown of his head. The canonization of the new saint, the pope notified to the clergy of Canterbury by a private letter, and to the whole church by a letter addressed to all the faithful, both dated at Segni the 12th of March of the present year.²

The emperor Frederic continued, during this long contest between the pope and the

¹ Epist. 88, 89. l. 5.

² See the life of Henry II.

The emperor besieges Alexandria, but is obliged to raise the siege;—[Year of Christ, 1174.] His army defeated;—[Year of Christ, 1175.] Concludes a peace with the pope;—[Year of Christ, 1176.] Congress held at Venice;—[Year of Christ, 1177.]

king of England, to oppose Alexander to the utmost of his power. In Germany, Guido of Crema, or Paschal III., was almost universally acknowledged for lawful pope, and upon his death in 1168, the abbot of Struma, under the name of Calixtus III. But on the other hand the allied cities of Lombardy continued to adhere, with great steadiness, to Alexander. Frederic therefore, having in 1174 spent the whole year in military preparations, entered Lombardy at the head of a powerful army, in the latter end of that or the beginning of the following year, with a design to reduce those cities, and march a second time from Lombardy to Rome. He began with the siege of the new-built city of Alexandria. But so vigorous was the opposition he met with from the inhabitants, that he was obliged after four months to abandon the enterprize. We are told, that the emperor having treacherously attacked the city, notwithstanding the truce he had concluded with the besieged, during the holy week, he was repulsed with great slaughter; and that St. Peter, to whom they had made a free gift of their city, was seen heading them upon a white horse, probably the same white horse upon which Pollux was seen many ages before heading the Romans. The emperor despairing, after this check, to reduce the place, raised the siege on Easter-day, and retired with his army to Pavia. As the army of the Lombards, far more numerous than his, was ready to fall upon him, he pretended to be desirous of negotiating a reconciliation with the pope, and sent ambassadors with some proposals to be examined by the cardinals, begging that should they be approved of, legates might be sent to treat of an entire agreement between the church and the empire. The pope suspected the sincerity of the emperor, as if he only wanted to extricate himself out of his present difficulties. However, he sent the bishops of Porto and Ostia with the cardinal of St. Peter ad Vincula to treat with him as legates of the apostolic see, and in the mean time ordered the Lombards to abstain from all hostilities. The emperor received the legates with all possible marks of respect; but as he only wanted to gain time, he soon broke off the treaty, and being reinforced with fresh supplies from Germany, he fell unexpectedly upon the allied army. The combat was most obstinate and lasted many hours, great numbers falling, and among them persons of the first rank, on both sides. At last victory declared for the allies; the emperor's army was forced to give way, and the emperor himself obliged to retire, with the remains of his broken forces, to Modena.

Frederic now despairing of being ever able to subdue the rebellious Lombards, began seriously to think of concluding a peace

with the pope. With that view he sent three of the chief men of the empire, namely, the bishop of Magdeburg, the archbishop of Mentz, and the bishop elect of Worms, to treat with the pope, who then resided at Anagni, about an agreement between the church and the empire. They had several conferences with the pope and his ministers, and great disputes arose; but in the end the following terms were agreed upon: 1. That the emperor should grant peace to pope Alexander, and acknowledge him for lawful pope, as well as his successors lawfully elected. 2. That he should restore to him the prefecture of the city, and the territories of the countess Mathilda to the Roman church. 3. That he should make full restitution of all the lands and demesnes of the Roman church that he had seized, and cause, so far as in him lay, those to be restored that had been seized by others. Lastly, that the allied cities of Lombardy, the king of Sicily, and all who had adhered to the pope, should be included in this treaty; that a congress should be held to settle all other points in dispute, and a safe conduct be granted to the ministers of the different powers resorting to it.

These articles being agreed and sworn to by the envoys of Frederic, the pope resolved to assist in person at the congress, and leaving, with that view, Anagni, he repaired first to Monte Gargano, and being met at a small distance from that place by the king of Sicily, he was supplied by him with a squadron of thirteen galleys to convey him to Venice. He arrived in that city on the 23d of March 1177, and being there received with all possible marks of respect and esteem, he appointed the deputies of the Lombard cities to meet him at Ferrara on Passion-Sunday, which, in 1177, fell on the 10th of April. They met him accordingly at the time and place appointed, and the city of Venice was by all pitched upon for the place of the congress, but upon condition that the doge and the people should swear that they would not suffer the emperor to come into the city without the pope's leave, till the peace was firmly established. As the chief articles had been agreed upon at Anagni, every thing was soon settled to the entire satisfaction of the contending parties. Some disputes only arose between the ministers of the emperor and the Lombard deputies concerning the lands they held of the empire. But the points in dispute were left, for the present, undetermined, and a six years' truce was granted to the Lombards, that they might, during that time, inquire into the grounds of the emperor's claims. At the same time, a fifteen years' peace was concluded between the emperor and the king of Sicily.

To these articles the emperor's ministers

The pope and the emperor meet. The pope holds a council at Venice. The pope's treading on the emperor's neck a mere fable; and his granting the dominion of the Adriatic sea to the Venetians. Messenger sent to the pope by presbyter John, king of India.

swore by his order, in his name; and Frederick being thereupon invited to Venice, he landed there on the 24th of July, and on the same day the pope sent some cardinals to receive his abjuration of the schism, and absolve him from all the anathemas that had been thundered out against him. Being thus absolved he repaired the same day to the church of St. Mark, where the pope waited for him, attended by all the clergy and all the nobility, at the church door. As he approached the pope he quitted the imperial mantle, and prostrating himself upon the ground kissed his holiness' foot. The pope raised him, gave him the kiss of peace, and the emperor holding the pope's right hand, they both walked into the church quite up to the high altar, where the pope gave him his benediction a second time. Andreas Dandulus, doge of Venice, tells us, that the pope walked up to the high altar between the emperor and the duke or doge.¹ The next day the pope celebrated mass with great solemnity, being the 25th of July, the festival of St. James the apostle, and the emperor received, as some authors tell us, the sacrament at the pope's hand. When divine service was over the emperor attended his holiness to his horse, and held the stirrup while he mounted.

The pope, before he left Venice, held a council, at which were present many German and great numbers of Italian bishops. The pope presided in person, the emperor sitting by him; and by this assembly the articles of the late agreement were all confirmed, the sentence of excommunication was solemnly pronounced against such as did not acknowledge Alexander, and on the 27th of September the treaty was signed and sealed by the pope, the emperor, the cardinals, and all the German princes who were present. A few days after the emperor, taking leave of the pope, retired to Ravenna, and from thence to Cesena, but left the archbishop of Mentz at the pope's court to settle some points in dispute relative to the territories of the countess Mathilda, and to cause full restitution to be made to the Roman church of all the lands, rights, and privileges she had enjoyed before the schism. The pope left Venice about the middle of October, and being attended by the galleys of the republic to Siponto, in Apulia, he pursued his journey from thence, by land, to Anagni, and arrived there on the 14th of December of the present year.

We are told by Fortunatus Ulmus, and some other writers, who flourished long after these times, that upon the emperor's prostrating himself before the pope, his holiness set his foot upon his neck, repeating the words of the ninety-first Psalm, "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and the adder; the

lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under thy feet;" and that the emperor answering, "Not to you, but to Peter," the pope replied, "To me and to Peter." But as no notice is taken of so very remarkable a circumstance, either by the author of the "Acts of Alexander," or by Romuald, archbishop of Salerno, who were both present, and have given us a minute account of every thing that passed on this occasion, that story, though for some ages credited, is now universally exploded as entirely fabulous. What we read in some Venetian writers is no less romantic, namely, that on this occasion Alexander granted to that republic the dominion of the Adriatic sea. For it does not appear that any pope has, to this day, ever claimed the dominion of that or any other sea whatever, or the power of disposing of any sea. The famous father, Paul, in his treatise of the dominion of the Adriatic sea, endeavors to prove that the Venetians are lords of that gulf, not by the grant of any pope or emperor, but because they seized on it when abandoned by the emperors of the West, and all other Christian powers. But nothing is more certain in history than that the Norman princes, masters of the present kingdom of Naples and Sicily, kept constantly fleets in the ports of the Adriatic, as lords of that sea, quite undisturbed by the Venetians, and that it was not till the times of the kings of the Arragon family, that the Venetians, being become more powerful at sea than those princes, began to claim the dominion of the gulf, and not to suffer any armed vessels to enter it, nor any commerce to be carried on in that sea without their permission.¹

While Alexander was still at Venice, arrived in that city one Philip, a physician, who had travelled into the East, and informed the pope that in those parts reigned a powerful prince, who was a priest or a presbyter, but a Nestorian; that he possessed very extensive dominions; and being desirous that he and his subjects should hold and profess no other doctrine but that which was held and professed by the apostolic see, he had commissioned him to beg of his holiness a church in Rome, with an habitation for such of his subjects as he should send, from time to time, to reside there, in order to learn, upon the spot, the doctrines as well as the practices of the Roman church, and instruct their countrymen on their return home. Alexander immediately sent Philip back with a letter to the king, dated at Rialto the 27th of October, wherein he tells him that Philip, whom he sends with the character of his legate, will instruct him in the more material points, and that he has already allotted a church and a proper habitation for the reception of those whom he

¹ In Chron. ad ann. 1177.

¹ Giannoni Hist. Civil. di Napoli. l. 13. c. 1. sect. 1.

Presbyter John's kingdom; where situated. Alexander returns to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1178.] The anti-pope Calixtus III. submits to Alexander. Landus, the fourth anti-pope, is taken and confined for life.

shall be pleased to send to Rome. The direction of the letter was, "Pope Alexander to his beloved son, Presbyter John, the illustrious and magnificent king of the Indians."

Baronius supposes Presbyter John, or as we call him, Prester John, to have reigned in Abyssinia or Ethiopia. But as these are provinces of Africa, the pope would not have styled him king of the Indians or of India, which is part of Asia, had he reigned in Africa. The more judicious among our modern travellers will have Prester John to have been king of the present kingdom of Tanchut, called by the Tartars "Barantola," by the Turks "Boratai," and by the inhabitants "Lassa." The names of "Pretejanne, Pretejannus, and Prester John," are corruptions of the two Latin words "Presbyter Joannes." William of Tripoli informs us that, in 1098, one Choires was "cham" or sovereign of the most eastern parts of Asia, and that upon his death a presbyter, named John, invaded his kingdom, and subdued it. The presbyter, adds Nangius, had a son named David, who succeeded him; but the Tartars, provoked at his laying heavier burdens upon them than they could bear, revolted and murdered him with all his family, except one daughter. The daughter was afterwards married to Cyngis, cham or king of the country which her father and grandfather had held; and from her were descended the chams, who were lords of that country in 1270, when Paulus Marcus Venetus visited those parts. For speaking of the kingdom of Tartary, "there reigned," says he, "that great king famous all over the world, and commonly known by the name of Presbyter John. But, at present, that province pays tribute to the grand cham of Tartary, and is governed by a king descended from the presbyter," namely, by his granddaughter, the rest of his family having been all cut off by the Tartars.

Alexander returned, as has been said, from Venice to Anagni on the 14th of December 1177, and the Romans of the imperial party being now abandoned by the emperor, and no longer in a condition to oppose him, he returned to Rome, and entered that city, in a kind of triumph, on the 12th of March 1178, being attended by the clergy in a body, by the senate, by all the nobility, and vast crowds of people flocking from all parts, to congratulate him upon his return, and the peace he had happily concluded between the church and the empire. On the 19th of the same month, that fell on a Sunday, the fourth Sunday in Lent, he assisted at a solemn procession, and was on Easter-day crowned a second time with great solemnity.² For in those days it was customary for the popes to be crowned not only upon their

consecration, but upon many other occasions, and on all the great festivals.¹ Petrus Mallius, canon of St. Peter's, mentions fifteen festivals (and some he has omitted) on which the popes used to be crowned in different churches.²

The abbot of Struma, whom the imperial party had elected under the name of Calixtus III., no sooner heard of the peace concluded between Frederic and Alexander, than leaving Viterbo, where he had hitherto resided, he retired to Mont Albano, a strong-hold belonging to a nobleman, his friend and protector. But the emperor insisting upon his submitting to Alexander, and upon that nobleman's withdrawing his protection from him if he did not submit, he resolved to throw himself upon the pope's mercy; and accordingly repairing with the heads of his party to Tusculum, he there prostrated himself, in the presence of all the cardinals, before Alexander, kissed his foot, and acknowledging him for the lawful successor of St. Peter, owned himself guilty of the greatest impiety in usurping a dignity to which he had no kind of right, and raising by that means such disturbances in the church. The pope, far from reproaching him with what he had done, received him with the greatest marks of kindness, absolved him from the censures he had incurred, and having kept him for some time at his court, and even admitted him to his table, he appointed him governor of the city of Benevento.³ He is placed by some writers among the archbishops of Benevento, and said to have been preferred by Alexander to that see, but to have died the same year, 1178.

The abdication of Calixtus did not put an end to the schism. For the schismatics, headed by the brother of the late anti-pope, Victor IV., a nobleman of great power and authority in Rome, chose one Landus, of the family of the Frangipani, under the name of Innocent III. The new anti-pope retired from Rome to a strong-hold in the neighborhood of that city, belonging to the brother of the anti-pope Victor, to whom he owed his election, and was there supported some time by his followers against all the efforts of Alexander. But the pope having purchased the strong-hold with a large sum of money, and by that means engaged the owner to withdraw his protection from the usurper, the place was closely besieged, and forced in the end to submit. Landus attempted to make his escape, but was taken and brought to Alexander, who confined him for life to the monastery of Cava, and the heads of his party to other monasteries.⁴ Thus ended at last the longest schism that had ever yet rent the church, having been

¹ Paul. Venet. l. i. c. 64. Guill. Trip. ad ann. 1098. Nangius ad ann. 1300.

² Acta Alex. et Ceccan. in Chron.

VOL. II.—66

¹ Mabill. Museum Ital. l. 2. p.

² Idem ibid, p. 158.

³ Rouvald. Salernitan. et Ceccan in Chron.

⁴ Ceccan. in Chron. Auctor. Aquinct. an. ann. 1179.

Council of Lateran and its canons:—[Year of Christ, 1179.] Lawrence, archbishop of Dublin, appointed legate for Ireland. The doctrine of Peter Lombard condemned by the pope.

carried on by four anti-popes, succeeding each other, for the space of twenty-one years.

As many abuses had crept into the church during so long a schism, Alexander, now universally acknowledged for lawful pope, resolved to spend the remainder of his life in reforming them. With that view he appointed a general council to meet at the Lateran, on the first Sunday in Lent 1179, and sent circulatory letters, inviting to it all the bishops in Christendom. In compliance with that invitation, three hundred bishops met at the place appointed, but the council did not sit till Monday after the third Sunday in Lent, that is, till the fifth of March of the present year. At this council the pope presided in person, attended by all the cardinals, and by the prefect, the consuls, and the senators of Rome, in a body. There were in all but three sessions; the first on the fifth of March, as has been said, the second on the seventh according to some, on the seventeenth according to others, and the third on the nineteenth of the same month.¹ In these three sessions twenty-seven canons were issued, whereof the following are the most worthy of notice. I. That for the future, to prevent schisms and divisions in the church, he alone should be deemed lawfully elected to the pontifical dignity, in whose election concurred two parts in three of the electors; and that if any, having but one third or less than two, should assume the title of pontiff, he and all who adhered to him should forfeit all their benefices, should be excommunicated, and excluded from the eucharist except at the point of death. The fathers declared, that this canon no ways affected those that had been wisely enacted concerning the election of other bishops, namely, that he should be held as canonically elected, who had any majority whatever on his side. For the disputes, say they, that may arise in other churches concerning elections, may be decided by their superiors: but the Roman church has no superior. II. All the ordinations made by the anti-popes were declared null; and those, upon whom they had bestowed benefices or dignities, were required, on pain of excommunication, forthwith to resign them. III. The bishops, who had adhered to any of the anti-popes, were ordered by the pope and the council to abjure the schism in the following words, before they were absolved from the censures they had incurred. "I renounce and anathematize all heresies against the holy Roman and catholic church, especially the schism of Octavian, Guido, and John. I acknowledge their ordinations to be null. I swear and promise obedience to the holy Roman church, to pope Alexander,

and his successors lawfully elected. I shall serve him without guile or deceit against all men, as is required by my order. I shall reveal to no man the counsels he shall communicate to me in writing or otherwise, but keep them inviolably secret even at the expense of my life and limbs. I shall honor the legates of the Roman church, shall attend them in coming and returning, and contribute to defray their expenses. So help me God and these his holy Gospels. IV. A thundering decree was issued against the heretics, called Cathari, Patareni, and Publicani, who no longer concealed, but openly taught their damnable errors in the territories of Ally and Toulouse, that is, the Albigenes, the name which they are now commonly known by. They were solemnly anathematized by the council, and all were forbidden, on pain of excommunication, to receive them into their houses, to suffer them in their territories, to buy any thing of them, or sell any thing to them. And it was ordained, that they who should, under any pretence whatever, transgress this decree, should have no offerings made for them after their death, nor should they be buried among Christians. Thus were those unhappy men banished all human society, and driven into the deserts to perish there of hunger among the wild beasts.¹

At this council Lawrence, archbishop of Dublin, was appointed by the pope his legate a *Latere* for Ireland, and vested with full power over all the bishops and churches of that kingdom. He is said to have discharged that office to the entire satisfaction of the apostolic see, and to have made it his chief business to check and restrain the incontinence of the clergy. He had, as archbishop and apostolic legate, full power to absolve the guilty from that and every other crime. But not choosing to make use of that power with respect to the incontinent clergy, he sent them all to Rome to be absolved there by the pope, not doubting but shame, as well as the trouble and expense of so long a journey, would oblige them to contain. Thus the author of his life, who adds, that at one time he sent no fewer than one hundred and forty priests to Rome, all convicted of incontinence.² Were incontinence a case now reserved to the pope, and all incontinent priests obliged to repair to Rome for absolution, very few, perhaps, if any, would be left at home.

The pope was for condemning in the Lateran council the doctrine of the famous Peter Lombard, formerly bishop of Paris, concerning Christ. For he had maintained that Christ was not man, but only God; and in his writings was found this proposition, "Christ as man is nothing," which the pope

¹ Concil. tom. 19. p. 1607. Anonym. Cassin. Dacher. Spicileg. tom. 12. p. 638. Guillelm. Tyr. l. 2. c. 16.

² Concil. tom. 10. p. 1603. et seq.

² Auctor. Vit. apud Surium, ad diem 14 Novem. c. 24.

Alexander bestows the title of king upon Alphonsus of Portugal. Applies to the Christian princes for new supplies against the Saracens;—[Year of Christ, 1180.] His death;—[Year of Christ, 1181.] His character. Reserves the canonization of saints to the apostolic see.

would have condemned in the council, had not some cardinals remonstrated against his branding the memory of so great a man in so public a manner. The pope acquiesced, but upon the breaking up of the council he declared Christ to be true God and true man, condemned the above proposition as heretical, without mentioning its author, and wrote to William archbishop of Reims and his legate in France, ordering him to assemble all the professors in the cities of Paris, of Reims, and other places, and forbid them in his name, on pain of excommunication, to teach for the future that "Christ as man is nothing," the contrary doctrine being held and taught by the catholic church, namely, that "as Christ is true God, so is he true man, consisting of human flesh and a rational soul."

As the popes had taken upon them, ever since the time of Gregory VII. to dispose of royal titles, and to make kings as well as unmake them, Alexander acknowledged this year Alphonsus, the first of that name, for king of Portugal, in consideration of the many signal victories he had gained over the Moors or Saracens. He was only styled duke of Portugal till the year 1139, when upon his giving a total overthrow to a very numerous army of Saracens he was saluted by his own soldiers with the title of king, and from that time honored with that title by all the other princes. However, Alexander continued to style him duke of Portugal till the present year, when, by a particular bull, he bestowed upon him the title of king. Of this grant mention is made by pope Innocent III., raised to the see in 1198. For that pope, in a letter to Sanctius I. the son and successor of Alphonsus, tells him that till the time of Alexander, his predecessor in the apostolic see, his father Alphonsus had been only styled duke, but deserved to obtain of the same holy pope the title of king for himself and his heirs. Alphonsus was honored with the royal title, as I have observed, by all the other princes many years before the pope conferred it upon him; so that it was not to his holiness he owed it, nor did other princes wait for the pope's bull or approbation to bestow it upon him.²

The following year, 1180, was wholly employed by the pope in procuring supplies in men and money for the Christians in the Holy Land against Saladin, prince of the Saracens, who had gained great advantages over them, and even threatened Jerusalem with a siege. He wrote very pressing letters to Henry II. king of England, and Philip king of France, who had this year succeeded his father Lewis VII. in that kingdom, representing to them the danger the holy city was in unless speedily relieved. But of these princes he could obtain nothing be-

sides fair promises, and in the mean time the Saracens carried all before them, which gave the pope such concern as was thought to have hastened his death.¹

As Geoffry, the natural son of Henry II. had been elected bishop of Lincoln, and had for eight years enjoyed the revenues of that see, without entering into orders, the pope wrote this year to Richard, archbishop of Canterbury, commanding him to oblige Geoffry to take holy orders without delay, or give up his election. He chose the latter, and was thereupon preferred by the king his father to the office of chancellor.² This is the last thing we read of Alexander; for he died on the festival of St. Felix and St. Adauctus, as appears from his epitaph; that is, on the 30th of August of the present year 1181,³ having held the see twenty-one years, eleven months, and twenty-three days, reckoning from the day of his election. For he was elected on the 7th of September 1159, but was not consecrated till the 20th of that month. He died at Civita Castellana in St. Peter's patrimony; but his body was conveyed from thence to Rome, and buried in the Lateran church. Most of the contemporary writers speak of him as a man of great prudence and discretion, loth to proceed to extremities, and in all disputes ever ready to hearken to any reasonable terms of agreement. Indeed his conduct, especially in the affair of Becket, answered that character. He is said to have been the most learned of all the popes that for the space of an hundred years had presided in that see, and better acquainted than any of them with the canons, laws, and decrees of the Roman church.⁴ His decretals were by his order collected into one volume under the title of *Consulta Alexandri*, but that volume has not yet been found. Till the time of Alexander every metropolitan had the power of canonizing, and we read of many saints canonized by them without the approbation or even the knowledge of the pope. Thus, in 1153, Hugh archbishop of Rouen, solemnly canonized an abbot named Gualterius, ordered his relics to be worshipped by the faithful, and granted indulgences to all who should implore his protection. "We have been," says the archbishop in his letter to the faithful, "in a manner forced, by the many miracles daily wrought by the holy abbot Gualterius, to rank him among the saints with the approbation and consent of the archbishop of Reims, and the other Gallican bishops."⁵ But Alexander declared the canonizing of saints to be the peculiar privilege of the apostolic see, and forbid any to be honored as saints, should the miracles they wrought be ever so many and stu-

¹ Hoveden in Annal. ² Idem ibid. Gervas in Chron.

³ Chron. Belg. ⁴ Robert. de Monte.

⁵ Mabill. in Præfat. suc. 5. Benedict.

¹ Budæus. p. 431.

² Innocent. Ep. 99.

Lucius III. chosen. Decides the controversy between the two pretenders to the see of St. Andrews in Scotland;—[Year of Christ, 1182.]

pendous, till their sanctity was approved by him or his successors. Hence from the time of Alexander we read of no saints canonized by any but the popes, and in 1231 the archbishop of Vienne applying with his

suffragans to Gregory IX. for the cononization of the bishop of Die, tells that pope, that they alone are to be honored as saints whose sanctity the apostolic see had declared and approved.¹

LUCIUS III., THE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ALEXIS COMNENUS, ANDRONICUS COMNENUS, *Emperors of the East*.—FREDERIC ÆNOBARBUS, *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 1181.] Alexander dying on the 30th of August, that in 1181 fell on the last Sunday of that month, Hubald or Ubald was chosen on the following Tuesday, the first of September, to succeed him, and consecrated on the 6th of the same month at Velitræ, now Veletri, under the name of Lucius III. He was a native of Lucca, had been employed in different legations by Innocent II., by Eugene III., and by his immediate predecessor Alexander III., was bishop of Ostia and Veletri at the time of his election, the see of Veletri having been annexed to that of Ostia by Eugene III., was dean of the sacred college, and, though a man of no great learning, universally esteemed for his prudence, of which he had given many specimens, as well as for the innocence of his life.¹ It was customary for the new pope to be consecrated by the bishops of Ostia, Porto, and Albano; but when the bishop of Ostia happened to be elected, the archpriest of that church was to assist at his consecration; and hence Lucius is said to have been consecrated by these two bishops and his own archpriest.² In the election of this pope was first put in execution the above mentioned decree of the Lateran council, declaring him alone to be lawfully elected, in whose election concurred two parts in three of the electors; a regulation that obtains to this day.³ Lucius was likewise the first pope elected by the cardinals alone, the people and the clergy, who had hitherto had a share in the election of the new pope, being excluded from all share in his; and he was, probably, on that account, consecrated at Veletri, and not at Rome.

The first thing that occurs worthy of notice in the pontificate of Lucius is his absolving William, king of Scotland, from the excommunication that his predecessor Alexander had denounced against him, and his taking off the interdict that the same pope had laid on the whole kingdom upon the following occasion. The see of St. Andrews being vacant, the clergy of that

church chose one John, surnamed Scotus, in the room of the deceased bishop. But the king, paying no regard to their election, nor to the appeal of the elect to the pope, put Hugh, one of his chaplains, in possession of the see. Hereupon Alexander, appointing Roger, archbishop of York, his legate for Scotland, ordered him in conjunction with the bishop of Durham, to excommunicate the king and interdict the whole kingdom, if John was not suffered to enjoy the see undisturbed, to which he alone had a just right. This commission the two bishops notified to the king, which so incensed him, that he drove John not only from his see, but out of the kingdom with all his relations, infants at the breast not excepted. The sentence of excommunication was therefore thundered out against him by the legate, and the kingdom was laid under a general interdict. This happened in 1180, and matters thus continued to the death of Alexander. But William no sooner heard of the election of Lucius than he sent ambassadors to congratulate him upon his promotion, and treat of an accommodation with the apostolic see. At their request the pope absolved the king from the excommunication, took off the interdict, and sent Roland, bishop elect of Dole, into Scotland, with the character of his legate, to determine the dispute between the two pretenders to the see of St. Andrews. It was, after several conferences between the king and the legate, agreed, that the pretenders should both give up all claim to that see; that John should be translated to Dnnkeld, and have forty marks yearly paid him out of the revenues of the see of St. Andrews. To this agreement John readily consented, but Hugh appealed against it to the pope, and summoned his rival to plead his cause at the tribunal of the apostolic see. They both repaired to Veletri, where the pope then resided, and being heard in a full consistory, they were both ordered to resign the bishopric of St. Andrews into his holiness's hands, which they did accordingly. But a few days after the pope granted the see of

¹ Prior. Vosiens. Chron. p. 327.

² Card. Cajetan. in Ord. Roman.

³ Onuph. ad Platin.

⁴ Apud Papebroc. de Canoniz. Sanctorum.

Lucius is forced to leave Rome. He returns to Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1183.] Is driven out a second time. Holds a council at Verona;—[Year of Christ, 1184.] The transactions of that council.

St. Andrews to Hugh, and confirmed to John that of Dunkeld.¹

From Veletri, where Lucius had resided ever since his election, he repaired, in the latter end of the present year 1182, to Rome, but was soon obliged to leave that city on account of a quarrel between him and the Romans. We are told, that he refused to comply with some customs that had been religiously observed by all his predecessors. What these customs were history does not inform us. But the Romans, highly provoked at his obstinacy, drove him out of the city, and pursuing him from one strong hold to another, forced him to return to Veletri. From thence he wrote to the emperor to acquaint him with the rebellion of the Romans, and implore his protection; and Frederic, espousing his cause with great zeal, ordered Christian, archbishop of Mentz, to march without delay, at the head of a powerful army, to his assistance. Christian soon reduced all the strong holds in the neighborhood of Rome, and encamping at Tusculum, so harassed the Romans with the parties he daily sent out, that they were ready to submit and receive the pope upon his own terms. But in the mean time Christian died at Tusculum, and his army dispersing upon his death, the Romans continued more obstinate than ever in their rebellion. Hoveden tells us, that the archbishop and great part of his army died of poison, the Romans having found means to poison a spring in the neighborhood of their camp that supplied them with water.² But of that circumstance no notice is taken by any other historian, and Christian, the second archbishop of Mentz of that name, who flourished in 1250, speaking of the death of his predecessor, says no more than that he died in the neighborhood of Rome; that in his illness he was visited by the pope; that he made his confession to him, received absolution, and expired soon after he received it.³ Ceccanus, who wrote at this very time, only says, the chancellor, meaning Christian, who was chancellor of the empire, being taken ill at Tusculum, died and was buried there in the month of August.⁴ Had he and great part of the army died of poison, others would have known and mentioned it besides Hoveden.

Lucius, unable to resist the Romans with the forces he had, and wanting money to raise more, sent nuncios to all the Christian princes as well as to the bishops to gather contributions for the defence of St. Peter against the Romans. Upon their arrival in England, the king, Henry II., acquainted the bishops with the pope's request, and they advised him to comply with it, but had the precaution to beg that he would grant

(as a free gift) in their name and his own, what he thought proper for them to give, and they would reimburse him; being apprehensive that if the pope's nuncios were once allowed to levy money upon them, it might be alleged, on many other occasions, as a precedent, to the great prejudice of the kingdom.¹ This precaution in the bishops plainly shows how much they were, and had occasion to be upon their guard against the encroachments of Rome. With the money the nuncios received in England and in other kingdoms the pope gained over some of the leading men among the Romans, and under their protection he returned to Rome.

He had not been long at Rome when the Romans revolted a second time, and laying every where waste the lands of the church, treated all who they thought favored the pope with the greatest barbarity. Having one day met, without the city, some clerks of his retinue, they put out the eyes of all but one, and placing mitres on their heads by way of derision, made the one whom they had spared swear that he would conduct the rest in that condition to the pope. Lucius, struck with horror at such a sight, anathematized all who had been in any ways concerned in, or accessory to, so cruel an action, and leaving Rome in great haste retired to Anagni. From thence he went into Lombardy to confer with the emperor, who was then on his march into Italy, and implore his protection. As the emperor had appointed the Lombard lords to meet him at Verona, the pope repaired to that city about the middle of July, and the emperor arrived there the last day of that month, 1184. The next day, the 1st of August, a council was held, at which were present the pope and the emperor, and all the bishops, as well as princes who attended them. In this council, conference, or diet, the pope's claim to the territories of the countess Mathilda was examined, and likewise the emperor's, but nothing was determined; such proofs being alleged on both sides as perplexed the best civilians among them. The pope complained to the emperor and the council of the Romans, painted in the strongest colors the cruelties they had committed, and they were declared by the whole assembly enemies to the church. The Albigenes were again condemned and anathematized under different names, and all who admitted them into their houses, suffered them in their territories, or afforded them any sort of relief. The same sentence was pronounced against all who held or taught different doctrines from those that were held and taught by the holy Roman church. Many bishops and other ecclesiastics who had adhered to the anti-popes in the late schism, and had been, on that account, suspended from their bene-

¹ Hoveden in Annal. ad ann. 1183.

² Idem ibid.

³ Hist. Mogunt. l. 5. p. 826.

⁴ Ceccan. in Chron.

¹ Hoveden ubi supra.

Lucius writes and sends legates to Saladin and his brother. His death.

fices and the functions of their respective offices, appeared at this council, and expressing great sorrow for what they had done, earnestly entreated the pope and the council to forgive them and reinstate them in their former condition. The emperor espoused their cause with great warmth, and the pope promised at first to comply with his and their request. But repenting soon after, and alledging that the ecclesiastics for whom Frederic interceded had been deposed in a general council, the council of Venice, and ought therefore to be restored in a general council, he promised to assemble one for that purpose at Lions. This satisfied the emperor, who, nevertheless, was not a little provoked at the pope's refusing to crown his son Henry, and bestowing upon him the title of emperor, a point which he had very much at heart. But Lucius could by no means be brought to consent to the crowning of the son unless the father resigned the crown; it being, as he pretended, as absurd that two emperors should sit on the same throne, as that two popes should sit in the same chair. Another dispute arose in the council between the pope and the emperor concerning the election of the archbishop of Treves. The electors being divided among themselves, two were elected, Fulmar and Rudolph. But though the former had the majority on his side, the emperor put the latter in possession of the see. Fulmar thereupon appealed to the pope, who readily espoused his cause, and the affair was warmly disputed in the council. But the pope being unwilling to disoblige the emperor at so critical a juncture, they came to no decision.¹

As Saladin had reduced the Christians in Palestine to great straits, the pope wrote and sent a legate both to him and his brother Saphadin, to treat of a peace between him and the Christian princes. The pope's letter has not reached our times, but Saladin's answer to it has, as well as his brother's, and the direction runs thus, "King Saladin, the most powerful of all the kings of the East, to the lord the pope." He then goes on thus:—"A paper has been delivered to us from your holiness, whom we believe to hold the greatest office upon earth, and know that you have received of God such grace as entitles you to that grandeur. We likewise know that all Christians fear and obey you. Your paper was presented to us by Oliverus Vitalis, whom we have honored for your sake, and caused to be introduced to us in a private room. What your legate has said, and what you say in your paper concerning a peace with all Christians, and

the exchange of prisoners, has given us great pleasure, and we readily agree to it. Let the Christians, therefore, dismiss all their prisoners, and we shall dismiss all ours. But I must observe to your grandeur, that the Christians in captivity among us are men of rank and distinction; whereas they whom your people have taken are but rustics and wretches of the meanest condition. Let the captives, therefore, on both sides be valued and compensation be made for their different conditions."² To Saphadin the pope sent Janus Dandulus with the character of his legate, and he was received by that prince with all possible marks of honor. The direction of his answer to the pope's letter was, "Saphadin, King of Justice and lord of the whole multitude of Saracens, to Lucius, by the grace of God, universal pope, lord of Christendom, and his best friend among the Christians." He tells the pope in his letter, that he is willing to conclude a peace with the Christians of Jerusalem and Tyre upon just and equitable conditions; that he shall strictly observe the terms of their agreement if they should agree, and set at liberty all the Christians detained in his prisons upon their setting at liberty all the Saracens whom they have made prisoners in the course of the war. He closes his letter with the following words: "God will reward every man according to his works. This paper was written on the last day of March, in the year of Mahomet 578. Thanks to God alone and the great prophet Mahomet."² The year 578 of Mahomet, or of the Hegira, began on the 6th of May 1182, and ended on the 26th of April 1183. This letter was therefore written on the last day of March 1183. But this treaty between the pope and the two Saracen princes had not, it seems, the wished for success. For we find the pope pressing with great earnestness the Christian princes, in 1184, to send powerful succors to the assistance of their friends and brethren in the Holy Land, overrun by the victorious armies of Saladin and Saphadin,

But while Lucius was promoting, to the utmost of his power, a new crusade, he died at Verona on the 29th of November 1184, after a pontificate of four years, two months and eighteen days, reckoning from the 6th of November 1182, the day on which he was consecrated. On his tomb was engraved the following epitaph:

"Luca dedit Lucem libi, Luci, pontificatum
Ostia, Papatum Roma, Verona mori
Immo Verona dedit verum tibi vivere, Roma
Exilium, Curas Ostia, Luca mori."

¹ Arnold. Lubecens. in Chron. l. 3. c. 10.

² Radulph. de Dicel. in Imag. Hist. p. 621.

² Idem ibid.

Election of Urban III. Quarrel between him and the emperor;—[Year of Christ, 1185.] The German bishops interpose;—[Year of Christ, 1186.]

URBAN III., THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTIETH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ANDRONICUS COMNENUS, ISAACIUS COMNENUS, *Emperors of the East.*—FREDERIC ÆNOBARBUS, *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1184.] The very next day after the death of Lucius, Humbert or Ubert Crivellus, then archbishop of Milan, and cardinal presbyter of St. Laurence in Damaso, was unanimously elected by the cardinals, and the following Sunday, the 1st of December, was solemnly crowned under the name of Urban III.¹

The quarrel, that broke out between Lucius and the emperor, was carried to a much greater height in the pontificate of Urban. For that pope absolutely insisted upon his being put in possession of the territories of the countess Mathilda, bequeathed by her, as he pretended, to the apostolic see. He, besides, complained of the emperor for seizing on the spoils of the deceased bishops, which, he said, belonged of right to their successors; and his having dissolved several nunneries, and confiscated their estates and effects, under pretence that the nuns led irregular lives. But what most of all provoked Frederic was the pope's peremptorily refusing to crown his son Henry unless he himself resigned the crown, and his consecrating Fulmar archbishop of Mentz in opposition to Rudolph, whose cause he had espoused. Some writers add, that Urban, not satisfied with consecrating Fulmar, created him cardinal, and even vested him with the character of his legate *a Latere* over great part of Germany; which so incensed the emperor, that he caused his son Henry to be crowned without the pope's consent. The ceremony was performed by the archbishop of Aquileia, and at the same time was crowned by a German bishop Constantia, whom the king had married that very day. Constantia was the posthumous daughter of Roger, king of Sicily, and aunt to William the present king. As William had no issue, the pope, apprehending that the kingdom of Sicily might by that marriage fall to the emperor's son, had always opposed it, and suspended, as soon as he heard of it, all the bishops who had assisted either at the coronation or the marriage.² Such a conduct in the pope provoked the young prince to such a degree, that he resolved to keep no measures with him. Having therefore met one day by chance a bishop while he was yet in Lombardy, he asked him at whose hands he had received his investiture, and the bishop answering, at the pope's, the prince repeated three times the same question,

and the bishop the same answer, adding at last that he held nothing of the emperor, and was therefore indebted to the pope alone for his bishopric. This answer so provoked the prince, that he ordered his attendants to beat the bishop most unmercifully, and when he could no longer stand to roll him in the dirt. Having on another occasion met one of the pope's servants charged with a considerable sum of money, he took the money from him, caused his nose to be cut off, and bid him show himself in that condition to his holiness.¹

In the mean time the emperor, foreseeing that an open rupture would soon ensue between him and the pope, ordered, upon his return to Germany, all the passages from Italy to be strictly guarded, and all to be arrested who brought any letters from the pope. He then applied to Philip, archbishop of Cologne, and the pope's legate in Germany, to take upon him the cognizance of all ecclesiastical causes, to judge and decide them independently of the pope, as he had ordered all intercourse to be cut off between Rome and Germany. That province the archbishop declined, alleging that to act independently of the pope would be betraying the trust his holiness had reposed in him. The emperor therefore, assembling a diet at Gellenbusem of all the bishops and princes of the empire, complained to them, in very sharp terms, of the conduct of the pope in refusing to crown his son, in suspending the bishops who had assisted at his coronation, and his consecrating, with his own hands, Fulmar archbishop of Treves, though neither he nor his son had ever approved his election. He mentioned many other instances of the pope's encroachments upon his royal prerogative and the just rights of his crown, and begged they would join him, for their own sake, in supporting the imperial dignity against the ambitious views and pretensions of Rome. The bishops promised to interpose their good offices and divert the pope, if by any means they could, from proceeding to extremities. For he had already threatened the emperor with excommunication, if he did not, within a limited time, suffer Fulmar to take possession of his see. The bishops wrote accordingly to the pope, entreating his holiness rather to dissemble for the present, than to renew by too much rigor the war between the church and the

¹ Gervas in Chron. ad ann. 1185. Dicet. p. 629.

² Chron. Aquicinct.

¹ Oldoinus in Hist. Cardinalium, et Chron. Belgic.

Urban's indulgence to the king of England. His death;—[Year of Christ, 1187.] Gregory VIII. elected. Promotes a crusade.

empire. In that letter, to which they all set their hands and their seals, they complained of the exorbitant contributions that were exacted, in money as well as provisions, of the churches in Germany by the legates and other ministers of the apostolic see, which, they said, had reduced many monasteries to beggary. They closed their letter with beseeching his holiness to reform such abuses, and suspend for a while all further proceedings against their lord the emperor. The pope, paying no regard to the entreaties and remonstrances of the German bishops, too partial, as he apprehended, to the emperor, persisted in his former resolution of excommunicating Frederic. But the people of Verona, where he resided, declaring, all to a man, that they would suffer no such sentence to be pronounced in their city or in their presence, he was forced to delay it, and died before he had an opportunity of carrying his design into execution.¹

The pope was more indulgent to Henry II. of England than he was to the emperor. For to that prince he granted many favors, which his predecessor Lucius had refused, and among the rest permission to cause which of his sons he pleased to be crowned king of Ireland. That permission he confirmed by a bull, sent a crown of peacock's feathers, interwoven with gold, for the new king as a token of his approbation, and appointed Octavian, cardinal deacon, and Hugh de Nunant, bishop of Durham, to perform the ceremony of the coronation with the character of his legates for Ireland. But the king put off the coronation, and took the legates with him to Normandy, to assist there at a congress between him and Philip king of France.²

As the Christians in the East were no longer able to oppose, with the forces they had, the brave and victorious Saladin, the pope, leaving Verona, set out for Venice with a design to persuade the Venetians to send a fleet to their relief. But being informed, on his arrival at Ferrara, that Saladin had gained a complete victory over the Christians, had cut their whole army in pieces, had taken the king himself prisoner, had made himself master of Jerusalem, and got possession of the holy cross itself, he was so affected with that melancholy account, that he died soon after of grief.¹ His death happened on the 19th of October 1187, after he had governed the church one year, ten months and twenty-five days, reckoning from the day of his election. That he died of grief on the occasion I have mentioned is attested by all the historians except Neubrigensis, who supposes him to have been prevented by death from hearing of that remarkable defeat.² Some letters of this pope, relating to ecclesiastical matters, have reached our times, and a paraphrase upon the psalm, "Miserere mei deus," &c. He is supposed to have been the first that reckoned the order of subdeacons among the superior orders of the church, which till his time had been only three, namely, of bishops, presbyters, and deacons. The order of subdeacons is still kept up in the church of Rome, as well as the other inferior orders of acolythists, exorcists, lectors, and doorkeepers; and all have distinct ordinations. By a constitution of Gregory the Great in 591, the subdeacons were ordered to vow celibacy at the time of their ordination, and they still make that vow. But no vow is annexed to the other inferior orders.

GREGORY VIII., THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIRST BISHOP OF ROME.

[ISAACIUS ANGELUS, *Emperor of the East.*—FREDERIC ÆNOBARBUS, *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1187.] In the room of Urban was elected, the day after his death, the 20th of October, cardinal Albert, a native of Benevento, and at the time of his election chancellor of the Holy Roman Church. He was consecrated on the 25th of that month, which in 1187 fell on a Sunday, and took on that occasion the name of Gregory VIII. Being greatly affected with the loss of Jerusalem, and the great advantages that the Saracens had lately gained over the Christians in the East, he was no sooner consecrated than he wrote a long and pathetic letter to

all the Christians in the West, giving them an account of the taking of Jerusalem, representing the danger the Holy Land was in of falling again into the hands of the avowed enemies of the Christian name, and exhorting them to contribute all in their power to the relief of their distressed brethren and the recovery of the holy city, of the holy sepulchre, and the cross upon which Christ died for our salvation. To this he added another letter, likewise addressed to all Christians, enjoining a five years' fast, to appease the anger of the Almighty, who, provoked at

¹ Arnold. Lubec. c. 17, 18.

² Hoveden. Annal. part 2. p. 631. 634.

¹ Gervas in Chron. p. 1510. Onuph. in Chron.

² Neubrig. l. 3. c. 20.

Gregory goes for that purpose to Pisa, where he dies. Election of Clement III. Concludes a peace with the Romans;—[Year of Christ, 1188.]

their sins, seemed in a manner to side with their enemies. The fast was to be observed thus: on all Fridays they were to fast as in Lent, and on Wednesdays and Saturdays abstain from meat. The pope added abstinence from meat on all Mondays for himself, for the cardinals, and for all who belonged to them. They who did not comply with this injunction were to incur the same censures as those who break, without any lawful excuse, the Lent fast.¹ Both these letters are dated at Ferrara on the 29th of October, the fourth day after Gregory's consecration. At the same time the cardinals engaged to take the cross the first; to go the first to the Holy Land in the habit of mendicant pilgrims, to receive no presents from such as had any business to transact at the pope's court, and never to mount on horseback, but travel on foot so long as the ground which our Savior had trod was under the feet of the infidels.²

As the two republics of Genoa and Pisa were at this time very powerful at sea, but at war with one another, the pope, leaving Ferrara, repaired to Pisa, to mediate a peace between the two states, and persuade them to join against the common enemy. He arrived at Pisa on the 9th of December, was received there with extraordinary marks of honor, and having prevailed on the Genoese to send deputies to treat of a reconciliation, the two states were upon the point of coming to an agreement, when Gregory was suddenly taken ill, and died in a few days. His death happened on the 17th of December, after a pontificate of one month and twenty-seven days.¹ He is greatly commended by all the writers who speak of him, for his learning, his eloquence, his humane disposition, and above all, for the purity of his manners. Some of his letters, besides the two I have mentioned, are to be met with in the volume of the Councils.

CLEMENT III., THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SECOND BISHOP OF ROME.

[ISAACIUS ANGELUS, *Emperor of the East*.—FREDERIC ÆNOBARBUS, *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 1187.] Gregory was succeeded by Paul, cardinal bishop of Palestrina, and a native of Rome. He was elected at Pisa on the 19th of December, and crowned the next day, under the name of Clement III. As Clement was by birth a Roman, he sent, immediately after his consecration, deputies to Rome, to treat of an accommodation between him and the Roman people. The Senate claimed the civil government of the city, leaving only the ecclesiastic to the pope, and the pope, on the other hand, pretended to be temporal as well as spiritual lord of Rome. This contest had lasted fifty years, during which time several popes had been obliged to quit the city and reside elsewhere. Besides, the city of Tusculum, that belonged to the pope, gave great umbrage to the Romans. For upon every disagreement between them and the pope, the Tusculans, breaking into the Roman territories, committed every where dreadful ravages. The Romans, therefore, insisted upon the pope's causing the walls of that strong hold to be demolished, which they had often besieged, but had never been able to reduce. Clement wanted to settle his see in peace at Rome, and the Romans, tired with the disturbances that were daily raised in the city, some insisting upon the pope's return, and others opposing it, heark-

ened very readily to proposals of an agreement: and an agreement was accordingly concluded, after a few conferences, upon the following terms: I. That the sovereignty of Rome should be lodged in the pope. II. That the office of patrician should be abolished, and a prefect, with a more limited power, be appointed in his room. III. That senators should be created yearly, with the approbation and by the authority of the pope, who should take an oath of allegiance to his holiness, and promise to assist him when required. IV. That St. Peter's church, and its revenues, should be restored to the apostolic see. V. That the tolls and all other public revenues should be at the pope's disposal, upon condition that he expended one third of them for the use of the Roman people. VI. That the senate and the Roman people should reverence the majesty and maintain the honor and dignity of the high pontiff. VII. That the Roman pontiff should bestow the usual gifts and largesses upon the senators, judges, advocates, and other officers of the senate. VIII. That he should pay yearly a certain sum for the reparation of the walls of the city. And lastly, that he should allow the walls of Tusculum to be razed and laid level with the ground, and should assist the Romans in that undertaking. This was the only article the pope

¹ Hoveden in *Annal. et Neubrig.* l. 3. c. 10.

² Hoveden *ibid.* p. 636.

¹ *Chron. Pisan.* Nangius in *Chron.* ad ann. 1187. Neubrig, &c.

Clement engages all the Christian princes in the holy war. Composes the difference between William, king of Scotland, and the apostolic see;—[Year of Christ, 1189.] The church of Scotland exempted from all subjection to the English church. The schism in the church of Treves terminated.

objected to, but was in the end forced to yield, and suffer the unhappy Tusculans to pay dear for their steady attachment to the apostolic see.¹ The place, however, was not destroyed till the pontificate of Celestine III. Thus was the papal dominion or sovereignty established over Rome. The articles being agreed to, Clement, leaving Pisa, set out without delay for Rome, and was there received by the senate, the nobility, and the people, with the greatest marks of respect and esteem.

Clement, treading in the footsteps of his predecessor, left nothing unattempted to engage all the Christian princes in a new crusade. Before he left Pisa he prevailed upon great numbers of the inhabitants, of all ranks, to take the cross, gave the standard of St. Peter to Ubald, their archbishop, and appointed him his legate to conduct and attend them into the East. The people of Pisa, animated by the warm exhortations, but more by the example of their bishop, concluded a truce with the Genoese, and having equipped a fleet of fifty ships of war, sent it, before the end of September of the present year, to the relief of their distressed brethren in the Holy Land.² Clement, on his return to Rome, dispatched cardinal Henry, bishop of Albano, into France, to promote the crusade in that kingdom, which he did with great success. From France he repaired to Germany; and at his hands the emperor himself took the cross, being at that juncture disengaged from all other wars. His example was followed by his son Frederic, duke of Swabia, and by most of the princes of the empire; and he set out the following year for the Holy Land, at the head of one hundred and fifty thousand fighting men. Philip, king of France, and Henry II. king of England, then at variance, were prevailed upon by John of Anagni, cardinal legate, to forbear all hostilities for the present, and join against the common enemy. Both princes took the cross, and heavy taxes were laid on both kingdoms to defray the expenses of the intended expedition. In England a tenth was exacted of all revenues, of all moveables and chattels. This tax was levied, with the utmost rigor, upon the clergy as well as the laity, those only excepted who went in person to the Holy Land. Thus an immense sum of money was raised for carrying on the war in the East; and it was accordingly carried on, but with very little success, not by Henry, who died in 1189, but by Richard, his son and successor, a bold and daring prince, who had taken the cross in his father's lifetime.³

Clement's next care was to compose the difference that had long subsisted between

the apostolic see and William, king of Scotland, concerning the election of the bishop of St. Andrews. The clergy had elected John, but the king, paying no regard to their election, had named Hugh, his chaplain, to that see. The pope, upon the clergy's appealing to the apostolic see against Hugh, as an intruder, summoned him to Rome, and as he did not appear within the limited time, deposed and excommunicated him, and declared his competitor lawfully elected. On this occasion the pope wrote to all the Scotch bishops, commanding them to lay the whole kingdom under an interdict, if the king did not stand to the judgment of the apostolic see, and allow John to take possession, without further molestation, of the see, to which he had been canonically elected. The king, unwilling to quarrel with the pope, and dreading the consequences of an interdict, thought it advisable to submit. But John, to gratify the king, and regain his favor, declaring himself satisfied with the bishopric of Dunkeld, to which he had been translated by pope Lucius, gave up all claim to the see of St. Andrews. The pope was so well pleased with the submission of the king, that he no sooner heard of it, than writing to him in the most kind and obliging terms, he declared and decreed that thenceforth the church of Scotland should be immediately subject to the apostolic see, and the apostolic see alone; that it should be lawful for none but the Roman pontiff himself, or his legates *a Latere*, to publish the sentence of interdict or excommunication against the kingdom of Scotland, and that no one who was not a native of the country, nor chosen out of the body of the Roman church, should exercise the office of legate in that kingdom.¹ Thus was the church of Scotland exempted from all subjection to that of England, and the legatine power of the archbishop of York over Scotland annulled. This letter is dated at the Lateran the 13th of March of the present year.

Clement was no less successful in putting an end to the schism that for the space of seven years had divided the church of Treves, some adhering to Fulmar, chosen by a majority, and some to Rudolph, nominated by the emperor. To terminate that dispute the pope sent cardinal Sigifred with the character of his legate *a Latere*, and it was agreed between him and the emperor, that the pretenders should both resign; that all whom Fulmar had excommunicated should be absolved and restored to the benefices they enjoyed before, and that the clergy should be at liberty to elect a third person out of the members of their own church.² Fulmar, thus deposed, but not degraded, repaired to England. For he is mentioned among the bishops who assisted at the coro-

¹ Cenc. Camerar. apud Onuph. ad Vit. Clement. III.

² Chron. Pisan.

³ Hoveden. Matth. Paris. Annal. Mail.

¹ Hoveden Annal. p. 616. ² Chron. Belgium, p. 200.

Death of the emperor Frederic ;—[Year of Christ, 1190.] Death of Clement ;—[Year of Christ, 1191.] Celestine elected, ordained, and consecrated. Crowns Henry emperor.

nation of king Richard on the 3d of September, 1189.¹ He died soon after at Northampton, and was buried there.

The following year the pope had the satisfaction to hear of the departure of Philip Augustus, king of France, and Richard, king of England, for the Holy Land at the head of two numerous armies. But the unexpected news he received soon after of the death of the emperor Frederic, so affected him, that for some days he forbore appearing in public, admitting none to his presence but his domestics and most intimate friends. Frederic had adjusted all his differences with the apostolic see, had taken the cross, and marching with a very numerous army to the relief of the Holy Land, had gained many signal advantages over the infidels; but on the 10th of June of the present year he was unhappily drowned in the river Caleph, supposed to be the Cidnus of the ancients. Some say, that in crossing the river he fell from his horse; and others,

that bathing in the river he went out of his depth, and perished, being stricken in years, before his attendants could afford him any assistance. Be that as it will, his death was a great loss to the Christians in Palestine, as he had already recovered many places taken by Saladin, and struck such terror into the Saracens, that they fled every where before him, and abandoned their strong-holds at his approach. For he put all, without distinction, to the sword, who had the misfortune to fall into his hands.¹

The following year Clement died, on the 27th of March, and was buried, being greatly beloved by the Romans, with extraordinary pomp in the Lateran church. Before his death he canonized Otto, bishop of Bamberg, the first who preached the gospel to the Pomeranians, and Stephen de Mureto, founder of the order of the Grandimontenses. We know of no letters written by this pope besides those that have been taken notice of in his life.

CELESTINE III., THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THIRD BISHOP OF ROME.

[ISAACIUS ANGELUS, *Emperor of the East.*—HENRY V., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1191.] Clement died, as has been said, on the 27th of March, and being buried the next day, the cardinals met upon the 30th of that month, and with one consent preferred to the chair Hyacinth, cardinal deacon of St. Mary in Cosmedin. He was a native of Rome, had been sixty-five years cardinal deacon, and was at the time of his election in the eighty-fifth year of his age. He was ordained priest on Easter-eve, on the 13th of April, and on Easter-day consecrated under the name of Celestine III.² He is said to have so long delayed his consecration, namely, from the 30th of March to the 14th of April, to mortify Henry, the son and successor of Frederic in the empire, who, entering Italy upon the news of his father's death, had encamped, with a mighty army, under the walls of Rome, and commanded rather than desired the late pope to crown him emperor. Celestine durst not refuse him the imperial crown, but to delay his consecration, says the historian, he delayed his own.³ As great disorders were daily committed by Henry's troops in the neighborhood of Rome, the Romans, to get rid of such troublesome guests, prevailed on the pope to delay no longer his own consecration nor

that of the emperor. He therefore consented, in compliance with their request, to be consecrated on Easter-Sunday, and the very next day he crowned Henry and his wife Constantia with great solemnity in the church of St. Peter. He received the king at the door of the church, and upon his swearing that he would inviolably maintain all the rights of the church, that he would give up the lands and territories that belonged to St. Peter, and restore Tusculum, which, it seems, he had seized, to the apostolic see, the pope walked before him into the church, and anointed both him and Constantia at the tomb of St. Peter. He then placed himself in the pontifical throne, and amidst the loud acclamations of the people put the imperial crown, which he held between his feet, upon the emperor's head while he kneeled at the foot of the throne. The historian adds, that he had no sooner placed the crown on the emperor's head than he struck it off with his foot, to show, that as he had given him the crown, he had the power of taking it from him, if he found him unworthy to wear it. Thus Hoveden, who lived at this time.² But whether his authority be of weight enough to overbalance the silence of all other writers (for by none of them is the least notice taken of so very re-

¹ De Diceto, p. 643, 644.

² Chron. Reich. ad ann. 1191. Petrus Blesens. Ep. 132.

³ Arnold. Lubec. t. 4. c. 4.

¹ In Appendice ad Radevic. apud Baron. ad ann. 1190.

² Hoveden Annal. p. 690.

Tusculum demolished. Disturbances in England. The pope orders the disturbers of the public peace to be excommunicated. The king shipwrecked on his return from the Holy Land, and imprisoned by the duke of Austria;—[Year of Christ, 1192.] The Norman bishops apply to the pope for the king's release; and the queen dowager;—[Year of Christ, 1193.]

markable a circumstance) let the reader judge. Henry, the sixth king of Germany, and the fifth emperor of that name, restored Tusculum to the pope before he left Rome; and by the pope it was immediately delivered to the Romans, who, not satisfied with demolishing the walls, left not a single house standing in the place.¹

Richard, king of England, upon his departure for the Holy Land, had appointed William, bishop of Ely, then high chancellor, to govern the kingdom in his absence, and to render that prelate more respectable, had procured for him the legatine power of pope Clement, the predecessor of Celestine. To prevent the disturbances that the king apprehended his two brothers, Geoffry, archbishop of York, and John, earl of Moreton, might raise in his absence, he took them both with him to Normandy, and there obliged them to promise, upon oath, that they would not return to England without his permission. But the king was scarce gone when, unmindful of their oath, they returned, and having formed a strong party against the chancellor, obliged him to quit the kingdom. To justify their conduct they publicly charged him with many heinous crimes and an enormous abuse of his power. But the bishop retiring to Normandy sent deputies from thence to Rome to clear himself from the crimes laid to his charge, and at the same time to complain of the unworthy treatment a legate of the apostolic see had met with from the earl and those of his party, who, said the deputies, had nothing less in their view than to seize on the crown, and divide among themselves the spoils of the nation. The pope hearkened to their complaints, and paying no regard to the complaints and remonstrances of the opposite party, wrote to the English bishops, strictly commanding them to excommunicate, with the burning of candles and the ringing of bells, the earl of Moreton and all his accomplices and abettors without exception, and cause them to be avoided by all, till they allowed the bishop of Ely to return and resume, undisturbed, the government of the kingdom. The bishops were not, even in that case, to absolve the earl or any of his party, but to send them all for absolution to Rome.²

In the mean time the king, who had distinguished himself in a very eminent manner by his bravery during his stay in the Holy Land, but now despaired of any further success on account of the divisions that prevailed among the Christian princes, concluded a three years' truce with Saladin, and on the 8th of October 1192, embarked on his return to England. But being shipwrecked in the Adriatic, between Venice

and Aquileia, he was obliged to pass through the territories of Leopold, duke of Austria. As he had quarrelled with the duke in the Holy Land, he travelled night and day, while in his dominions, in the disguise of a pilgrim. But being, nevertheless, discovered, he was arrested by that prince's order; and, when he had been kept some time closely confined, delivered up; or, to use the king's own expression, "sold as an ox or an ass," to the emperor. What gave occasion to the enmity those princes bore him is related at length by all our historians, especially by Matthew Paris, to whom I refer the reader, as it is foreign to my subject. The imprisonment of the king was no sooner publicly known, than the archbishop of Rouen and all his suffragans wrote to the pope to acquaint him with it, representing the injury done to the king as done to his holiness himself, under whose immediate protection all were, and more especially princes, who went to the Holy Land to make war on the infidels, and rescue the holy city and the holy sepulchre out of their hands. They put him in mind of the unreserved regard and attachment the king had always shown to the apostolic see, of his gallant behavior in Palestine, of the fatigues, hardships, and dangers he had undergone to obey his holiness' commands, and earnestly pressed him to interpose his authority, to draw the sword of St. Peter, and revenge the unworthy treatment that so great a prince, and so deserving of the apostolic see, had met with in defiance of all laws, ancient and modern.¹ But this letter did not awake the zeal of Celestine, nor did the several letters of the queen mother, filled with the most pressing instances, prayers, entreaties, and even reproaches. "You send," said the queen in one of her letters, "your cardinals for trifling matters to the most barbarous nations, and in so great, so lamentable, so public a cause, you have not so much as sent one sub-deacon, or acolythist. It is not for the honor of God, or his church, the peace of kingdoms, or the good of mankind, that legates are now sent, but to enrich themselves at the expense of the nations to which they are sent."² In another letter she addresses the pope thus:—"Where is your zeal? where the authority of St. Peter? you have it in your power to deliver my son; no prince is exempt from your jurisdiction. What excuse then can you alledge for not exerting your authority on so important an occasion, when your honor and the honor of your see are both at stake? Now I see how little the promises of your cardinals are to be relied upon. They promise much, but their promises are only empty words; nay, they countenance the tyranny which they

¹ Hoveden Annal. p. 690.² Idem, p. 718.¹ Petrus Bles. Eu. 64.² Idem, Ep. 144.

Richard purchases his liberty;—[Year of Christ, 1194.] Legates sent into France on occasion of the king's divorcing his wife Ingelburga;—[Year of Christ, 1195.] The pope reverses the sentence of the legates and the Gallican bishops.

are in duty bound to punish. My son, a prince so deserving of the apostolic see, is kept confined and treated by an open breach of the law of nations and all the laws of humanity, as a criminal; the high pontiff knows it, and dissembles! Have the keys of St. Peter lost all their power, or is he who has been trusted with them afraid to exert it, &c?"¹ This letter was written in 1193; and in the same year she wrote a third, filled with more bitter reproaches than the other two: "It is now," says the queen, "the third time you have promised to send legates to procure the release of my son. If he were in prosperity, we should see legates flying upon his first call, in hopes of being well rewarded by so generous a prince. Do you thus observe the promise you made us with the strongest protestations of friendship and affection? Do you thus deceive the simple, who put their trust in you? The most enormous crimes in the great and the powerful are connived at, and the rigor of the canons is only exerted against the poor. One tyrant keeps my son in captivity, while another invades and lays waste his dominions," meaning the king of France; "the one holds, to use the vulgar expression, while the other flays. This the high pontiff sees, and yet keeps the sword of St. Peter in the sheath! Have we not too much reason to construe his silence into a tacit approbation and consent? &c."²

To these pressing instances and repeated reproaches of the queen not the least regard was paid by the pope; no legates were sent, nor does it appear that a single letter was written either to the emperor, or to the duke of Austria, in behalf of the king, during the whole time of his captivity. Celestine probably gave him up for lost, and was unwilling to disoblige either of these princes for the sake of one, whom he looked upon as no longer able to make him a suitable return. The unhappy prince was therefore obliged, in the end, to purchase his liberty with the exorbitant sum of 150,000 marks of silver; nor was he released from his captivity till two-thirds of that sum were paid, and hostages were left for the payment of the remainder. Thus he at last recovered his liberty in the beginning of February, 1194, when he had been kept in captivity ever since the 20th of December, 1192.

The pope, who had been hitherto so very backward in employing his good offices in behalf of the king, no sooner heard of his being set at liberty, than he espoused his cause with great zeal, thundering out the sentence of excommunication against the duke of Austria, and threatening the imperial dominions with an anathema, if the ransom money was not immediately restored,

and the hostages dismissed. He wrote likewise to the king of France, who, at the instigation of John, the king's brother, had invaded his Norman dominions, requiring him to forbear all hostilities against the king of England, upon pain of incurring the indignation of St. Peter. The duke chose rather to incur all the censures of Rome than to part either with the money or the hostages: and he was accordingly solemnly excommunicated by the bishop of Verona, pursuant to the pope's mandate, dated at St. Peter's the 6th of June of the present year. But the duke having not long after received, by a fall from his horse, a hurt in his leg that proved mortal, ordered, at the point of death, the money to be returned and the hostages to be dismissed; and he was thereupon absolved from the excommunication.¹

The following year, 1195, an affair that happened in France gave the pope more trouble and concern than the captivity of Richard. The French king, Philip Augustus, upon the death of his first wife, Elizabeth, daughter to Baldwin earl of Hanau, had married Ingelburga, the daughter of Canutus IV. king of Denmark, but had divorced her soon after the marriage was consummated, under pretence that she was related to him within the forbidden degrees of consanguinity; a pretence common to all who wanted to get rid of their wives. This divorce was declared lawful by the Gallican bishops. But the king of Denmark complaining to the pope of the affront offered to his daughter, and maintaining that if Philip was at all related to her, it was not within the degrees forbidden by the church, his holiness sent two legates into France, Melior cardinal presbyter, and Cencius subdeacon, to assemble a council at Paris of all the archbishops, bishops, and abbots of the kingdom, and inquire jointly with them whether Philip's plea was well or ill grounded. By that great assembly sentence was pronounced in favour of the king, and confirmed by the legates, either afraid, says the historian, to disoblige that prince, or gained by his presents. But in the mean time a public instrument concerning the genealogy of the princess being sent to the pope by the archbishop of London and his suffragans, and the king's plea appearing from thence to be entirely groundless, his holiness declared in a letter to the archbishop of Sens the sentence of the council of Paris to be null, revoked it as such, and strictly enjoined that prelate to exhort the king to take again to his bed Ingelburga, his lawful wife, and restrain him by apostolic authority from marrying any other woman in her lifetime. In that letter he reprimands the archbishop and the other

¹ Petrus Bles. Ep. 145.

² Idem, p. 146.

¹ Diceto, p. 668. Hoveden ubi supra. Matth. Paris ad ann. 1195. Neubrig. l. 5. c. 6.

Celibacy restored in Poland; opposed in Bohemia;—[Year of Christ, 1197.] Death of the emperor. His son crowned king of Sicily. Celestine's death;—[Year of Christ, 1198.]

Gallican bishops very severely for presuming to determine a cause of such importance without consulting the apostolic see, to which all greater causes have been reserved by the repeated decrees of the fathers. The power of judging and determining all greater causes was by several councils vested in the pope. But as the councils did not determine which were and which were not greater causes, the popes took upon them to determine every cause of any importance as one of those causes. The pope's letter is dated at the Lateran in the month of March in the 5th year of his pontificate.¹ Philip, paying no regard to the prohibition of the pope, or the remonstrances of the archbishop of Sens, married Mary, or, as others call her, Agnes, the daughter of the duke of Bohemia, soon after the archbishop received the pope's letter. Ingelburga, hearing of that marriage, wrote a most affecting letter to Celestine, to acquaint him with the king's marriage, with the undeserved treatment she had met with, being kept closely confined in a castle, and to implore his holiness's protection.² But Celestine, it seems, gave himself no further trouble about that affair, and the king lived with the princess Mary as his wife till the year 1201, when Innocent III. undertook with great zeal the cause of the injured Ingelburga.

Celestine being informed that in Poland and Bohemia most of the clergy were either married or publicly kept concubines, sent the following year, 1197, Peter, cardinal deacon of St. Mary in Via Lata, to reform those abuses, and cause the laws of celibacy, as enjoined by several councils, to be strictly observed by the clergy of both nations. In Poland the clergy tamely suffered those laws to be revived, dismissed their wives and concubines, and promised to follow in that particular the example of the Roman clergy. But the very name of celibacy so offended the clergy of Bohemia, that they would have even laid violent hands upon the cardinal legate, had not the bishop of Prague interposed.³

The emperor dying this year at Messina on the 28th of September, the pope would not permit his body to be interred without the consent of the king of England, till the

money which he had unjustly extorted from that prince was returned. But the emperor had, by his last will, ordered Frederic, his son and successor, to return the whole sum, and begged the pope to exert his authority, and force him to it, if he declined it.¹ Frederic was the emperor's son by Constantia, who alone had a right to the crown of Sicily, as has been observed above.² However as a report prevailed that Frederic was not the son of Constantia by the emperor, whom she never loved, the archbishop of Messina thought it advisable to apply to the pope for leave to crown him, which was granted, but upon condition that Constantia made oath that Frederic was her son by the late emperor, and that the new king paid one thousand marks of silver to the pope himself, and the same sum to the cardinals; which he had no better right to than the duke of Austria or the emperor had to the money they extorted from the king of England.

In the mean time the pope being taken dangerously ill, and sensible that his end approached, as he was now in the ninety second year of his age, assembled the cardinals, and earnestly recommended to them John, cardinal presbyter of St. Prisca for his successor; nay, he even offered to resign, provided they agreed to choose him. But this proposition was rejected by all the cardinals to a man, as quite unprecedented; and, besides, most of them aspired themselves at the pontificate, and had already formed their parties. This happened a little before Christmas; and the pope died on the 8th of the following January, after a pontificate of six years, nine months, and nine days.³ Celestine canonized during his pontificate four saints, Ubald bishop of Eugubio, Malachy archbishop of Armagh, John Gualbert abbot, and Bernard bishop of Hildesheim. Till this pope's time the children who had been by their parents offered up to monasteries while yet infants, were bound, when they attained to the years of discretion, to confirm the vows their parents had made for them, and embrace a monastic life, though not their own choice. But Celestine absolved by a particular bull all children from that obligation, and declared them free to return to the world, if they chose it; and his bull was confirmed by the council of Trent.

¹ Dicit. in Imag. Hist. p. 682. Hoveden. Rigordus. Chron. Aquicini. &c.

² Rigordus ad ann. 1196. Baluz. Miscell. tom. 1. p. 422.

³ Joannes Longin.

¹ Epist. Innocent. 20.

² See p. 520.

³ Hoveden, p. 777.

Innocent III. elected. He subjects the city of Rome to his see. Recovers several cities as the patrimony of St. Peter. Revokes some privileges granted to the king of Sicily.

INNOCENT III., THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FOURTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[ISAACIUS ANGELUS, ALEXIUS ANGELUS, ALEXIUS DUCAS, THEODORUS LASCARIS, *Emperors of the East*.—PHILIP, OTTO IV., *Emperors of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 1198.] Celestine died on the 8th of January, and the cardinals, having first performed the exequies of the deceased pope, met at a place called Septa Solis, and on the same day, the 8th of January, chose cardinal Lotharius to succeed him. As Lotharius had not yet completed his 37th year, some of the cardinals objected to his age, especially those among them who were advanced in years, as they could entertain no hopes of surviving him, or ever attaining to the pontifical dignity; and three others were nominated. But he was in the end elected by a great majority on account of his irreproachable character, his learning, and his excellent parts.¹ He was a native of Anagni, and the son of Trasimund, sprung from the illustrious family of the counts of Segni. In his youth he studied at Rome, then at Paris, and lastly at Bologna, and he every where distinguished himself above all his fellow-students, both in philosophy and divinity. He was ordained subdeacon by Gregory VIII., and preferred to the dignity of cardinal-deacon by Clement III. He took, as soon as he was elected, the name of Innocent III. As he was but a deacon, and orders were only conferred in the Ember-weeks, he was not ordained priest till Saturday of the Ember-week in Lent, the 21st of February; and the following Sunday he was consecrated high pontiff, with the usual ceremonies, in the presence of four archbishops, twenty-eight bishops, six presbyter and nine deacon cardinals, and ten abbots. With these he went in procession from St. Peter's to the Lateran, being attended by the prefect of the city, by the magistrates, and all the Roman nobility; and after his coronation he entertained them all with great magnificence in the Lateran Palace.² He issued several bulls before his consecration, but sealed them only with one half of the pontifical seal. However, by circulatory letters to all the bishops he declared them to have the same force and authority as if the whole seal were annexed to them. This letter is dated at the Lateran, the 3d of April.³

Innocent was perfectly well qualified to raise the papal power and authority to the highest pitch, and we shall see him improving, with great address, every opportunity that offered to compass that end. He

began with entirely subjecting the city of Rome to his see. The prefect of the city, as well as the other magistrates, had hitherto taken an oath of allegiance to the emperor only. But Innocent, the very next day after his consecration, insisted upon their taking that oath to him; and to him they all took it, accordingly, as their lawful sovereign, quite independent of the emperor. He invested the prefect in his office, delivering to him the mantle, which he had hitherto received at the hands of the emperor or his ministers, notwithstanding the agreement which the Romans had made with Clement III.¹ As the "March of Ancona" was held by Marcuvaldus, seneschal of the empire, duke of Ravenna, and marquis of Ancona, the pope sent two cardinals, with the character of legates, to recover that country, as belonging to the apostolic see. The legates were every where received by the people with great demonstrations of joy; and the cities of Ancona, Fermo, Osimo, Camerino, Singalia, and Fano, withdrawing themselves from all subjection to Marcuvaldus, submitted to Innocent as their lawful lord. Their example was followed by the people of the dukedom of Spoleti, of the county of Assisi and Monte Bello, and of many cities in Tuscany, who, finding themselves supported by the pope, drove out the usurper, received the legates, and in their presence swore allegiance to the apostolic see. At the same time Innocent took into his protection several cities in Tuscany, and the confederate states of Lombardy, having first obliged them to swear that they would acknowledge no emperor till he was acknowledged by his holiness.²

Constantina, the widow of the late emperor Henry V., no sooner heard of the election of Innocent, than she applied to him to be invested, together with her son Frederic, in the kingdom of Sicily, the dukedom of Apulia, and the principality of Capua, with all their appurtenances. The pope did not question her right or her son's to those countries, but taking advantage of the government of a woman, and the minority of the young king, he insisted upon their giving up the articles of agreement between his predecessor Hadrian IV. and William, king of Sicily,³ pretending that Hadrian's consent

¹ Acta Vit. apud Bosquet. ² Acta ibid.

³ Epist. Innocent, l. I. Ep. 63.

¹ See p. 521.

² Acta ibid, et Ep. 405. l. I.

³ See p. 494.

Innocent sends legates into Germany. The archbishop of Salerno released from his captivity. A civil war kindled in the empire. The king of Galicia excommunicated by Innocent, who causes the ransom money to be restored to king Richard of England.

to them had been extorted by force, as being extremely derogatory to the dignity of the apostolic see. These articles were, I. That no appeals should be made to Rome, except in such matters as could not be settled or determined by the ecclesiastics of the kingdom. II. That the deputies of the Roman church should perform no consecrations, visitations, or other functions whatever in the places where the king, or his heirs, should happen to be at the time, without their consent. III. That no legates should be sent into Sicily but at the request of the king, or his heirs. IV. That the bishops should be elected by the clergy, but should not be inducted, nor should the song of thanksgiving be sung till the election was notified to, and confirmed by, the king, or his heirs. The pope peremptorily insisted upon the queen's renouncing the first three articles, without any restriction or limitation whatever; and upon her consenting to have the following words added to the fourth, "nor shall the elect presume to intermeddle with the administration till he is confirmed by the pope." The queen spared no pains nor presents to gain friends in the conclave. But the pope was inflexible, and could, upon no other terms, be prevailed upon to grant the investiture either to her or her son, but their giving up the privileges granted by Hadrian to the kings of Sicily. And in the end she thought it advisable to yield, as the only means to prevent the disturbances that the pope might otherwise raise in the kingdom during the minority of her son.¹

The affair of Sicily being settled to the satisfaction of the pope, he despatched two legates into Germany, the bishop of Sutri, by birth a German, and the abbot of St. Anastasius, a Cistercian monk, to procure the liberty of the archbishop of Salerno, whom the late emperor had taken prisoner upon his declaring for Tancred, raised by a strong party to the crown of Sicily, in opposition to him. The emperor dying soon after, left the archbishop with his brother Philip, duke of Suevia, who kept him closely confined as a traitor. Innocent thinking it inconsistent with the dignity and the authority of high pontiff tamely to suffer an archbishop to be thus treated, ordered the legates to excommunicate those who detained him; nay, and to lay all Germany under an interdict, if he was not set at liberty in a limited time. The legates, upon their arrival in Germany, applied, in the first place, to the duke of Suevia, who agreed at once to dismiss not only the archbishop, but all the ecclesiastics who had been taken with him, upon condition they absolved him from the excommunication that pope Celestine had, it seems, denounced

against him, for seizing upon some territories in Tuscany, which the pope claimed as the patrimony of St. Peter. With that proposal the legates readily closed; and thus was the archbishop restored to his liberty, after a four years' painful confinement.¹

The legates had not yet left Germany, when Philip of Suevia, having gained some of the German princes, caused himself to be proclaimed king of the Romans; and he was anointed as such at Mentz, by the archbishop of Taranto, the German bishops all declining to perform that ceremony. Of all the bishops who were present at that ceremony, the pope's legate alone, the bishop of Sutri, appeared in his pontifical ornaments, which so provoked the pope, as the affair had not been communicated to him, that he deposed the bishop upon his return to Rome. In the mean time the archbishops of Cologne and Treves, and the far greater part of the princes of the empire, chose first Bertolph, or Barthold, duke of Zaringia, and upon his resigning soon after his election, they sent for Otho, the son of Henry, late duke of Saxony, who was then in Normandy, with Richard, king of England, his uncle. Upon his arrival he was unanimously elected at Cologne, and solemnly crowned by the archbishop of that city, at Aix-la-Chapelle. Innocent declared warmly for Otho; and thus was a civil war kindled in the bowels of the empire.

Innocent in the very beginning of his pontificate excommunicated Alphonsus X. king of Galicia and Leon, for refusing to dismiss Tarsia, the daughter of Sanctius king of Portugal, whom he had married within the forbidden degrees. He likewise threatened Sanctius with excommunication if he did not remit to Rome without delay the sum which his father Alphonsus, upon his receiving the title of king, had bound himself and his heirs to pay yearly to the successor of St. Peter.² At the same time he wrote, at the request of king Richard, to the archbishop of Magdeburg, commanding him to let the duke of Suevia know, that he was bound, as brother and heir to the late emperor, to restore the money that had been so unjustly extorted from the king of England; and that if he did not comply with that obligation, he should soon proceed against him and his territories, being determined not to let pass such a crying piece of injustice without the deserved punishment.³ This letter is dated the 31st of May; and the pope had writ the day before to the son of the duke of Austria, and told him that as his father, when upon his death-bed, had made him promise upon oath to restore the money which he had, with the utmost injustice,

¹ Acta *ibid*, et Inn. Ep. 410. l. 1.

¹ Epist. 24, 25, 26.

² Epist. 91, 92. l. 1; et Epist. 75. l. 2. ³ Epist. 236.

Embassy from the Greek emperor to Innocent. Innocent made guardian to the young king of Sicily. Disturbances in Sicily;—[Year of Christ, 1199.] Quieted by Innocent. Three pretenders to the crown of Germany. Innocent declares for Otho, or Otto;—[Year of Christ, 1200.]

forced the king of England to pay by way of ransom, he thought it his duty to remind him of that obligation, and had writ to the archbishop of Saltzburg, ordering that prelate to proceed to the sentence of excommunication against him, and to lay all his territories under an interdict, if he did not fulfil, without delay, his father's last will.¹ As neither of those princes was excommunicated, we may suppose them to have complied with the pope's injunction. For Innocent was not a man to content himself with menaces only when his orders were not obeyed. Besides, as he was an avowed enemy to the duke of Suevia, and had espoused the cause of his rival, he would not, in all likelihood, have spared him, had he not satisfied both him and the king.

Alexander Angelus, emperor of Constantinople, hearing of the promotion of Innocent, dispatched a solemn embassy to Rome, with very rich presents for his holiness, begging he would send legates into the East to treat of a union between the two churches. Innocent received the presents, and in compliance with the emperor's request sent Albert, subdeacon, and a notary of the same name, charged with letters for the emperor, and likewise for the patriarch. He exhorted the emperor to assist the Latins to the utmost of his power in recovering the holy city, and promote, so far as in him lay, the union of the two churches, and the subjection of the Greek to the Latin. Several letters passed on this occasion between the pope and the patriarch of Constantinople concerning the primacy of St. Peter and the Roman see. It was in the end concluded, that a general council should meet, and the points in dispute be there determined by the whole church. The emperor promised to oblige the patriarch and all the other bishops in his dominions to attend the council. But the patriarch and the other bishops observing to the emperor, that the pope in one of his letters had threatened both him and them with excommunication, if they did not submit to his church, he repented the promise he had made, and wrote to the pope, that he had promised to send his bishops to the council, but that it was only upon condition they met in the East, where the four first councils had been held. To this the pope would not agree, as the emperor well knew before-hand; and thus the design was dropped.²

In the latter end of the present year, 1198, died in Sicily the empress Constantia, and by her last will appointed the pope guardian to her son Frederic, yet a minor, ordering thirty thousand turins to be paid yearly to his holiness, and more if thought necessary, to defray the expenses of the government, and defend the king and the kingdom. Con-

stantia was the daughter of king Roger, and the last of the lawful race of the Normans. She married, as has been said, the emperor Henry, and had by him Frederic, who, by right of his mother, became, upon his father's death, king of Sicily. The pope readily accepted of the trust, and wrote immediately to the archbishops of Palermo, Monreale, and Reggio, to acquaint them that he had accepted of the guardianship "not only in word but in deed." At the same time he sent Gregory, cardinal of St. Mary in Porticu, into Sicily, with the character of his legate, to take the government of the island upon him in his name. The cardinal upon his arrival in Sicily obliged all the bishops and the barons to swear allegiance to Innocent as regent of the kingdom, and then returned to Rome.¹ Such were the exploits of the first year of Innocent's pontificate.

Marcuvaldus, a powerful German lord, upon whom the emperor Henry had bestowed several baronies in Apulia and in Sicily, no sooner heard of the death of Constantia, than assembling all his friends and countrymen, he attacked and reduced many of the strongholds in Apulia, with a design of making himself master of the kingdom. But Innocent, not satisfied with solemnly excommunicating Marcuvaldus and all his adherents, ordered them to be cursed with bell, book, and candle, on every Sunday and holyday till they left the kingdom, or laid down their arms. As very little regard was had by Marcuvaldus and his Germans to these anathemas, Innocent resolved to back his spiritual with his temporal arms. Having, therefore, raised a considerable army, he sent it over to Sicily, under the command of John, his cousin and marshal, reputed one of the most experienced warriors of his time. The marshal, upon his arrival in Sicily, found Marcuvaldus besieging the city of Palermo with his Germans and all the Saracens of the island, whom he had gained over to his party. He attacked them nevertheless, and after a most obstinate resistance put them to flight, and pursued them with such slaughter, that Marcuvaldus was obliged to abandon the kingdom.²

In Germany the princes, as well as the people, were divided into three opposite parties, Philip of Suevia, the late emperor's brother, having been by one party chosen king of Germany, and Otho of Saxony by another, while many maintained that the imperial crown belonged, of right, to young Frederic, the son of the late emperor, and that, as they had sworn allegiance to him while he was yet in the cradle, they would acknowledge no other. Innocent will be the evil consequences of such a division; but declared Otho lawfully elected, ar—

¹ Epist. 242.² Acta. p. 60; et Epist. 211.¹ Epist. 563.² Epist. 250. Act. In

Arnold. Lubec.

The kingdom of France put under an interdict;—[Year of Christ, 1201.] The king obliged to recall his lawful wife. Embassy to Innocent from the king of Armenia;—[Year of Christ, 1202.] The kingdom of Bulgaria reunited to the apostolic see.

beginning of the following year, 1200, sent the two cardinals, Octavian, bishop of Ostia, and Guido, bishop of Palestrina, to notify this, his declaration, to the German princes, and command them, in his name, to abandon Philip and acknowledge Otho. But, notwithstanding the pope's declaration, many continued to adhere to Philip, which occasioned a most destructive war till the year 1207, when Philip and Otho came to an agreement, as we shall see in the sequel. In this dispute Premislaus, duke of Bohemia, sided first with Philip, but afterwards quitted his party and became one of Otho's most zealous partisans, which so pleased the pope that he bestowed upon him the title of king, which none of his predecessors had granted to any of the dukes of Bohemia, though Wratisslaus, the twentieth duke, had been created king by the emperor Henry III., in 1086.¹

As Philip Augustus, king of France, had not yet recalled Ingelburga, his lawful wife, but keeping her confined, continued to live with Mary, the daughter of the duke of Bohemia, Innocent dispatched into France, Peter, cardinal deacon of St. Mary, in Via Lata, with positive orders to lay all the king's dominions under an interdict, if he did not dismiss Mary, and own Ingelburga for his lawful wife. The legate, upon his arrival in France, held two councils, the one at Dijon, the other at Vienne; and in the latter he pronounced the sentence of interdict, forbidding ecclesiastics of all ranks, upon pain of suspension, to perform any sacred function whatever, within the king's dominions, except the christening of infants, and absolving penitents at the point of death. The king appealed to the pope; but Innocent, instead of revoking or suspending the sentence of the legate, confirmed it; inasmuch that Philip was in the end obliged to submit, and apply to the pope for a legate to take off the interdict, the people being everywhere ready to revolt. Innocent sent cardinal Octavian, bishop of Ostia, who, in a council held at St. Leodegarius, in Nivele, on the 7th of September, absolved the kingdom from the interdict, but upon condition, that in the space of six months, six weeks, six days, and six hours, the king should recall Ingelburga; and that if he did not within that period, a council should meet at Soissons, and the interdict be renewed. The council met at the time appointed, and the king, as well as Ingelburga, presented themselves at it to the legate. But the king, finding the legate as well as the bishops disposed to declare his first marriage valid, and quite tired with the altercations of the civilians, that had lasted several days, left the place abruptly, and took Ingelburga with

him, which put an end to the council.—The king dismissed Mary, but yet was not reconciled to Ingelburga till the year 1213, when Innocent at last prevailed upon him, to the inexpressible joy of all France, to take her to his bed again.

The following year a solemn embassy was sent to Innocent by Leo or Lievo, king of Armenia, and the patriarch Gregory, to assure his holiness that in all material points they entirely agree with the Roman church, and to implore his protection against the count of Tripoli, the people of Antioch, and the knights templars, treating them, though as good Christians as themselves, no better than they did the Saracens. The king begged, besides, that his holiness would reserve to himself the power of excommunicating him or any of his subjects, or laying his dominions under an interdict. The pope complied so far with the request of the king as to confine to himself, to his legates *a Latere*, or to such as acted by his particular mandate, the power of pronouncing any sentence against him, his subjects, or his kingdom; and sent at the same time, at the desire of the king, the pall, the ring, and the mitre to Gregory, lately preferred to the patriarchal dignity.²

The same year Innocent had the satisfaction of reuniting the kingdom of Bulgaria and Walachia to his see. The Greeks had been long masters of that country, and had subjected those churches to the see of Constantinople. But Johannitus, or Calo-Johannes, descended from the ancient kings of Bulgaria, having driven out the Greeks, and by his valour made himself master of the whole country, wrote a very submissive letter to the pope to acquaint him therewith, and beg his holiness to send him a crown, such a crown as the preceding popes used to send to the kings of Bulgaria his predecessors, as he was no less zealously attached to the apostolic see than any of them. Basilus, archbishop of Bulgaria, wrote much to the same purpose, promising in the king's name and his own, an entire submission to the apostolic see. Upon the receipt of these letters the pope immediately despatched one of his chaplains into Bulgaria, with letters in answer to those he had received from the king and the archbishop; and being informed by the chaplain of the state of affairs in that kingdom, he sent a legate *a Latere*, with the pall, the ring, and the mitre for the archbishop, but delayed sending the crown till the kingdom was reconciled, with the usual ceremonies, to the church. This was done in the latter end of the present year, the king swearing perpetual obedience to Innocent and his successors lawfully elected;

¹ Act. Inn. et Epist. 14, 15, &c. l. 3.

² Act. Inn. Hoveden ad ann. 1200.

³ Act. Inn. et Epist. 43—45.

A legate sent into Bulgaria. The king of Arragon at Rome ;—[Year of Christ, 1204.] Crowned by the pope. Oath taken by the king at his coronation. Philip elected anew king of Germany. The archbishop of Cologne excommunicated.

and in the following January Leo, cardinal presbyter of the holy cross, was sent into Bulgaria with the crown and all the other ensigns of royalty. But as he passed through the territories of Andrew, king of Hungary, he was stopped by that prince, on account of some differences subsisting, at that time, between him and the king of Bulgaria. This the pope looked upon as a gross affront offered to the apostolic see, and representing it as such in the letter he wrote, on that occasion, to the king, he threatened him with excommunication, if he did not forth with dismiss the legate, and suffer him to proceed on his journey. The king, dreading the consequences of an excommunication, which he knew the king of Bulgaria would not fail to improve to his advantage, dismissed the legate, who, arriving in Bulgaria, crowned the king with extraordinary pomp and solemnity. It is observable that on this occasion the legate granted to the king, in the pope's name, the privilege of coining money, which every prince had hitherto looked upon as inherent in his crown, and quite independent of the pope. The king, to convince the pope of his sincerity, sent with the legate, on his return to Rome, one of his own sons to be educated there.¹

Innocent was no less pleased with the submission of Peter II., king of Arragon, than with that of Calo-Johannes, king of Bulgaria. For the king of Arragon would be crowned by the pope himself, and came for that purpose, in the month of September of the present year, with a grand and numerous retinue to Rome. The pope sent the prefect of the city and the nobility in a body to meet him; and by them he was attended to St. Peter's, where Innocent received him with the greatest marks of esteem and affection, and allotted him the house of the canons of that church for his habitation, ordering him to be treated with all the magnificence suitable to his rank. On the third day after his arrival, the festival of St. Martin, or the 11th of November, the pope, attended by the whole college of cardinals, by the heads of the clergy, by all the magistrates and the nobility, went to the monastery of St. Pancratius, and having caused the king to be anointed there, in his presence, by the bishop of Porto, he placed the crown upon his head with his own hand, upon his taking the following oath: "I, Peter, king of the Arragonians profess and promise to be ever faithful and obedient to my lord pope Innocent, to his catholic successors, and the Roman church, and faithfully to preserve my kingdom in his obedience, defending the catholic faith, and persecuting heretical pravity. I shall maintain the liberty and immunity of the churches,

and defend their rights. I shall strive to promote peace and justice throughout my dominions. So help me God and these his holy gospels." The king, thus crowned, returned with the pope to the church of St. Peter, and there laying his crown and his scepter upon the altar of that saint, he received a sword from his holiness, and in return made his kingdom tributary to the apostolic see, binding himself, his heirs and successors for ever to pay yearly to Innocent and his successors two hundred and fifty pieces of gold called Massentinæ. This grant was signed by the king, and is dated, as we read it in the acts of Innocent, at St. Peter's, the 11th of November, the 8th year of king Peter's reign, and of our Lord 1204.¹

Innocent had declared, as we have seen, in favor of Otho, duke of Saxony, elected by one party king of Germany, against Philip of Suevia, chosen by another. He objected to the election of Philip, its not being made in the manner prescribed by the laws of the empire; nor indeed was it, and of this Philip himself was aware. His rival therefore being taken dangerously ill, and his recovery despaired of, he appointed a diet to meet at Aix-la-Chapelle, and there resigning the crown, to which, he said, some questioned his right, he applied to them to elect him anew, if they judged him worthy of the empire. The diet was numerous, and as they all concurred with their suffrages in replacing him on the throne, he was anointed and crowned with the usual ceremonies by Adolphus archbishop of Cologne, who had been one of Otho's most zealous partizans. The pope, highly provoked at the conduct of the archbishop in presuming to crown Philip, while Otho, whom the apostolic see had acknowledged, was still living, ordered Suffridus, archbishop of Mentz, to repair with the bishop of Cambray to Cologne, and there publicly to pronounce, in his name, the sentence of excommunication against Adolphus, to summon him to Rome, and if he refused to comply with the summons to remove him from his office, and appoint Bruno of Bon in his room. Suffridus executed his holiness's orders. But Adolphus, paying no regard to the excommunication, continued to exercise all the functions of his office as if no such sentence had ever passed, and Bruno, when he came to take possession of the see of Cologne, was arrested by Philip, and kept closely confined till the year 1207, when he was set at liberty by one of the articles of the agreement concluded between that prince and the pope, of which mention will be made in the sequel.² Otho recovered; but

¹ Act. Inn. Num. 120.

² Kranzius, l. 7. c. 24. Trithem. et Arnold. Lubec. in Chron.

¹ Act. Inn. et l. 7. Epist.

The city of Constantinople taken by the Latins. Baldwin, earl of Flanders, chosen emperor. The Latin patriarch confirmed by the pope;—[Year of Christ, 1205.] Miraculous image of the Virgin Mary.

the far greater part of the princes of Germany continued, in defiance of the pope's anathemas, to adhere to Philip.

Innocent had the satisfaction of receiving this year at Rome the submission of the patriarch of Constantinople, the Latin patriarch, the Latins having made themselves masters of that city on the following occasion: Isaacus Angelus, emperor of the East, being, in the year 1195, deposed, deprived of his sight, and confined to a dungeon by his brother Alexius Angelus, Alexius, the son of the deposed emperor, a youth then but fifteen years of age, having luckily made his escape, repaired to Philip, king of Germany, who had married his sister. Philip received him with great humanity, treated him in a manner suitable to his rank, and prevailed upon the Croises to espouse his cause, upon his promising to assist them to the utmost of his power; and to re-unite the two churches, if he were by their means placed upon the throne of his ancestors. The powerful supplies, therefore, consisting chiefly of French and Venetians, destined for the relief of the Christians in Palestine, sailing from Zara, where they had wintered, to Constantinople, attacked that city by sea and land, and at the end of eight days obliged the inhabitants to submit, and acknowledge young Alexius and his father Isaacus, whom they set at liberty, for lawful emperors. Alexius was crowned in the church of St. Sophia, by the patriarch; and on that occasion the father ratified all the promises his son had made. As for the usurper, he found means to make his escape before the Latins entered the city, and Alexius was crowned on the first of August 1203. But the two emperors being obliged to lay heavy taxes upon the people, to make good the promises they had made to the Latins, they openly revolted, and proclaimed Alexius Ducas emperor, who having seized young Alexius, put him to death with his own hand; and his father Isaacus dying soon after, Ducas, now master of the empire without a competitor, marched out against the French and Venetians, encamped in the neighborhood, and attacked them with great fury. But they, though in a manner surprised, not only stood their ground, but drove the enemy back with great slaughter into the city, which they immediately besieged. Ducas defended the walls some time with great bravery; but not finding himself in a condition to withstand the repeated efforts of the victorious army, and apprehending that, should he fall into their hands, they would revenge upon him the murder of Alexius, he withdrew in the night from the city, and left the citizens to shift for themselves. Upon his flight they proclaimed Theodorus Lascaris, his son-in-law, emperor. But the Latins having, in the mean time, made a breach in the wall, he too thought it advisable to con-

sult his own safety; and the citizens retiring, upon his flight, from the walls, the Latins entered the city without further opposition, and gave it up to be plundered by the soldiery. Thus was the city of Constantinople taken by the French and the Venetians on the 12th of April 1204, and Baldwin, earl of Flanders, chosen emperor, and crowned with great solemnity on the 16th of May of the same year.

As by an agreement between the French and the Venetians, the emperor was to be chosen out of the former nation, and the patriarch out of the latter, Thomas Maurocenus, a nobleman of Venice, was preferred to the patriarchal dignity, in the room of John Comaterus, who had fled, with many others of the clergy as well as the laity. The conduct of the Croises was at first highly disapproved and severely censured by the pope, as it was to make war on the infidels, and not on the Christians, that they had taken the cross. However, he afterwards approved of it, upon their representing to him the treacherous behavior of the late emperor, and the irreconcilable hatred he bore to the Latins. The new patriarch came, as soon as elected, to Rome, to have his election confirmed by the pope, and thus acknowledge his dependance upon the apostolic see. But Innocent, instead of confirming his election, declared it null, as having been made by the clergy, who had no such authority, and by laymen, who were not to intermeddle in elections. He was nevertheless prevailed upon by the emperor Baldwin to confer that dignity upon him by his own authority, as he was a man of an irreproachable character, was well known to Innocent, and by all judged worthy of the high station to which they had raised him. As he was at this time only subdeacon, the pope ordained him first deacon, then priest, and lastly bishop, and gave him the pall, reminding him, on that occasion, of the obedience he owed, though patriarch of the imperial city, to the successors of the prince of the apostles in the see of Rome.¹

Alexius Ducas, upon his sallying out of the city of Constantinople to attack the French and the Venetians, caused a famous, and as was believed, a miraculous image of the Virgin Mary, to be carried at the head of his army. Of this image frequent mention is made by all the Greek historians, and the victories the emperors gained ever since the year 973, are all ascribed by them to that image, as it was constantly carried before their armies. But far from defending them at this juncture, it was not able to defend itself, and was taken with the imperial standard. This image was supposed to have been painted by St. Luke; and the Venetians

¹ Acta Inn. Num. 92. 98. Page ad ann. 1204, 1205.

The new patriarch's conduct censured by the pope;—[Year of Christ, 1206.] The pope is reconciled to Philip, king of Germany. Quarrels with John, king of England. Occasion of this quarrel. The king's letter to the pope, and the pope's answer.

pretend the image that is to be seen in the church of St. Mark, at Venice, to be the identical image that was taken by them on the present occasion from the Greeks. But from one of Innocent's letters it appears that the image supposed to have been painted by St. Luke was taken by the Venetians out of the church of St. Sophia, that the patriarch excommunicated them on that account, and that the pope confirmed this sentence, and thus obliged them to restore it.¹

The Venetians, not satisfied with having a patriarch of their own nation, obliged him to swear that he would prefer none but natives of Venice. That oath Innocent declared to be null, and we have several letters written by him to the patriarch as well as to the duke and the senate of Venice, wherein he insists upon the patriarch's preferring men of merit, without any regard to their country, and threatens to absolve the clerks of other nations from their obedience to him, if he confined ecclesiastical dignities, the rewards of virtue, to those of his own.²

The following year peace was at last restored to Germany, and the pope, who had hitherto zealously adhered to Otho, was reconciled to Philip, whom he had deposed and excommunicated as unlawfully elected. For that prince having gained a complete victory over Otho, and even obliged him to quit Germany, and fly for refuge to John, king of England, his uncle, the German bishops sent Walfger, patriarch of Aquileia, and Gebhard, burgrave of Magdeburg, to acquaint the pope therewith, and beg his holiness would absolve him from the excommunication, and acknowledge him for lawful king, lest, by continuing to countenance his rival, he should rekindle the war. Innocent, finding Philip was now almost universally acknowledged by the princes of the empire, thought it advisable to abandon his rival and adhere to him; and he sent, accordingly, two cardinal legates into Germany to absolve him from the excommunication, upon his promising, upon oath, to stand to the judgment of the apostolic see with respect to the points that had occasioned the quarrel between him and the pope, and had drawn upon him the sentence of excommunication. When he had taken this oath the legates absolved him, and owned him, in the name of the pope, for lawful king of the Romans. The legates, in the next place, undertook, in conjunction with the German princes, to bring about an agreement between the two competitors, Philip and Otho, and thus prevent any new disturbances in the empire. The terms they proposed were, that Philip should give his daughter in marriage to Otho, with a dispensation from the pope, as they were re-

lated within the fourth degree of consanguinity, and that Otho should succeed his father-in-law if he happened to survive him. To these terms both princes agreed, and the pope approving and confirming them, hostilities ceased on both sides, and Philip was every where received for lawful king.¹

The differences that arose at this time between Innocent and John, king of England, on occasion of the election of a new archbishop of Canterbury, were not so easily composed. For archbishop Hubert dying, the monks of Canterbury chose privately, before he was buried, Reginald, their sub prior, for his successor, and sent him to Rome to be confirmed by the pope. This election they concealed from the king; nay, and to avoid incurring his indignation, they afterwards chose, upon his recommendation, John Gray, bishop of Norwich, and him the king put immediately in possession of the temporalities of the see of Canterbury, and sent some of the monks to Rome, to have his election confirmed by the pope. Upon the arrival of the sub prior and of these monks at Rome, the pope, after a superficial inquiry into the merits of both elections, declared them both null, and ordered the monks of Canterbury, then at Rome, to proceed to a new election, when Stephen Langton was chosen, or rather imposed upon them by Innocent, whose creature he was. Stephen thus elected, was consecrated by the pope himself on the 7th of June of the present year. He was a man of great probity and learning, was a native of England, and had been preferred this very year by Innocent from the post of chancellor of the university of Paris to the dignity of presbyter cardinal of St. Chrysogonus.²

The king was no sooner informed of what had passed at Rome, than provoked beyond measure at the deceitful as well as undutiful conduct of the monks, he sent two knights with a sufficient force to drive them all from Canterbury, confiscated all their lands and effects, and forbade Stephen Langton to set foot in England, upon pain of being treated as a traitor. At the same time he wrote a very sharp and spirited letter to the pope, telling him, that he was quite astonished at his conduct in vacating the election of the bishop of Norwich, a person in whom he could confide, and putting upon him one who had spent great part of his life with his enemies in France, and was utterly unknown both to him and the chapter, and that without his knowledge or consent, by an open invasion of the undoubted rights of his crown, which he was unalterably determined to maintain to the last drop of his blood. He added, that his kingdom afforded

¹ Inn. Epist. 211.

² Regist. l. 9. Num. 94.

¹ Innocent Epist. 142—150.

² Matth. Paris. Acta Inn. Num. 131.

England laid under a general interdict;—[Year of Christ, 1208.] Philip murdered, and Otho chosen in his room. Oath taken by Otho before his consecration. Is crowned at Rome by the pope;—[Year of Christ, 1209.]

greater advantages to the apostolic see, than all the kingdoms together on this side the Alps, which entided him to some regard from that see; that he was determined to maintain, at all events, the election of the bishop of Norwich; that he should have justice done him at home, if refused at Rome; that he would suffer no appeals to be made to Rome, and thus prevent his subjects from carrying thither the wealth of the kingdom. Innocent was well acquainted with the character of the king, knew him to be a man of no steadiness, of no resolution, and rather hated than beloved by his subjects; and therefore making no account of his menaces, he answered him in his own style, telling him that the friendship of the apostolic see was as necessary to him as his friendship was to the apostolic see; that if he did not submit he would plunge himself into inextricable difficulties; that he resisted in vain the vicar of Him at whose name every knee must bend; that the customs which he was attempting to revive had been given up by his father and brother, &c.¹

Innocent, finding he could by no letters, no admonitions prevail upon the king to receive the new archbishop, and restore to the monks of Canterbury their confiscated lands and effects, wrote to the bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester, commanding them to admonish him anew in his name, and, if he continued obstinate in his former resolution, to lay the whole kingdom under an interdict. This order the three prelates notified to the king, earnestly exhorting him to avert the impending calamities, by a speedy compliance with his holiness's injunctions. But the king, suffering his passion to get the better of his reason, drove them from his presence with the most opprobrious language, and most dreadful menaces, not only against them, but against the whole body of the clergy as well as the monks, if they presumed to execute that or any other order from Rome, against his will, or without his permission. But the bishops choosing, in spite of these menaces, to obey the pope rather than their sovereign, published a general interdict on the 23d of March of the present year 1208, and ordered it to be strictly observed, throughout the kingdom, by ecclesiastics of all ranks on pain of excommunication and the loss of all their benefices. Thus was an entire stop put everywhere to all religious functions, except the baptizing of children, and absolving of such as were at the point of death. All the churches, oratories, and places of public worship were shut up. The dead were no longer buried in consecrated ground, but in the fields without any funeral pomp, or prayers, or the attendance of the clergy.² We shall leave

England for a while in that condition, and return to the affairs of Germany.

Philip enjoyed but a very short time the peace he had concluded with Otho. For Otho, palatine of Witelspach, provoked at his disposing of his daughter to another when he had promised her in marriage to him, treacherously murdered him at Bamberg on the 22d of June of the present year. Upon the news of his death, Innocent wrote to all the princes of the empire, recommending to them the observance of the late agreement between Philip and Otho, and forbidding the bishops upon pain of excommunication, to elect, crown, or anoint, any other than Otho; and he was accordingly unanimously elected anew, at Francfort, on the 11th of November of this year. Hereupon Innocent dispatched immediately legates into Germany to congratulate him upon his election, and invite him to Rome to receive there the imperial crown. The legates were charged with the form of the oath that Otho was to take before he set out in his journey to Rome. It was drawn up in the following terms: "I promise to honor and obey Pope Innocent as my predecessors have honored and obeyed his. The elections of bishops shall be free, and the vacant sees shall be filled by such as have been elected by the whole chapter, or by a majority. Appeals to Rome shall be made freely, and freely pursued. I promise to suppress and abolish the abuse that has obtained of seizing the effects of deceased bishops and the revenues of vacant sees. I promise to extirpate all heresies; to restore to the Roman church all her possessions, whether granted to her by my predecessors or by others, particularly the March of Ancona, the dukedom of Spoleti, and the territories of the countess Mathilda, and inviolately to maintain all the rights and privileges enjoyed by the apostolic see in the kingdom of Sicily." This oath was taken by Otho at Spire on the 22d of March 1208, and sent to the pope by Walfger, patriarch of Aquileia.¹

This oath Innocent caused to be lodged in the archives of the Roman church, as a pattern of the oath that all other emperors were to take; and commending Otho, in the letter he wrote to him on that occasion, for his filial submission and obedience, invited him anew to Rome, to receive the imperial crown at his hands. In compliance with that invitation, Otho set out from Germany at the head of a very numerous army, being attended by most of the ecclesiastic as well as secular princes of the empire. On his arrival at Milan he was crowned there king of Italy by Hubert, archbishop of that city, with an iron crown, according to custom. From Milan he pursued his march to Rome,

¹ Matth. Paris. Acta Inn. num. 135. ² Idem ibid.

¹ Acta Inn. et Epist. 189.

Otho excommunicated and deposed by the pope;—[Year of Christ, 1210.] Frederic, king of Sicily, chosen emperor. Legates sent into England. The king excommunicated and deposed. A crusade set on foot against him.

and finding the pope at Viterbo, he was there received by him with all possible marks of friendship and esteem. Innocent, after some private conferences with the king, returned to Rome, whither he was soon followed by Otho, who arriving at that city on the 15th of September was, on the following Sunday, the 17th of that month, crowned by the pope in St. Peter's with the usual ceremonies.¹

The harmony between the pope and the new emperor was but short-lived. For Otho, alleging that the oath which his holiness had required of him to take, was inconsistent with his prior oath to maintain the just rights of the empire, not only refused to restore the demesnes of the countess Mathilda, but made himself master of the whole province of Flaminia, then possessed by the pope, as originally belonging to the empire, and unalienable. At the same time he broke into Apulia, seized, he said, by usurpers, meaning the Normans, during the disturbances that prevailed in Germany, and obliged the emperor to connive at their usurpations. Innocent, highly provoked at Otho's ingratitude, as he called it, and finding he paid no regard either to his menaces or his repeated monitories, excommunicated him at last as solemnly as he had crowned him the year before; declared him an enemy to the church; and not only absolved all his subjects from their oath of allegiance, but involved in the same sentence all who should thenceforth own him for emperor, or obey him as such. This sentence was published in Germany by Suffrid, archbishop of Mentz, and such disturbances thereupon ensued as obliged Otho to quit Apulia, where his arms were attended with great success, and return with all haste to his German dominions. For several princes, and among the rest the king of Bohemia, the dukes of Austria and Bavaria, and the archbishop of Treves, in a meeting they had, chose Frederic king of Sicily for emperor in the room of Otho, who, they said, had forfeited all right to the imperial crown by his disobedience to his lord the pope. Frederic was the son of the late emperor Henry V., and at this time in the seventeenth year of his age, had been proclaimed and acknowledged king of the Romans in his father's lifetime, while yet an infant in the cradle, as has been said, and had therefore a better right to the imperial crown than either Philip or Otho. This election the above-mentioned princes immediately notified to the pope, and upon his confirming it, which he did very readily, they sent a solemn deputation to invite Frederic into Germany.²

In England, the interdict, laid on the

kingdom in 1208, was still observed almost universally; which drew a cruel, and not wholly undeserved, persecution upon the monks and the clergy. The monks were driven from their monasteries, and the clergy from their churches, and their effects, lands, and possessions generally confiscated. They took care to acquaint the pope with the unhappy situation to which they were reduced for obeying his commands, earnestly entreating him to interpose his authority in their behalf. Innocent, hearkening to their complaints, sent Pandulph, subdeacon of the Roman church, and Durand, knight-templar, to try whether they could prevail upon the king to suffer the archbishop to take possession of his see, a point which his holiness was determined never to give up, and to receive the clergy, who had complied with the interdict, into favor. The legates met with a more kind reception from the king than they expected. He even agreed, in the several conferences he had with them, to receive the archbishop, to recall all the banished monks and clergy, and reinstate them in their benefices and possessions. But the legates insisting upon his repairing the losses they had sustained, the king dismissed them and would see them no more. They retired to France, and from thence transmitted to the pope an account of the success of their negotiations in England. That account the pope caused to be read in a consistory of all the cardinals, when all were of opinion that the king ought not only to be excommunicated, but deposed: and that sentence was accordingly pronounced, with the greatest solemnity, by the pope himself. The king's subjects were not only all absolved from their oath of allegiance, but strictly forbidden to acknowledge him, in any respect whatever, for their sovereign, to obey him, or even to speak to him. Innocent did not stop here, but charging Philip Augustus, king of France, with the execution of his sentence, he granted to him the kingdom of England, to be held for ever by him and his successors, provided he drove John, who had forfeited all right to it, from the throne. At the same time he exhorted, by his letters and his nuncios sent over all Europe, all Christian princes, and all good Christians, to take the cross, and attend the king of France in the holy war against the king of England, as a cruel persecutor of the English church, and a disturber of the church universal. They who engaged in this war, or any ways contributed to the carrying it on, were to wear the cross, and enjoy the same privileges as those who went to Palestine to serve against the infidels.

Philip of France, tempted with the promise of so great a reward as the kingdom of England, if he drove John from the throne, assembled a powerful army and numerous

¹ Corius Hist. Mediolan. Part. III. Chron. Fossæ Novæ. Chron. Haver. l. 7. c. 10. Usperg, &c.

² Usperg. Godefrid. Matth. Paris, &c.

The king is forced to submit;—[Year of Christ, 1213.] Yields up his kingdom to the pope, and becomes his vassal. Crusade against the Albigenses;—[Year of Christ, 1214.] The count of Toulouse excommunicated.

fleet for that purpose. On the other hand John, hearing of these vast preparations, was not idle, but drew together an army of sixty thousand men, and caused a great number of ships to be fitted out and manned to dispute the passage of the French. He marched at the head of his army to Dover, where the fleet assembled. But while he was watching there the motions of the French, arrived Pandulph, the pope's nuncio, with a letter from Innocent to the king, telling him, that blessing and cursing were set before him; that it was yet in his power to choose; and that if he did not submit to the terms he had prescribed and sent to his nuncio, he would deliver the church of England, as God did that of Israel, with a strong hand. At the same time the crafty nuncio magnified the strength of Philip's fleet and army; assured the king that he had no less to fear from his subjects than from the French, and that many of the barons had promised to join Philip as soon as he landed in England. A false prophet was likewise set up, one Peter an hermit, who publicly prophesied, and was believed by many, that the king would certainly be deprived of his kingdom before the approaching feast of the Ascension, which in the present year, 1213, fell on the 10th of May. These circumstances were all dexterously improved by the nuncio to heighten the fears of the king, and with the wished-for success. For that unhappy prince distrusting, and not without reason, his own subjects, and apprehending himself to be in no less danger from them than from the French themselves, chose rather to submit to the very hard terms imposed upon him by the pope than to run the risk of losing his kingdom. He therefore in the first place promised upon oath to stand to the judgment of the church; and at the same time sixteen of the barons swore, that if the king did not freely perform the promise he had made, they would oblige him by force to observe it. On the following Monday, the 13th of May, the king delivered a writing to the nuncio, wherein he promised to allow the archbishop to take undisturbed possession of his see, to recall all the banished bishops, clerks, monks and laymen, to receive them into favor, and make full satisfaction for the losses they had sustained. Two days after, that is, on the 15th of May, the eve of the Ascension, the nuncio, pursuant to his instructions, obliged the king, now entirely at their mercy, to yield up to him, as the representative of the pope, the kingdoms of England and Ireland, to be thenceforth held for ever by him and his successors as feudatories of the apostolic see, paying yearly seven hundred marks for the former, and three hundred for the latter, besides the Peter-pence for both kingdoms. Having thus surrendered his two kingdoms to the

pope, he took the crown from off his head and delivered it to Pandulph, who returned it five days after upon the king's consigning to him an instrument, whereby he owned himself a vassal of the apostolic see, and his paying the stipulated sum as a token of his vassalage. He was not however absolved from the excommunication, till all the exiles were returned and reinstated in their benefices and possessions, that is, till the 16th of July of the present year, when the archbishop Langton and the other bishops absolved him with great solemnity upon his renewing all the promises he had made.¹

Raymund, count of Toulouse, met with no better treatment from the pope than John king of England. Innocent had sent several missionaries to convert the Albigenses, who were very numerous and increased daily in the territories of the count. But the missionaries made very little progress, and one of them, Peter de Chateaufort, was murdered, as was commonly believed, by the count's order. Hereupon Innocent, not satisfied with excommunicating the count without any further inquiry, set on foot a crusade against the Albigenses in general, ordering them to be pursued with fire and sword, and to be treated with more severity than the Saracens themselves. An army was soon raised, some say of five hundred thousand men, which so alarmed count Raymund, as the pope had absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and granted his dominions to any who should seize them, that thinking it advisable to submit for the present, he dispatched deputies to Rome to beg his holiness would recal the monks who had exasperated his subjects with their too great severity, and send a legate in their room, to whose judgment he said he was ready to stand, and to give his holiness the satisfaction that his legate should require. The pope, in compliance with his request, sent Milo, one of his chaplains, and Thedisius, canon of Genoa, with the character of his legates *a Latere*, to receive his submission, and absolve him if he agreed to the terms which they were enjoined to offer. The legates on their arrival in Provence, summoned the count to meet them at Valence, whither he immediately repaired, flattering himself that in consideration of his ready compliance with their summons they would stop the Croises, ready to fall upon his dominions. The legates received him with great haughtiness, and let him know that to obtain absolution he must promise upon oath to obey them in all things, and deliver up to them five of his strong holds to be held by the Roman church, if he did not perform what he had promised. With these terms, hard as they were, the count

¹ M. Paris ad ann. 1209, 1212, 1213. Innocent Epist. l. 10. Epist. 159, et Epist. l. 15. Epist. 233. Polydor. l. 15.

The count of Toulouse submits to the penance imposed upon him. Cruelties committed by the Croises.

was obliged to comply. The castles were yielded up to Thedisius, who immediately garrisoned them with detachments from the army of the Croises. Raymund was then ordered to repair to St. Gilles to receive absolution there from the hands of Milo the other legate, who, before he granted it, made him swear upon the corpus Domini, or the body of our Lord, and upon the relics of the saints, that he would obey the pope and the holy Roman church so long as he lived, that he would pursue with fire and sword the Albigenes till they were totally extirpated or converted, and would even take the cross and serve in the holy war against them. Having taken this oath at the door of the church of St. Gilles or Ægidius, he was ordered by the legate to strip himself naked, and humbly submit to the penance which he and the prelates there present thought he ought to undergo for the murder of the holy monk sent by the pope to reclaim his subjects from their detestable errors. The count protested against this extraordinary penance, declaring that he had not murdered the monk, nor ordered him to be murdered. The legate answered, that as the murder was committed in his dominions, and the murderer had not been brought to justice, nor had any search been made after him, the crime was justly imputed to him, and he must publicly atone for it. The count therefore having stript himself quite naked from head to foot, with only a linen cloth round his waist for decency's sake, the legate threw a priest's stole round his neck, and leading him by it into the church and nine times round the pretended martyr's grave, he now and then made use of the bundle of rods which he held in his hand. The legate granted him at last the dear-purchased absolution, after obliging him to renew all the oaths he had taken, and to add one more to them, that of inviolably maintaining all the rights, privileges, immunities, and liberties of the church and the clergy.¹

The count of Toulouse having thus saved himself and his dominions from utter ruin, the Croises turned their arms against the count of Beziers, who was himself a good catholic, but as the greater part of his subjects had embraced and professed the doctrine of the Albigenes, they were to be extirpated. Siege was accordingly laid to the city of Beziers, which held out for some time, but being in the end forced to surrender, the inhabitants were all most cruelly massacred by the holy warriors without distinction of sex or age, of catholic or heretic, in spite of the remonstrances of the count and the bishop of the place, assuring them that the town was inhabited by as many catholics, at least, as heretics. To be sure

¹ Petrus Vallus-Surnensis, Cællus Hist. Comit. Tolus. l. 2.

that they spared no heretic, they spared none at all, but put all to the sword indiscriminately, and then setting fire to the city, reduced it to ashes. From Beziers the Croises marched to Carcassonne, belonging to the count of Beziers, besieged it, and though defended with great bravery by the count in person, made themselves masters of the place. Petrus Vallus-Sernensis, a monk who lived at this time, writes, that when the inhabitants desired to capitulate, the terms offered them by the legates were, that they should surrender at discretion, and, marching out of the town naked as they came into the world, throw themselves upon the mercy of the conquerors. With these terms they refused to comply, and were therefore treated by the Croises with the same barbarity as the inhabitants of Beziers. Upon the taking of Carcassonne, they chose Simon count of Montfort for their general, a man of a most cruel disposition, and therefore perfectly well qualified to be placed at the head of such an army. Under his conduct they fell upon the dominions of the counts of Foix, of Comminges, of Bearn, destroying all before them with fire and sword. The counts were all three catholics, but met with no better quarter than the heretics, because they refused to join in the cruel persecution against them and massacre their own subjects. In this war threescore thousand persons are said to have been sacrificed to the fury of these holy warriors. The king of Arragon, shocked at the unheard-of barbarities committed by the Croises in the territories of catholic princes, appealed in their behalf to the pope, but finding that they were countenanced therein by his holiness, he raised an army of an hundred thousand men, and being joined by the count of Toulouse and the other counts mentioned above, he besieged the count of Montfort in the castle of Muret at a small distance from Toulouse. But he was unhappily killed in a sally made by the besieged with their general at their head. Upon his death the army dispersed, and the count of Toulouse being excommunicated anew for joining him, his dominions were overrun by the Croises, and granted by the pope to the count of Montfort, to be held by him till the meeting of the general council, which he intended to assemble in the Lateran. The reader will find in Perrin's History of the Albigenes a most shocking account of the barbarities practiced upon that innocent people, when no longer able to defend themselves.

In Germany the emperor Otho, whom Innocent had excommunicated and deposed, being abandoned by most of the German princes, Frederic, king of Sicily, whom they had chosen in his room, leaving Sicily, set out, at their invitation, for Germany, and taking Rome in his way, he was received

Donation of the county of Fondi to the pope. The fourth Lateran council. Number of bishops, &c. Some canons of this council. Transubstantiation established. Canons against heretics.

there by Innocent with all possible marks of distinction. Frederic in return confirmed the donation the count of Fondi had lately made of that city and all its territories to the Roman church. The diploma confirming it begins thus: "To our most holy father and lord Innocent, high pontiff, Frederic, by the grace of God and his, king of Sicily, of the dukedom of Apulia, and the principality of Capua, emperor of the Romans elect, and ever august. Whereas R., (that is, Richard,) late count of Fondi, has, by his last will, bequeathed to the holy Roman church the county of Fondi and all his territories on the river Garigliano, we allow you to hold or vend the said county with all its appurtenances, or otherwise dispose of it as you shall think fit."¹

The following year, 1215, was held the fourth general Lateran council. To this council Innocent had invited all the bishops of Christendom by his circulatory letters dated the 20th of April, 1213, and had appointed them to meet in the Lateran church on the 1st of November, 1215, and there to deliberate jointly with him upon the means of recovering the holy land, of extirpating heresies, and redressing the abuses that had crept into the church. The patriarchs, archbishops and bishops were all strictly enjoined to attend the council, except one, or at most, two, who were to remain in each province to perform there the episcopal functions, and such as for their age or infirmities were not in a condition to undergo the fatigues of a journey; but they as well as all chapters, were to send their deputies to attend in their room. The abbots and priors were particularly summoned, and all Christian princes exhorted to send ambassadors to represent them at the council.²

The council met at the place and time appointed, and consisted of four hundred and twelve bishops, among whom were the two Latin patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem, and seventy-seven archbishops. The patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria sent their deputies, the former being indisposed, and the latter subject to the Saracens. Ambassadors assisted from all the Christian princes, namely, from Frederic, king of Sicily and emperor elect; from Henry, emperor of Constantinople, and from the kings of France, England, Hungary, Jerusalem, Cyprus, Arragon, &c.; and so great was the crowd, that one of the bishops was stifled in it the first day; which the pope being informed of, he swore by St. Peter, that the deceased bishop's Mausoleum should be distinguished with a marble tomb stone.³ The pope opened the council with a speech, exhorting all, but particularly the ecclesiastics, to contribute all in their power to the relief of the Holy Land, and to the extirpa-

ting of the many abuses that prevailed almost universally and greatly disfigured the face of the church. Those abuses he ascribed chiefly to the ecclesiastics, whose example, he said, the laity were apt to follow, and, therefore warmly exhorted the bishops to begin the reformation with reforming their clergy.

In the next place seventy canons, all drawn up before hand by the pope, were, by his order, read to the council for their approbation. Some did, says Matthew Paris, who wrote in 1240, and some did not approve of these canons. However, as none openly opposed them, they passed for the decrees or canons of the council. The first canon contained a confession of faith, and all who did not hold that confession were declared heretics. One of the articles, that all were to hold on pain of being deemed heretics, was this, that "the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament are verily contained under the appearance of bread and wine; the bread being, by Divine power, transubstantiated into the body and the wine into the blood of our Lord; that to complete the mystery of a perfect union, we might receive of him what he took of us." Thus was transubstantiation first heard of and declared an article of faith. By the second canon the book of Joachim, abbot of Flore, treating Peter Lombard, the Master of Sentences, as a heretic, was condemned. But the abbot himself was spared, as he had submitted his doctrine to the judgment of the apostolic see. Joachim pretended that Lombard had held a quarterity in God. But the council, or rather the pope, declared his manner of explaining the Trinity entirely orthodox, and Joachim's erroneous. The third canon was calculated to extirpate heresies and heretics, and contains many sanguinary laws against them. Heretics, when convicted, were, by that canon, to be delivered up to the secular power, in order to be punished as they deserved, but the clerks were to be first degraded. The effects of laymen were confiscated, and those of the clergy to be applied to the church. And it was ordained, that all princes should swear to extirpate the heretics in their dominions; that they should be excommunicated by the metropolitan and the bishops of the province, if they refused to take that oath; and if they gave not satisfaction within the space of a year, they should acquaint the pope therewith, that he might absolve their subjects from their allegiance, and bestow their dominions upon catholics, who should hold them upon their extirpating heretics and maintaining the purity of the faith, saving the right of the lord paramount, provided he did not oppose the execution of this ordinance. For if he opposed it, he was to forfeit his right. By the same canon the privileges enjoyed by those who serve

¹ Raynald. Census Eccles. Roman. Num. 2.

² Epist. Innocent. ordine 3.

³ Chron Mailros.

Canons concerning the rank of the patriarchs and their power. The manner of proceeding against ecclesiastics. Confession and communion enjoined once a year. Laws concerning elections. Count of Toulouse deprived of his dominions by the pope and the council.

against the Saracens in Spain or in Palestine, are all granted to such as shall serve against the heretics, or any ways contribute to their destruction; all persons are enjoined to avoid, on pain of excommunication, the company and all intercourse with heretics; and such as incur, on that account, the excommunication, are excluded from the sacraments, and to be denied Christian burial, if they give not satisfaction before their death. Lastly, all bishops are commanded, upon pain of excommunication and deposition, to clear their respective dioceses of all heretics, employing for that purpose the secular power, and obliging the princes with the censures of the church to concur with them in so pious an undertaking. So great was the antipathy the Greeks bore to the Latins, that they would not celebrate upon the same altars till they had washed them, and rebaptized those who had been baptized by the Latins. These practices are condemned by the fourth canon, and the Greeks are exhorted to adopt the ceremonies and practices of the Roman church. The fifth canon settles the rank of the patriarchal see, and the see of Constantinople is declared the first after that of Rome, placed by our Lord himself above all other sees; the see of Alexandria the second; that of Antioch the third; and the see of Jerusalem the fourth. To these patriarchs power is granted to bestow the pall upon the archbishops under their jurisdiction; but they must themselves have first received it of the apostolic see, and must exact of those to whom they give that mark of the plenitude of power, a profession of canonical obedience to the Roman church, and to him who presides in it. When they have received the pall, they are allowed to have the cross carried before them, except in the city of Rome, and in the places where the pope's legate may reside. By the same canon they are empowered to receive and determine appeals, unless they are made to the apostolic see; for to such appeals all must pay humble deference. The eighth canon regulates the manner of proceeding against ecclesiastics. They were not to be accused slightly; they were to be present when an information was lodged against them; they were to have a copy of the accusations brought against them; were to be told who were their accusers, and their exceptions to the witnesses as well as to the accusers were to be heard. The twenty-first canon commands all who have attained to the years of discretion, to confess their sins at least once a year to their proper priest, to fulfil the penance he shall impose, and to receive the eucharist at least at Easter. This is still one of the commandments of the church, except that every one may now confess to any licensed priest whatever. They who did not

comply with this injunction were excluded from the church during their life, and from Christian burial after their death. The twenty-fourth canon prescribes the laws to be observed in all elections, namely, that three persons be chosen out of those who have a right to vote to gather the suffrages, and set them down in writing; that the votes shall be publicly read as soon as they have all voted, and the person who has a majority shall be declared canonically elected. The chapter, however, is allowed to appoint some of their own body to elect in the name of them all. Elections made otherwise are all declared null, unless the electors should all concur at once, as it were by inspiration, on electing one and the same person. They who consent to elections made by the secular power are deprived of the benefices to which they were elected, and pronounced incapable of holding any other; and all who shall approve of such elections are suspended from their respective offices and benefices during the space of three years, and excluded for ever from voting in elections. The twenty-ninth canon forbids the same person to have two benefices, to which the cure of souls is annexed. The forty-fourth canon forbids ecclesiastics to observe the constitutions of princes that are any ways prejudicial to the rights of their churches. Many other decrees were issued by this council to reform the manners of the clergy, particularly against drunkenness and incontinency; against the debauchery and negligence of the bishops; the manner of proceeding in excommunications was regulated; the prohibition of marriages was restrained to the fourth degree; clandestine marriages were forbidden, and the children of persons married within the forbidden degrees were declared illegitimate.

Before the council broke up, Raymund, count of Toulouse, came to Rome, to demand of the pope the restitution of his dominions, from which he had been driven by Simon, count of Montfort, as an abettor of the Albigenes. He promised to give what satisfaction his holiness and the council should require, and even to join the Croises against his own subjects. But all in vain, his dominions were adjudged to the count of Montfort, as a reward for the zeal he had exerted in the destruction of the innocent Albigenes. However, the territories possessed by the count in Provence were left to his son; and a pension of four hundred marks of silver a year was ordered to be paid him out of his father's other dominions, provided he joined in extirpating the heretics. From this time the count of Montfort assumed the title of count of Toulouse, received the investiture of that county at the hands of the French king, and continued to prosecute the poor Albigenes with fire and

The archbishop of Canterbury suspended. The barons excommunicated. Other matters determined in the council. The decrees made by Innocent, and not by the council.

sword, but could never entirely suppress them.¹ Thus did the pope and the council, not only with the consent, but with the concurrence of princes, usurp an absolute power in temporals as well as in spirituals.

In this council the sentence that had been pronounced some time before, suspending Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury, was confirmed. The archbishop had been charged by king John's ambassadors at Rome with favoring the barons, who had taken up arms against him, and the pope had writ to the archbishop, commanding him to oblige the barons, by ecclesiastical censures, to submit to the king. To that command the archbishop paid no kind of regard; and being on that account suspended by the pope's order, the affair was brought before the council, when the pope, swearing by St. Peter that he would not suffer such temerity and disobedience to pass unpunished, confirmed the sentence.² By the same council, or rather by the pope in the council, the barons were excommunicated, as appears from a letter he wrote on that occasion to the archdeacon of Poitiers, and to one Robert, of the church of Norwich. "We will have you to know," says Innocent, in that letter, "that in the general council we have excommunicated and anathematized, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in the name of the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, and our own, the barons of England, with their partisans and abettors, for persecuting John, the illustrious king of England, who has taken the cross, and is a vassal of the Roman church, and striving to deprive him of a kingdom that is known to belong to the Roman church."³ But the barons, bidding defiance to the pope's anathemas, pursued their point, and settled the English government upon the bottom on which it remains at this day.

Several other matters were settled in this council. The ambassadors from the two pretenders to the empire, Otho and Frederic, were heard for several days together; but as in the end the contest between the two opposite parties grew very warm, the pope, rising from his chair, and commanding silence, confirmed the election of Frederic. The two orders of "Dominic" and "Francis of Assisi," or of "Dominicans" and "Franciscans," are said to have been approved by the pope in this council, though no bull was issued to confirm them. On the last day of the council, the pope caused the decree, which he had drawn up for the immediate relief of the Christians in the Holy Land, to be published. By that decree greater privileges were granted to all who should take the cross, than had yet been granted to any

other. A plenary indulgence, or a full remission of all sins, was promised to all who should either take the cross, or supply with money, arms, or provisions, such as took it. The beneficed clergy were all ordered to contribute the twentieth part of their revenues, for the space of three years, and the cardinals the tenth, and that obligation the pope laid upon himself. All Christian princes who were at war were commanded to make peace, or at least to agree to a four years' truce, upon pain of being excommunicated in their persons, and having their dominions laid under an interdict, &c.

As to the decrees and definitions of the council, they were, as has been observed above, drawn up by Innocent, and only read to the council, when they were liked by some, says Matthew Paris, but thought burthensome by others: so that they were not even approved, at least all of them, by the council, and cannot, therefore, be looked upon as the decrees of the council, but of Innocent. Nay, Gregory IX., who was nephew, and next successor but one to Innocent, published these decrees as his uncle's own, calling them constantly "the decrees of Innocent." Besides, to this council there are no subscriptions, and authors are not agreed about the number of its canons or decrees. For some mention only sixty, but in the council, as we now have it, are seventy, and in Innocent's works seventy-two. However, as transubstantiation, auricular confession, the deposing power, the entire subjection of the see of Constantinople, as well as of all other sees, to that of Rome, and the supremacy of the pope in temporals as well as in spirituals, are supposed to have been defined by this council, no man dares question its authority in the countries where the inquisition prevails, or ascribe its decrees and definitions to Innocent alone. But the learned Du Pin has made it appear that no canons were made by the council; that several decrees were indeed drawn up by the pope, some of which, when read in council, seemed burthensome to many.¹ And who knows but the decrees concerning transubstantiation, the deposing doctrine, and auricular confession, were in the number of those decrees that seemed burthensome?

The only thing we read of Innocent, after the celebration of the council, is his carrying, in a solemn procession, the famous image, called Veronica, from the church of St. Peter to the Hospital of the Holy Ghost, and from that hospital back to St. Peter's. Of this image mention is made by some writers long before Innocent's time, and by them we are told, that as our Savior was carrying his cross to Mount Calvary, and "sweat ran from his face like drops of

¹ Petrus Vallus-Sernens. Hist. Albigen. c. 83.

² Mat. Paris, p. 189.

³ Ibid, p. 192.

¹ Du Pin Dissert. p. 573.

Death of Innocent ;—[Year of Christ, 1216.] His character.

blood," a pious woman, named by some Berenice, and by others Veronica, wiped it with her handkerchief; upon which our Savior, to reward her piety, left imprinted the true image of his countenance. Innocent composed a prayer in honor of this image, and granted a ten days' indulgence to all who should visit it.¹ John XXII., more generous than Innocent, vouchsafed no less than ten thousand days indulgence to every repetition of the prayer: "Hail, holy face of our Redeemer, printed upon a cloth as white as snow; purge us from all spot of vice, and join us to the company of the blessed. Bring us to our country, O happy figure! there to see the pure face of Christ." This prayer is publicly said to this day; and I need not tell the reader what kind of worship is thereby paid to that image. Some will have the word Veronica to be an abbreviation of the two words "vera icon," or true image, and consequently the name of the image, and not of the woman. This famous handkerchief is still to be seen in St. Peter's, at Rome, and likewise at Turin, as is St. John Baptist's right arm to be seen at Genoa and at Malta, and we read of many other relics that are thus to be met with in many different places.

As the Pisans and the Genoese were at war, Innocent undertook a journey the following year to Pisa, with a design to reconcile those two powerful republics, and persuade them to join the other Christian princes against the common enemy. But, being arrived at Perugia, he was seized there with a violent fever, that in a few days put an end to his life. His death happened on the 16th of July, 1216, after a pontificate of eighteen years, six months, and nine days, reckoning from the day of his election, that is, from the 8th of January, 1198. The contemporary authors are not agreed about his character. He is charged with extreme avarice by M. Paris, who tells us that he obliged the bishops, who came to the council, to pay large sums for leave to return to their respective sees, which sums they were obliged to borrow of the Roman merchants, at an exorbitant interest; that he extorted an hundred marks of the abbot of St. Albans, and ten thousand of the new archbishop of York.² But in his "Acts," he is greatly

commended for his generosity to the poor, and it is certain that he founded and richly endowed the Hospital of the Holy Ghost, famous to this day in Rome, and expended a considerable part of his yearly income in promoting the holy war. As for his parts and his learning, all who speak of him allow him to have been superior in abilities and knowledge to most of his predecessors, and inferior to none. He is said to have been the best civilian, as well as the best divine of his time; and it is observed of him by the author of his life, that in all disputes he so faithfully recapitulated the reasons on both sides, and urged them with such force, that nobody could tell what side he inclined to till he gave sentence, and that his sentence was ever agreeable to the strictest laws of justice and equity. His ambition knew no bounds. He claimed, as absolute monarch of the universe, the power of pulling down and setting up kings, and disposing of their kingdoms at his pleasure, and was attended, as we have seen, with better success in the exercise of that chimerical power, than his predecessor, Gregory VII., in whose pontificate it first was heard of. We are told by Thomas de Cantinpré, who wrote the life of St. Lutgard, a Cistercian nun, and died in 1262, that Innocent, appearing to that saint after his death, surrounded with flames, told her that he had been condemned, for three offences, to the pains of purgatory till the day of judgment; and that he would have been condemned for the same to the torments of hell, had not the Virgin Mary, to whose honor he had built a monastery, obtained grace for him to repent at the point of his death. That writer adds, that the saint imparted to him the three offences, but that he chose to keep them secret out of respect to the memory of so great a pontiff.¹ No pope deserved better of the Roman church and the holy see than Innocent; no, not Gregory VII. himself. But this pretended revelation or vision is thought to have prevented his canonization.

As for the writings of Innocent, about five hundred of his letters have reached our time, which afford great light to the history of those days. He wrote several treatises before and several after his promotion to the apostolic see, which have been all printed in two volumes at Cologne in 1552 and 1575.

¹ Act. Inn. Mabill. Museum Ital. t. 1. p. 88.

² M. Paris, ad ann. 1215; et Vit. Abbat. Alban. p. 117.

¹ Vit. Lutgard. apud Surium 16 Junii.

Honorius chosen. Crowns the emperor of the East;—[Year of Christ, 1217.] Protects the two dowager queens of England. The king of the Isle of Man makes himself a vassal of the Roman church;—[Year of Christ, 1219.]

HONORIUS III., THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[THEODORUS LASCARIS, JOHANNES DUCAS, *Emperors of the East.*—FREDERIC II., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1216.] Innocent died, as has been said, on the 16th of July 1216, was buried the next day, and on the third, or the 18th of the same month, Centius, cardinal presbyter of St. Paul and St. John, was unanimously elected by the cardinals who were then at Perugia.¹ He was a native of Rome, of the ancient and illustrious family of the Sabelli or Savelli; had discharged several employments with great reputation, and was universally esteemed both for his learning and his probity.² Upon his election he took the name of Honorius, and was the third pope of that name. He was consecrated the Sunday after his election, that is, on the 24th of July, and in all his letters he reckons the years of his pontificate from that day. He wrote as soon as elected to all the Christian princes, to acquaint them with his promotion, and exhort them at the same time to send without delay such succors as might enable their brethren in the East to complete the conquest of the Holy Land.³ Honorius continued at Perugia till the latter end of August, when he set out for Rome; and he entered that city on the last day of that month, amidst the loud acclamations of the Roman people.⁴

Henry, emperor of Constantinople, dying without issue on the 11th of June of the present year, the princes of the crusade chose Peter, count of Auxerre, his brother-in-law, to succeed him, who no sooner heard of his election, than leaving France he set out with his wife Jolanta for Rome, to be crowned there by the pope. Honorius received them with all possible marks of distinction, and they were both crowned, with great solemnity, by his holiness in the church of St. Laurence, without the walls of Rome, the pope not choosing to perform that ceremony within the city, lest the emperors of the East should take occasion from thence to claim any power or jurisdiction over the empire of the West.⁵ We have a letter from Honorius to the patriarch of Constantinople, dated from the Lateran the 12th of April of the following year, wherein he owns, that the crowning of the new Emperor belonged of right to him as patriarch of the imperial city, but that as the emperor had desired to receive the crown from the apos-

tolic see, and had come for that purpose to Rome, his departing from thence without attaining his request might be interpreted to his disadvantage; and, upon that consideration, he begs the patriarch to excuse what he has done.¹

As Henry III. of England attempted to deprive Berengaria, the widow of king Richard, of her dower, though confirmed to her by his father king John, and likewise by the apostolic see, Honorius wrote to him, exhorting him not to disturb that princess in the possession of what she had so good a right to, and at the same time ordered Gualo, bishop of Winchester and legate of the apostolic see, to restrain the king with the censures of the church from giving her any further trouble. As Berengaria, as well as Isabella, the widow of king John, apprehended, and not without reason, that some of the court bishops might be prevailed upon by the king to excommunicate them, the pope, taking them into his protection, reserved by a special bull that power to himself, and granted to both princesses the privilege of assisting at Divine service even in the time of a general interdict, provided they had given no occasion to it.²

The Isle of Man was at this time an independent kingdom. But the king, Reginald, apprehending that it might be invaded and subdued by the kings of England, resolved to make himself a vassal of the apostolic see, and by that means engage the protection of the sovereign pontiffs, at this time the most powerful princes upon earth. He therefore made a free donation of the whole island to Honorius and his lawful successors, to be held for ever by them as a fief of the Roman church; and on the 22d of October 1219, delivered the instrument of the donation into the hands of Pandulph, the pope's legate, who immediately restored the island to him as a gift of the apostolic see, and granted him the investiture in the pope's name, upon his binding himself and his heirs for ever to pay yearly twelve marks sterling to the Roman church, on the day of the purification of the Virgin Mary, as an acknowledgement of his vassalage.³

Frederic, king of Sicily, had been elected emperor, as has been related, in the pontificate of Innocent, and having prevailed over

¹ Honor. Ep. I. Register. ² Naucler. Generat. 41.

³ Regist. l. 1. Num. 18.

⁴ Auctor Chron. Fosse Nova. ⁵ Idem ibid.

¹ Apud Raynald. ad ann. 1217.

² Idem ibid.

³ Regist. Honor. l. 4. Ep. 629.

Frederic II. crowned emperor by Honorius;—[Year of Christ, 1220.] First seeds of the disagreement between Honorius and Frederic. Conference between the pope and the emperor at Veroli. Another at Ferentino;—[Year of Christ, 1223.]

his rival Otho, and put an end to the disturbances in Germany, he set out from hence in the beginning of September 1220, for Rome, to receive there the imperial crown at the hands of the pope. He repaired first to Milan to be crowned there, according to custom, with the iron crown. But the Milanese, zealous partisans of the deceased Otho, and sworn enemies to the house of Suevia, refusing to admit him into their city, he dissembled the affront for the present and pursued his march to Rome. At St. Leo, a village but a few miles distant from that city, he was met by the pope's legate, and by him required in his holiness's name to confirm the donation of the county of Fundi, lately made to the apostolic see; to annul all the laws prejudicial to the liberties of the church; to resign the kingdom of Sicily to his son Henry, at that time but eleven years old, as a fief of the apostolic see and not of the empire; and lastly, to swear that he would, within a limited time, restore to the Roman church the lands of the countess Mathilda, and all the cities of Tuscany belonging to St. Peter's patrimony. Frederic, unwilling to quarrel with the pope at this critical juncture, complied with all his demands, and being then allowed to enter Rome, he was received by Honorius with all possible marks of distinction, and crowned with the empress Constantia, in the church of St. Peter, on the 22d of November of the present year. On the same day, to gratify Honorius, he published several very severe laws against heretics, some of which were afterward inserted into the Justinian code. On this occasion the emperor, at the request of the pope, made a solemn vow to go in person to the relief of the Holy Land, and received the cross at the hands of cardinal Hugolin, bishop of Ostia.¹

Frederic, leaving Rome as soon as he had received the imperial crown, repaired to Sicily to settle the affairs of that kingdom before he returned to Germany. During his stay there he drove several disaffected bishops from their sees, and placing others in their room, invested them by his own authority with the ring and crosier. This greatly provoked Honorius, and some very smart letters passed between him and the emperor, maintaining that he had, as well as all other princes, an undoubted right to drive not only from their sees, but out of his dominions, such prelates as he had just reason to suspect or could not trust, and that it was the ancient prerogative of the kings of Sicily, which he was determined never to part with, to grant investitures. During this contest the pope received the disagreeable news, that the Christians had surrendered Damia, anciently called Pelusium, one of

the most important places in all Egypt, and had shamefully restored it to Saladin, when it had cost them an infinite deal of trouble and a great many lives to reduce it. Honorius was so affected with that news, that leaving Rome he retired to Anagni, and from thence wrote to Frederic, who was still in Sicily, charging that loss upon him, as he had not gone in person, agreeably to his vow, nor sent the promised succors to the relief of the Christians in Egypt, and earnestly exhorting him, not without menaces, to accomplish his vow without any further delay. The emperor in his answer to the pope's letter begged he would excuse his not going at present in person, on account of the unsettled state of affairs both in the empire and in Sicily; assured him that he would pass into the East at the head of a powerful army as soon as his affairs would allow him, and had already made all the necessary preparations for the intended expedition. At the same time, to soften his holiness, he ordered all the territories of the countess Mathilda to be restored to the apostolic see, and by imperial diploma, still to be seen in the Vatican library, he confirmed, forever, the possession of those territories to Honorius and his lawful successors.¹

Honorius hearing, during his stay at Anagni, that the emperor was come from Sicily to Apulia, sent to invite him to a conference, appointing Veroli for the place of their meeting. With that invitation the emperor readily complied, and after several conferences concerning the most effectual means of repairing the loss the Christians had lately sustained in the East, it was agreed that a general assembly of all the Christian princes should be held at Verona, and all should be invited to assist at it. The pope wrote accordingly circulatory letters to the kings of France, of England, and to all other ecclesiastic as well as secular princes, exhorting them to repair to Verona against the festival of St. Martin of the following year, 1223, in order to concert with him and the emperor the proper measures for renewing the war and carrying it on with success against the infidels.² Of this assembly or conference no mention is made by any contemporary historian. But they all speak of one held the following year, 1223, at Ferentino in Campania, at which were present the pope, the emperor, John king of Jerusalem, the patriarch of that city, and the grand masters of the knights hospitaliers and templars, besides a great many other persons of great distinction. At this conference the emperor promised upon oath to go in person with a powerful army to the relief of the Holy Land within the space of two years, reckoning from the approaching

¹ Richard de St. German. et Raynald. ad ann. 1220, Num. 54.

¹ Richard de St. German. et Raynald. ad ann. 1222.

² Idem ibid.

Honorius dies. His writings. Gregory IX. elected. Presses the emperor to repair to the Holy Land.

festival of St. John Baptist. As the empress Constantia died about this time, and the emperor was but twenty-five years of age, the pope, to engage him in the conquest of the Holy Land for his own interest, proposed, at this conference, a match between him and Jolanta, the daughter of John king of Jerusalem, and presumptive heiress of that kingdom. This marriage was suggested to the pope by Hermannus Sulza, grand master of the Teutonic order, and by the pope proposed to the emperor, who not only agreed to it, but by a solemn oath bound himself, as we read in the pope's letter to the king of France, to marry Jolanta and no other.¹ He married her accordingly in 1225, and upon that marriage styled himself, in all his diplomas, king of Sicily and Jerusalem, as have done all his successors in the kingdom of Sicily to this day. Some writers tell us, that the marriage ceremony was performed by the pope himself. Be that as it will, it is very certain that the new empress was crowned with great solemnity by the pope, soon after their marriage.

As the time when the emperor had promised to go in person to the Holy Land drew near, he sent the king of Jerusalem,

his father-in-law, to obtain of his holiness a further delay, which so provoked Honorius, that he dispatched two cardinals, with orders to let him know, that if he did not accomplish his vow within the time that he himself had fixed, the apostolic see would no longer connive at his disobedience, and the breach of so solemn a promise. However the pope, not caring to come to an open rupture with so powerful a prince, granted him the delay he required of two years more. But before the two years expired, Honorius died. His death happened on the 18th of March, 1227, after a pontificate of twenty years and eight months. By this pope the two religious orders of Dominic and Francis of Assisi were confirmed, and several saints were canonized, among whom were Laurence archbishop of Dublin, and William archbishop of York. We have several sermons of his, some written before and some after his promotion; a defence of the book of the abbot Joachim against Peter Lombard the master of sentences; the ceremonial of the Roman church, and some decretals. He was interred in the church of St. Mary the Greater.

GREGORY IX., THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SIXTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JOHANNES DUCAS, *Emperor of the East.*—FREDERIC II., *Emperor of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1227.] Honorius dying on the 18th of March, the cardinals met the very next day, and unanimously chose cardinal Ugolin, bishop of Ostia, a native of Anagni, descended from the counts of Segni, and nearly related to his predecessor Innocent III. On the same day he was enthroned in the Lateran church, on which occasion he took the name of Gregory IX., and on the following Sunday, which fell on the 21st of March, he was consecrated in the church of St. Peter. For on Sundays only, and in St. Peter's, the popes were ordained, if they were not bishops before, and consecrated if they were. From St. Peter's the pope returned to the Lateran, being attended by the magistrates of the city in their gorgeous attire, by the nobility, and the whole clergy clad in scarlet.²

Gregory immediately notified his election by circulatory letters, dated the 22d of March, to all the western bishops, commanding them at the same time to exert all their authority, and oblige such as had taken the cross, to repair, without delay, to the Holy Land. Gregory wrote at the same time to the em-

peror, exhorting him to fulfil at last the vow which he had so solemnly made at the time of his coronation, and so often renewed. To his exhortations he added menaces, telling the emperor that he would admit of no excuses whatever, but look upon them as mere pretences, and proceed against him as guilty of a breach of his vow. Soon after he sent Gualo, a Dominican friar, with the character of legate, to acquaint Frederic, that if he did not forthwith raise the necessary forces, agreeably to the engagement he had entered into with his predecessor Honorius, and putting himself at the head of them, march to the relief of the afflicted Christians in the East, he would no longer dissemble, but exert the power that heaven had put into his hands.¹ In answer to the pope's letter and the pressing instances of the legate, the emperor represented the unsettled state of his affairs in Lombardy, but at the same time assured them that in August next, at the latest, he should embark with a very numerous army, and flattered himself that he should be able to give his holiness an account of the recovery of the kingdom of

¹ Lib. 7. Ep. 146.

² Auctor Vit. Greg.

¹ Epist. Greg. l. 1. Ep. 2.

Frederic embarks for the Holy Land, but returns. Is excommunicated by the pope. The pope driven out of Rome. The emperor embarks for the Holy Land.

Jerusalem, which he had so much at heart. He accordingly wrote to his son Henry, whom he had caused to be crowned king of Germany, requiring him to convene a diet at Aix-la-Chapelle, and acquaint the German lords with his intention of embarking for the Holy Land on the 15th of August next, that they, who were willing to attend him in that expedition, might by that time be ready to embark at Brundisium, now Brindisi, the place of the general rendezvous. The diet met at the place appointed, and great numbers of the German princes as well as prelates took the cross on that occasion, and settling their domestic affairs in the best manner they could upon so short a warning, repaired to Brundisium. At the time appointed the emperor came, attended by most of the lords of his Italian dominions, and the troops being all embarked, he went to Otranto to take leave of the empress, but returning the next day, the 15th of August, he embarked with the rest, though he was at that time, or pretended to be, greatly indisposed. Some authors speak of his indisposition as real, while others will have it to have been only pretended. Be that as it may, he returned the third day after his departure, alleging that he could not bear the sea.

Gregory no sooner heard of the emperor's return, than taking it for granted that his illness was a mere pretence, he assembled all the cardinals and bishops who had attended him to Anagni, where he then was, and with their consent and approbation declared the emperor guilty of a breach of his vow, as he had declined, without any just cause, to fulfil it, adding that he had thereby incurred the sentence of excommunication, denounced against him by Honorius, if he did not repair in person to the Holy Land within a limited time long since expired. This sentence was pronounced at Anagni, on the 29th of September of the present year, 1227. In the mean time the emperor having, upon his landing, repaired to the baths of Pozzuolo for the recovery of his health, despatched from thence, as soon as he was informed of the sentence pronounced against him, Raynald, duke of Spoleti, and Henry of Malta, to assure the pope that his return was entirely owing to the bad state of his health, and to beg he would revoke the sentence, or, at least, suspend it, as he was resolved to put to sea again as soon as his health would allow him. But Gregory would hearken to nothing in his vindication; nay, on his return to Rome he assembled all the cardinals and bishops in that city and neighborhood, and in their presence excommunicated the emperor anew, ordered all the faithful to avoid his company, and forbade Divine service to be any where performed where he was present. Of this

sentence, pronounced with great solemnity on Maunday Thursday, that in the present year, 1228, fell on the 23d of March, the pope sent copies to all the Christian princes, with letters filled with most furious invectives against the emperor. On the other hand the emperor wrote to the king of France, and to most other princes, as well as to the cardinals, to the senators of Rome and the Roman people; and in those letters he no more spared the pope than the pope had spared him. At the same time he ordered all the ecclesiastics in his dominions to perform divine service as usual, without any regard to the interdict.¹

Gregory, provoked beyond measure by the letters of the emperor, charging him with pride, ambition, tyranny, &c., resolved to excommunicate him a third time with still more solemnity. Having, therefore, invited all the cardinals and other prelates then in Rome, and with them the Roman magistrates and nobility, to attend him to St. Peter's on Easter Monday, he there celebrated high mass with a design to renew the excommunication as soon as that service was over. But the emperor had, by this time, gained over several of the Roman nobility; and among the rest, the powerful family of the Frangipani, and the populace of their party falling unexpectedly upon the pope and the cardinals before the mass was ended, drove them out of the church with such imprecations and menaces as obliged Gregory to quit the city and retire to Viterbo. From Viterbo he repaired to Perugia, leaving the emperor's friends masters of the city.²

In the mean time Frederic, to leave the pope no just cause of complaint, resolved to accomplish his vow; and he accordingly embarked for Palestine on the 11th of August of the present year, being attended by twenty galleys and a great number of transports crowded with troops, the flower of his army. As he had been twice excommunicated by the pope, and had not sued for absolution before his departure, thinking the sentence unjust and null, Gregory, highly provoked at that contempt, as he called it, of his authority, wrote to the patriarch of Jerusalem, as well as to the knights templars, and hospitaliers, not to assist but to oppose him in all his undertakings, as an excommunicated person, and one who paid no regard to the church or her censures. His holiness did not stop here, but ordered John, king of Jerusalem, with whom the emperor had quarrelled, to stir up the rebels in Lombardy, and jointly with them reduce the cities there that continued faithful to that enemy of God and his church. Thus was

¹ Raynald, ad ann. 1227, 1228.

² Auctor Vit. Greg. Richard de Sancto Germano. Usperg. Matth. Paris ad ann. 1228.

Guelfs and Gibellines in Italy. War between the pope and the emperor;—[Year of Christ, 1229.] The emperor concludes a truce with the sultan. The kingdom of Jerusalem recovered by treaty.

a civil war kindled in Lombardy, which soon spread all over Italy, some siding with the emperor under the name of Gibellines, and some with the pope under that of Guelfs or Guelphs. These two famous factions did not arise at this time, but are of a more ancient date. They first began in Germany, and were occasioned by the dissensions between the families of Bavaria and Suevia. The Guelfs took their name from Welf or Guelf, Duke of Bavaria, who at the instigation of Innocent II. and Roger I., king of Sicily, made war upon the emperor Conrade III. of the Suevian family. The Gibellines were so called from Gibel, the place where Conrade was born or educated. These party names, almost forgotten, were now revived, and attended in Italy with such effusion of blood as reduced that unhappy country to a most deplorable condition.

Some writers tell us, that in this war the Gibellines or imperialists were the aggressors, that Rainald, duke of Spoleti, whom the emperor had appointed governor or viceroy of the kingdom of Sicily during his absence, entered unexpectedly the March of Ancona in a hostile manner, and, having reduced several cities there, obliged the inhabitants to swear allegiance to the emperor; that thereupon the pope excommunicated him and all his followers; but finding that he paid no regard to the excommunication, he resolved to repel force by force; and raising an army with that view entered into a defensive and offensive alliance with the disaffected cities of Lombardy. Be that as it may, a numerous army was soon set on foot by the rebels of Lombardy, styling themselves the militia of Christ, and the command of it given to cardinal Colonna and John king of Jerusalem, the emperor's father-in-law, but his most bitter enemy, on account of his having obliged him to resign that kingdom in his life-time, though he had no right to it till after his death. The Lombards soon obliged the duke of Spoleti to quit the territories of the church, and even pursued him into the province of Abruzzo, where they made themselves masters of several strong holds.¹ At the same time the pope's legate, Pandulphus of Alagna, and the counts of Fundi and Celano, both rebels to the emperor, entering Apulia at the head of a numerous army raised by the pope, overran the whole country, took and destroyed many castles and strong holds, treating every where, with the utmost severity, all who refused to submit to the "army of the church." For thus they styled themselves, and wore on their garments the keys, the symbol of the power of the church, as they who went to the holy war, wore the cross. Their success was, in great measure, owing to a false report of the empe-

ror's death, industriously spread by the monks and friars, which encouraged many cities not only to revolt, but to murder all the Germans that were left to garrison them. Of this the duke of Spoleti was no sooner informed, than he banished all the friars and monks out of the king's dominions, those of Monte Cassino not excepted, and confiscated their estates; which drew upon him a new excommunication.¹

In the mean time the emperor landing with his forces at St. John d'Acre, called formerly Ptolemais, marched from thence to Joppa, where he joined the Christian army. That place he fortified, and proceeding to a castle called Cordana, as if he designed to attack the sultan of Egypt encamped in that neighborhood, he sent from thence Balianus, lord of Tyre, and the count of Lucerna, with the character of his ambassadors, to treat of a peace with the sultan, and let him know, that he was not come to Palestine to rob him of any of his dominions, but only to recover the kingdom of Jerusalem with Christ's sepulchre, which had been already possessed by the Christians, and now, by right of his wife, belonged to him. The sultan had heard a great deal of the exploits and valor of Frederic, and being therefore desirous to conclude a peace with him, he told the ambassadors that he was ready to hearken to just and reasonable terms. At this very juncture arrived two friars, with the pope's letters to the patriarch, acquainting him with the excommunication of Frederic, and at the same time forbidding him as well as the knights templars and hospitalers to lend him any assistance whatever. Hereupon the emperor, thinking it advisable to strike up a peace upon the best terms he could get, before the confusion that the pope's orders would occasion in the army was known to the enemy, dispatched, without delay, new ambassadors to the sultan; and by them a ten years' truce was concluded upon the following terms: I. That the city of Jerusalem with its territories should be delivered up to the emperor, but that the holy sepulchre should be kept by the Saracens, as they had been long accustomed to pray there, and the Christians be allowed free access to it at all times. II. That the cities of Bethlehem and Nazareth, and all the towns on the road to Jerusalem, with the cities of Tyre and Sidon, and all the strong holds that had ever belonged to the knights templars, should be restored to the Christians, and possessed, without molestation, by the emperor. III. That the emperor should be allowed to fortify Jerusalem with walls and towers as he should think fit, and likewise Joppa, Cesarea, and the other places that were to be delivered up to him. IV. That all prisoners on both sides

¹ Rich. S. Germano.

² Rich. S. Germano.

The emperor returns to Italy. Is excommunicated anew. Submits to the pope and is absolved;—[Year of Christ, 1230.]

should be set at liberty without ransom. And lastly, that Frederic should be suffered quietly to enjoy the kingdom of Jerusalem in the same condition that it was in under Baldwin IV.¹

These articles being agreed to, and all the places, that by the treaty were to be delivered up, being evacuated by the Saracens, Frederic garrisoned them with his own troops, and then marching to Jerusalem, to take possession of the holy city, he sent to invite the patriarch to attend him thither, being desirous to be crowned king of Jerusalem before he returned to Italy, and to have the ceremony performed by him. The patriarch returned answer, that as the emperor had been excommunicated by the pope, he could neither perform the ceremony, nor be present at it. Frederic, however, pursuing his march, made his public entry into Jerusalem on the 17th of March, 1229, but found, to his great surprise, that the patriarch had laid the holy city, and even the church of the sepulchre, under an interdict; so that he could not have the satisfaction of assisting any where at divine service during his stay there. He was attended by several German bishops, but not one even of them could be prevailed upon to perform any religious function whatever in his presence, or to appear in the church on the day of his coronation; so that he was obliged to take the crown from off the altar, and crown himself. He intended to have staid at Jerusalem till the walls, which the Saracens had levelled with the ground, were rebuilt, and the city was completely fortified. But upon the account sent him by the duke of Spoleti, of the war carried on in Italy against him by the pope, and of the dreadful ravages committed by his holiness's army in Apulia, he gave proper orders for carrying on the works he had begun, and marching with his army to Ptolemais, he embarked there for Italy, and landed safe at Brundisium in the latter end of May.²

The emperor sent, as soon as he landed, ambassadors to the pope, to let his holiness know that he had recovered the kingdom of Jerusalem from the infidels, and beg he would absolve him from the excommunication, as he had fulfilled his vow, and recall the troops that had committed such ravages in his dominions, while he was, at his holiness's earnest request and desire, employed in making war upon the infidels. But Gregory had already received letters from the patriarch of Jerusalem, strangely misrepresenting the conduct of the emperor in the Holy Land, as well as the treaty which he had concluded with the sultan. The patriarch chiefly complained of his having left the holy sepulchre in the hands of the Saracens, when it was chiefly to res-

cue it out of their possession that the Christians had engaged in this war. Frederic had only allowed the Saracens, as has been said, to pray, as well as the Christians, at the sepulchre; but the whole city, and consequently the sepulchre, was in the possession of the Christians. However, the pope, provoked at the emperor's concluding a peace with the infidels upon any terms, excommunicated him anew, absolved his subjects from their allegiance, and forbade all, on pain of excommunication, to acknowledge or obey him as emperor. Frederic, being upon the return of his ambassadors, informed of the reception they had met with from the pope, and of his holiness's intention of pursuing the war, ordered all his forces to assemble in Apulia, and his army being reinforced by a strong body of Germans, sent by his son Henry, king of Germany, he soon recovered all the places that had submitted to the pope, put several of the Apulian lords, who had revolted from him, to death, and, entering the territories of the church, destroyed all before him with fire and sword.

However, being desirous to put an end to so ruinous a war, he sent ambassadors anew to Rome, to propose an accommodation. To these the pope hearkened, his affairs being now in a very unpromising condition; and it was agreed that a congress should be held at St. Germano, a city on the borders of Campania. At this congress, held in the beginning of July 1230, assisted, in the pope's name, John, bishop of Sabina, and Thomas, presbyter of St. Sabina, both cardinals; and, on the part of the emperor, the patriarch of Aquileia, the archbishop of Saltzburg, and the bishop of Ratisbon. The congress lasted from the beginning of July to the latter end of August, when the emperor was obliged to submit to the following terms, in order to be absolved from the excommunication. I. That he should promise to stand to the judgment of the church concerning the points for which he had been excommunicated. II. That he should, within a limited time, restore whatever had been taken by him, by his ministers or officers, from those who had adhered to the pope. III. That he should recall all the banished bishops, should reinstate them in their sees, and should ever maintain inviolate all the rights and privileges of the Roman church, as well as of the churches in Sicily. IV. That he should pay to the pope an hundred thousand ounces of gold, to repair the damages that the apostolic see had suffered in the present war. And lastly, that the emperor should repair, as a supplicant, to Anagni, where the pope then was, and confirm, in his presence, the articles which he had agreed to. All this Frederic promised, upon oath, to perform, and he was thereupon absolved, with all his followers, by the bishop of Sabina, the legate, in

¹ Rich. S. Germano. ² Idem *ibid.*

The pope retires to Rieti;—[Year of Christ, 1231.] Receives the patriarch of the Jacobites to his communion;—[Year of Christ, 1237.] The emperor makes war on the rebels of Lombardy;—[Year of Christ, 1238;] and gains a complete victory over them. Gregory interposes in their favor.

the church of St. Justa, at Ceperano, on the 28th of August, 1230. From Ceperano the emperor repaired, on the 1st of September, to Anagni, and was received there with all possible marks of distinction by the pope, upon his throwing himself at his feet, and promising punctually to observe the articles of the agreement concluded with his legates. The pope entertained him, and the princes who attended him, at his table; had a long conference with him the next day, to which Hermannus Salza, grand master of the Teutonic order, was alone admitted, and upon his departure gave him his benediction, and wished him success in all his undertakings so long as he continued faithful to his mother, the Holy Roman Church.¹

From Anagni Gregory returned to Rome in the beginning of November of the present year. But a most dreadful earthquake, that is said to have lasted a whole month, and to have overturned most of the buildings in the town and its neighborhood, obliged him to retire from thence, and he chose the city of Reate, now Rieti, for the place of his abode, during the summer season, the heat being less intense there, on account of the neighboring mountains, than in most other cities within the territories of the church. He left Rome on the 1st of June, 1231, and did not return till the year 1237. Nothing occurs in the history of Gregory worthy of notice during that time, except his admitting the patriarch of the Jacobites to his communion. They were a numerous sect in the East, had their patriarch, their archbishops and bishops. They were called Jacobites from one Jacob a Syrian, the founder of their sect, and taught the following doctrines: that circumcision and baptism were alike necessary; that the confession of sins was to be made to God alone; that in Christ there was but one nature and one person; and they used to imprint the sign of the cross with a burning iron upon the forehead, the cheeks, or the temples of their children, thinking that the original sin was thus expiated.² These tenets the patriarch publicly abjured on occasion of his visiting the holy sepulchre at Jerusalem, and at the same time promised perpetual obedience to the Roman church. The pope's letter, congratulating him upon his conversion, and admitting him into his communion, is dated at Viterbo, the 28th of August, in the eleventh year of his pontificate, that is, in 1237.

Frederic, now at peace with the pope, and disengaged from all other wars, resolved to turn his arms against the rebels in Lombardy, who had not only sided with the pope in the late war, but had joined his son Henry upon his rebelling against him in

1234. For that prince, encouraged by some German lords, and among the rest by Leopold, duke of Austria, whose daughter he had married, set up the standard of rebellion against his father, and was thereupon immediately proclaimed king of Italy in all the confederate cities of Lombardy. The Milanese were at the head of that confederacy; and they no sooner heard of the rebellion of the young prince than they invited him by a splendid embassy to their city, in order to be crowned there, according to custom, with the iron crown. Some writers will have the young prince to have rebelled at the instigation of the pope, while others clear him from being any-ways concerned in that revolt. It is however certain, that all the cities that had sided with the pope against the emperor, joined the son against the father. Be that as it will, the rebellion was soon suppressed in Germany. Henry was abandoned by most of the German lords at the approach of the emperor's army, and obliged to throw himself upon his father's mercy, who ordered him to be kept closely confined.¹ Frederic having now settled his affairs in Germany, marched at the head of a powerful army into Lombardy, and having forced the passes, though defended with great bravery by the Milanese, he reduced several cities, and among the rest Brescia and Vicenza, which he levelled with the ground, and put most of the inhabitants to the sword. In the mean time the confederates, having drawn together an army equal in number to the emperor's, resolved to put an end to the war by a decisive battle. They took the field accordingly, and meeting the emperor at a place called Cortenuova, a bloody battle ensued, which ended, after many hours and great slaughter on both sides, in a total defeat of the confederates. Most of them were killed in the battle, and such numbers in the flight, that very few are said to have escaped the slaughter of that day. Peter Trepoli, brother to the duke or doge of Venice, one of the ringleaders of the rebellion at Milan, and chief magistrate of that city, having fallen into the emperor's hands, he was by his order first tied to a post in the sight of the whole army with a rope about his neck, and afterwards hanged.²

Gregory alarmed at the success that attended the emperor's arms against the cities that were in alliance with the apostolic see, and apprehending that if Frederic pursued the war they would soon be put out of a condition of lending any assistance to the church in case of a rupture with the empire, wrote to the emperor, exhorting him to put an end to so destructive a war, and offering his mediation. The emperor returned answer, that as these cities had so often revolt-

¹ Rich. S. Germano. et Auctor Gest. Greg.

² De Vitricia. Hist. Orient. c. 76; et Matth. Paris ad ann. 1237.

¹ Richard. ad ann 1234.

² Richard. *ibid.* Sigon. de Reg. Ital. l. 18.

The pope and the emperor quarrel anew. The emperor excommunicated;—[Year of Christ, 1239.] War between the pope and the emperor. Frederic marches against Rome, but not able to reduce it;—[Year of Christ, 1240.]

ed, and had even invaded his dominions while he was engaged in the holy war, he wondered that his holiness should interpose in their favor, and that he was determined not to lay down his arms till they had submitted to such terms as he should think fit to prescribe. The pope, provoked at this answer, wanted only a pretence to break anew with the emperor. And a pretence soon offered—the emperor sent Entius, his natural son, to recover the island of Sardinia, which he maintained had formerly belonged to the empire. But the pope, on the other hand, pretending that the greater part of that island belonged to the church, wrote to Frederic to recall Entius, threatening both with excommunication if they gave any farther trouble to the vassals of the apostolic see. The emperor answered, that he had bound himself at his coronation by a solemn oath, to maintain all the rights of the empire; that the empire had an undoubted right to the whole island of Sardinia, and that he was, therefore, determined to re-unite it to the other imperial dominions, which he hoped his holiness would not resent, it being lawful for every man to recover his own. Many letters passed on this occasion between Gregory and Frederic. But as the emperor could not be prevailed upon by exhortations nor menaces to yield, but on the contrary, created his son Entius king of Sardinia, as a fief of the empire, the pope resolved to proceed against him as an avowed enemy of the church, and an usurper of the inheritance of St. Peter. He accordingly thundered out, with great solemnity, the sentence of excommunication against him, on Palm Sunday, the 20th of March, on Maunday Thursday; and on Easter day, absolved all his subjects from their allegiance, and ordered them to obey him no longer as their lord and sovereign, since he had by his disobedience to God and his church, forfeited all right to that title.¹

The emperor was celebrating the festival of Easter with great solemnity at Padua when he received, on the second day of that festival, an account of the sentence pronounced against him at Rome. It gave him no small concern to find himself involved in new troubles and in a new war with the church; but dissembling his resentment, he assembled the chief citizens of the place, with all the German lords who attended him, and declaring the sentence to be null, as repugnant to all the laws of justice and equity, and dictated only by a spirit of revenge, he exhorted them to stand by him in defence of the undoubted rights of his crown agreeably to their oath of allegiance, from which no power upon earth could absolve them. When Frederic had done, the fa-

mous Petrus de Vineis, his favorite secretary, made an elegant oration in his praise, commending him not only for his exploits in war, but for his piety, his religion, and even his submission to the apostolic see in all things consistent with the rights of the empire, which he was determined to maintain, agreeably to his oath, against all, his holiness himself not excepted, who should presume to invade them. Here he enlarged upon the injustice of the sentence pronounced with so much solemnity against him at Rome; represented in strong terms, the ambitious and unchristian temper of the pope setting himself above the first Christian prince in the whole world, and treating him as his vassal or slave. The pope, on the other hand, wrote to all the Christian princes, painting the emperor as a persecutor of the church, and imploring their assistance against him as an avowed enemy of God and St. Peter. By means of his emissaries he engaged the Genoese, the Venetians, and the disaffected cities in Lombardy, to enter into an alliance with the apostolic see, and drive the emperor quite out of Italy. A considerable army was accordingly, with incredible expedition, set on foot by the allies, and the command of it given to Gregory de Montelongo, the pope's legate, who fell upon the cities of Lombardy that continued faithful to Frederic, while the Venetians made a descent in Apulia, and there reduced many strong holds, destroying all before them with fire and sword. The emperor not thinking it advisable to venture an engagement in Lombardy, the army of the allies being vastly superior in numbers to his, put strong garrisons into those cities, and with the rest of his forces marched straight to Rome; which so terrified the pope that he ordered a grand procession from the Lateran church to St. Peter's, in which he himself walked, carrying the heads of St. Peter and St. Paul. On this occasion he made a warm exhortation to the Roman people, encouraging them to take the cross, and promising plenary indulgence and forgiveness of all their sins to such as should enlist themselves in this holy war, and die in defence of the rights of St. Peter and his see. Great numbers of the Romans took the cross, and not satisfied with defending the walls, marched out in good order against the emperor as he approached Rome. A battle thereupon ensued, in which many fell on both sides, but the Romans were, in the end, driven back into the city. Frederic was so provoked at their taking the cross against him as an infidel, that he caused all who fell into his hands to be branded with a cross on the forehead, and then put to death, which has furnished the Guelf writers of those days with ample matter for their invectives. The emperor finding he had not

¹ Mat. Paris, Richard. de S. German. Albert. Stad.

The city of Benevento, and other cities belonging to the church, taken by the emperor;—[Year of Christ, 1211.] The pope appoints a general council to meet. Most of the bishops repairing to it taken and ill used by the emperor's order.

a sufficient force with him to make himself master of Rome, reduced and razed all the forts and strong holds in that neighborhood, and, having laid waste the whole country, marched into Apulia, to oppose the Venetians, who had been joined by some of his barons, gained over by the pope. At his approach the Venetians, abandoning the places they had taken, repaired in great haste on board their fleet, carrying an immense booty with them. Some of them, however, had the misfortune to fall into the emperor's hands, and among the rest, Peter Tiepoli, the doge's son, who had sunk a vessel returning from Palestine with German soldiers on board, and was, therefore, hanged by the emperor's order on a tower near the shore, in sight of the fleet.¹

Italy was now all divided into the two opposite factions, Guelfs and Gibellines, and the clergy as well as the monks and friars being, generally speaking, of the former party, the emperor ordered such of them as were not natives of his dominions to quit them forthwith, drove several bishops from their sees, and seizing on the immense treasure of the monastery of Monte Cassino, he obliged the monks who had distinguished themselves by their attachment to the pope, to depart his dominions, on pain of death or perpetual imprisonment. Having thus cleared his Italian dominions from all suspected persons, he resolved to invade the territories of the church, and thus oblige the pope to hearken to reasonable terms; for he ever expressed a great desire of re-establishing the ancient harmony between the church and the empire. In the beginning therefore of the year 1241, he laid siege to Benevento, made himself master of that important place, notwithstanding the vigorous resistance he met with from the inhabitants, and levelled the towers and walls with the ground. He treated in like manner several other cities belonging to the church in Campania; while cardinal Colonna, the pope's legate, revolting from his holiness upon some disgust, delivered up to the emperor the cities of Tivoli and Albano with other forts in their neighborhood; and thus was Rome, in a manner, blocked up on all sides.²

Gregory had appointed a general council to meet at Rome on Easter-day of the present year, 1241, and had sent legates with letters to all the Christian princes, to acquaint them therewith, and entreat them to oblige the prelates of their respective kingdoms to repair to the council, in order to consult jointly with him about the most effectual means of repairing the losses they had suffered in Palestine, and restoring the wished-for tranquillity to the church. He not only wrote to all the Christian princes,

but sent nuncios into the different kingdoms with letters addressed to all the patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and abbots, commanding them to assist in person at the intended council, if their age and infirmities allowed them; and if unable to undergo the fatigue of the journey, to send their deputies. Gregory's chief view in assembling this council was, no doubt, to get the sentence he had pronounced against Frederic confirmed by the church universal, and arm the whole Christian world against him. Of this Frederic was well apprised, and therefore caused new proposals of peace to be made in his name by his brother-in-law Richard, earl of Cornwall, declaring that, notwithstanding all the advantages he had gained, his ears were open to any terms that the dignity of the empire would suffer him to agree to.

Frederic had consented to the assembling of a general council, and promised to allow the bishops to repair to it unmolested; but finding that the pope was averse to an accommodation, and bent upon his ruin, nay, that he had even offered the imperial crown to others, as if it were at his disposal, he revoked the promise he had made, not to hinder the bishops from repairing to the council, alleging, that he could not suffer a council to be held at which a public enemy of the empire was to preside; and at the same time declaring, that he would look upon all as enemies of the empire who should assist either in person or by their deputies at such an assembly. This declaration he caused to be published throughout the empire, and copies of it to be sent into France, England, Scotland, and most other kingdoms. But the bishops choosing to obey the pope rather than the emperor, repaired in great numbers from the above-mentioned kingdoms to Genoa; the Genoese, who were in alliance with the pope, engaging to convey them to Rome by sea. But while the bishops were assembling in that city, the emperor took care to acquaint his son Entius, king of Sardinia, with their design, ordering him at the same time to join his small fleet to that of the Pisans, as zealous Gibellines as the Genoese were Guelfs, to attack jointly the Genoese fleet, and if they prevailed, to send all the bishops who should fall into his hands in chains to Naples. Entius, in compliance with the emperor's orders, manned his galleys with great expedition, and being joined by the Pisans, put to sea, met the Genoese fleet on the third of May near the small island of Meloria, and gained a complete victory over them. Three of the enemy's galleys were sunk, and twenty-two taken, on board of which were two cardinals, and a great many French, English, Scotch, and Italian bishops, with the ambassadors of several princes, all going to the council. Such of

¹ Vit. Gregor. Richard. de St. Germano.

² Richard. ad ann. 1241.

Gregory dies. His writings.

the bishops as in the different countries had distinguished themselves by their attachment to the pope, were thrown into the sea and drowned. The rest were all sent to Naples, and confined in different prisons, where most of them died of grief and hunger. The ambassadors were better treated than the bishops, and afterwards dismissed at the request of their respective sovereigns. With this victory Frederic immediately acquainted all the Christian princes, boasting of it in his letter as a manifest proof of his having justice on his side.¹

Gregory was so affected with the news of this disaster, and at the same time so terrified with the approach of the emperor at the head of his victorious army, that he was taken dangerously ill, and died of grief in a few days. His death happened on the 21st of August of the present year, 1241, when he had governed the church fourteen years, five months, and two days. The emperor, who was then encamped at Grotta Ferrata, in the neighborhood of Rome, no sooner heard of his death than he transmitted an account of it to the king of England and to all the other Christian princes, complaining in his letters of the undeserved treatment he had met with from the deceased pope, and expressing a sincere desire of putting an end to so long and so destructive a war.² We have a great many letters of this pope, all written with more spirit, and in a much better style than those of any of his predecessors in the three foregoing centuries,

though he was at the time he wrote them near a hundred years old. Many of his decretal letters are to be met with in the five books of decretals collected under his inspection by Raimund de Pennafort, a Dominican friar, and ordered by Gregory to be alone taught in the schools, and quoted in trials. Gregory canonized several saints, namely, St. Elizabeth, daughter of Andrew, king of Hungary, and the wife of Lewis Landgrave of Thuringia, St. Francis and St. Dominic, the founders of the Franciscan and Dominican orders, and the very famous St. Antony of Padua, so called, because he died in that city, though a native of Lisbon. The bulls of these canonizations are to be met with in the Great Bullarium. By this pope was confirmed the religious order of St. Mary de Mercede, as it is called, an order instituted to make gatherings all over the Christian world for the redemption of Christians taken and kept in slavery by the infidels. This order was instituted by James, king of Arragon, about the year 1223, and was confirmed by Gregory on the 17th of January, 1230. The general of this order resides constantly at Barcelona, where it was instituted by the king of Arragon, under the direction of Raimund de Pennafort, then canon of that city, and afterwards general of the Dominican order.¹ The antiphone *salve Regina*, &c., composed by Hermanus Contractus in 1059, was by this pope ordered to be sung in all churches in Saturday's service.²

CELESTINE IV., THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JOHANNES DUCAS, *Emperor of the East*.—FREDERIC II., *Emperor of the West*.]

[Year of Christ, 1241.] As there were but few cardinals at Rome when Gregory died, they sent a solemn embassy to the emperor, encamped at a small distance from the city, to acquaint him with the decease of the pope, and at the same time to beg he would set at liberty the two cardinals his prisoners, upon what conditions soever he should think fit to prescribe. Frederic, in compliance with their request, ordered the two cardinals to be brought immediately from Naples, where they were kept closely confined, to his camp, and granted them leave to assist at the election of the new pope, after making them swear, that if neither of them was elected pope, they should both return to the place of their captivity. The cardinals, only

ten in number, were at first divided; but being shut up by the senate in a narrow place, called *Septemsolium*, where most of them were taken ill, and one of them died, namely, Robert, cardinal deacon of St. Chrysogonus, an Englishman, they, at last, all agreed, on the 22d or 23d of October, in the election of cardinal Godfrey, called by some *Jufrid*, and by others *Jumfrid*. He was of the illustrious family of the *Castiglioni*, one of the first families in Milan, the son of John *Castiglioni* by *Cassandra Crivelli*, the sister of pope Urban III. He had been canon and chancellor of the church of Milan; but, retiring from the world, led a religious life among the *Cistercians*, till his predecessor Gregory IX. created him cardinal presbyter of St. Mark and bishop of Sabina. At the

¹ Mal. Paris ad ann. 1241. Sigon. l. 15. Petrus de Vineis, Ep. 107.

² Richard. ad ann. 1211. Epist. Fred. apud Rainald. Num. 83.

¹ Oldoin in Notis ad Ciacon. Bullarium. in Greg. IX. Constit. 9.

² Auctor Vit. Greg.

Long vacancy. Innocent IV. chosen;—[Year of Christ, 1243.] Acquaints all the faithful with his election. A splendid embassy from the emperor. Rupture between the emperor and the pope.

time of his election he took the name of Celestine IV. He was no sooner elected than he sent legates to acquaint the emperor with it, and at the same time to assure him, that he had nothing so much at heart as to establish a lasting peace between the church and the empire. But he died before he received the emperor's answer. His death happened on the eighteenth day of his pontificate, when he had not yet been crowned.

Matthew Paris writes, that he was said to have been poisoned. But the same author informs us, that he was much advanced in years and infirm. He was buried in the Vatican. The contemporary writers all speak of him as a man of a pacific disposition, and one who would have made it his study to put an end to the disturbances in Italy, and suppress the two factions by which it was so cruelly harassed.¹

INNOCENT IV., THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JOHANNES DUCAS, *Emperor of the East.*—FREDERIC II., CONRAD IV., *Emperors of the West.*]

[Year of Christ, 1243.] Celestine died, as has been said, in November 1241, and the see remained vacant from that time till the 24th of June 1243. Most authors agree as to the length of the vacancy, but disagree with respect to the cause. Some ascribe it to the discord that reigned in the conclave between the Guelf and the Gibelline cardinals: cardinal Colonna and some others siding with the emperor, and opposing the election of any who they apprehended would tread in the footsteps of Gregory. Platina will have so long a vacation to have been owing to an agreement among the cardinals not to proceed to the election till their brethren, whom the emperor had taken and kept confined, were set at liberty. Others tell us, that the captive cardinals protested against any election that should be made in their absence. However that be, the emperor was in the end prevailed upon by Baldwin, the Latin emperor of Constantinople, representing to him the deplorable state of their affairs in the East, chiefly owing to so long a vacancy, not only to dismiss the cardinals his prisoners, but to grant leave to all the other cardinals to repair from the different places whither they had fled, to Rome. The cardinals therefore being all assembled at Rome, adjourned from thence to Anagni, to avoid the disturbances that might be raised by the emperor's friends in the city, and there, with one consent, chose Anibald, cardinal presbyter of St. Lawrence. He was elected on the 24th of June, the festival of St. John Baptist, and consecrated the following Sunday, the 28th of that month, taking on that occasion the name of Innocent IV. He was a native of Genoa, of the noble family of the Fieschi, was first canon of Parma, afterwards chancellor of that church, and created cardinal by Gregory IX. He is said to have been the best civilian of the age he lived in, and as

such he is frequently quoted by the famous Bartoli.²

Innocent, three days after his consecration, that is, on the 2d of July, wrote circulatory letters, addressed to all the faithful, to acquaint them with his promotion, and beg the assistance of their prayers in the discharge of so important an office. As he had been a particular and intimate friend of the emperor, the news of his election was received with great joy by that prince; and he not only ordered thanks to be returned to God throughout his dominions, but being then at Melfi, he sent a most splendid embassy to Anagni, to congratulate him upon his election, and express the joy it had given him to hear that his old friend was become his father. The ambassadors were ordered to assure his holiness that nothing should be wanting, on his side, that could any ways contribute to the re-establishing of the ancient harmony between the church and the empire, and that he was willing to grant to the clergy all the privileges, immunities, and exemptions that were consistent with the honor of the empire and his other kingdoms. Thus Richardus de Sancto Germano, who flourished at this time.³ But other writers, who lived after him, tell us that Frederic received the congratulations of his friends on that occasion very coldly, saying they had rather reason to condole with him than to wish him joy. For he who had been his best friend while a cardinal, would, in all likelihood, prove his worst enemy now he was pope.

Innocent, on his side, dispatched Peter archbishop of Rouen, William bishop of Modena, and William abbot of St. Fæcundus, to propose terms of agreement: And these were, that the emperor should imme-

¹ Auctor Compil. Chronologic.

² Nichol. de Curbio in Vit Richard. de S. German. Matt. Paris.

³ Richard. ad ann. 1243.

A new treaty begun, but unsuccessful;—[Year of Christ, 1244.] The pope repairs to France. A general council appointed to meet at Lions. The council meets;—[Year of Christ, 1245.]

diately set at liberty all the cardinals and other ecclesiastics whom he had taken prisoners by sea or by land; that he should clear himself from the crimes for which he had been excommunicated by his predecessor; and that, if he thought he had been wronged by the apostolic see, a general council should be assembled, and the whole submitted to the judgment of the princes and the prelates who should compose it. But Frederic insisted upon his being first of all absolved from the excommunication, which he maintained to be unjust, and would hearken to no terms till that sentence was revoked. On the other hand, Innocent urged the release of the cardinals before he would enter upon any negotiation. Thus was the treaty broken off as soon as begun; and the emperor, to prevent the pope from prejudicing the other Christian princes against him, ordered all the ports and roads to be strictly guarded, and such as should be found carrying letters from the pope to any of the transalpine princes to be put to death upon the spot. Pursuant to this order, several Franciscans employed by the pope to convey his letters into France and Germany, were all apprehended and hanged.

In the mean time Frederic, entering the patrimony of St. Peter at the head of his army, burnt and destroyed all before him, directing his march again to Rome, where he had gained many friends. But being met by ambassadors from several places interposing their good offices in behalf of the pope, he was persuaded by them to forbear hostilities and renew the negotiation. He sent, accordingly, Raimund, count of Toulouse, who had been reconciled to the church in the pontificate of Gregory IX., and with him Petrus de Vineis, his secretary, and Thadeus of Suessa, to swear, in his name, that in all things he would acquiesce in the judgment of his holiness, would restore the cities and territories that belonged to the church, and set the cardinals, as well as the other ecclesiastics, at liberty, upon condition he was absolved from the excommunication. This oath the three ambassadors took on Maunday Thursday, which, in 1244, fell on the last day of March. But the pope, still refusing to take off the excommunication till the emperor had executed all the articles, and given him full satisfaction, the negotiation was again broken off.¹ The pope, leaving Rome, had repaired to Civita Castellana, in order to be nearer to the emperor, who was then encamped at Interamna, now Terni. But being informed, when the treaty was broken off, that the emperor designed to seize him, he left Civita Castellana in the dead of the night, and travelling only by night, he reached, the third day, Civita Vecchia, where the Genoese fleet, consisting

of twenty-two well armed galleys, by his appointment waited for him. By that fleet, under the command of his two nephews, James and Hugh Fieschi, he was conveyed to Genoa, and received there, being a native of that city, with all possible marks of distinction. His original design was to pass immediately from Genoa, where he did not think himself safe, into France. But he was obliged, being taken dangerously ill, to continue there three whole months, to travel slow when he left that city, and to rest so often, that though he set out from Genoa about the beginning of September, he did not reach Lions till the 2d of December. The reader will find a very minute account of his journey in the History of his Life, by Nicholas de Curbio, who attended him from Civita Castellana to Lions.¹

Innocent, now out of the reach of the emperor, resolved to be revenged upon him for the hardships he had made him undergo, and with this view, on the feast of St. John the Evangelist, the 27th of December, he appointed a general council to meet at Lions on the 24th of the following June, the festival of St. John Baptist. To that council he invited all the bishops and princes of Christendom, and the reasons he alleged for summoning it were, to reform the many abuses that had crept into the church; to procure some immediate relief for the Christians in the East, reduced to the most deplorable condition; and to settle the differences between the church and the empire, to which all their misfortunes were owing. The emperor saw very plainly that it was chiefly to depose him with greater solemnity that the council was appointed to meet, and therefore wrote a long letter to all the Christian princes, laying open to them the pope's real design, and charging upon him all the calamities the Christians suffered in the East, as his holiness had diverted him from lending them any assistance, by stirring up the cities in Italy to revolt, and openly supporting them in their rebellion. He added, that if his holiness would but absolve him from the excommunication, and oblige the rebels in Lombardy to lay down their arms, he would send a powerful army to the relief of the Holy Land.

In the mean time the bishops assembled from all parts at Lions, and on the eve of the festival of St. Peter, on the 28th of June 1245, was held the first session, at which were present, besides all the cardinals, the three patriarchs of Constantinople, Antioch, and Aquileia, one hundred and forty archbishops and bishops, from France, Spain, Italy, England, Scotland, and Ireland, but very few from Germany. Baldwin, emperor of Constantinople, came to solicit relief for the Holy Land. Raimund, count of

¹ Mat. Paris. Epist. Innocent, 645.

¹ Nich. de Curbio. Vit. Innocent, c. 15.

First session of the council at Lyons. Second session. Third session.

Toulouse, Raimund, count of Provence, and some other princes, assisted in person, and all the other Christian princes, sent their ambassadors; among whom were Thadeus of Suessa, and Petrus de Vineis, appointed by the emperor to represent him and maintain his cause against the pope and the rest of his enemies. The pope opened the council with a speech, laying before them the motives that had induced him to call them together, namely, the disorderly lives of the clergy, the insolence of the Saracens, the schism of the Greeks, the cruelty of the Tartars, who had broken into Hungary, and the persecution of Frederic. He enlarged upon these five motives, or, as he called them, his five sorrows, but especially upon the last; painting the emperor as a tyrant, as a persecutor of the church, and charging him with heresy, with sacrilege, with courting the friendship of the sultan of Babylon, with keeping Saracen women, and peopling a new-built city with Saracens. These accusations were all answered by Thadeus of Suessa, reproaching the pope with pride and haughtiness quite unbecoming "the servant of the servants of the Lord," and charging him with the want of sincerity and the breach of the most solemn promises. As for the charge of heresy, Thadeus assured the fathers of the council that it was entirely groundless; that his master was as true a Christian as any of them; that were he present he would confute so barefaced a calumny with making a public confession of his faith; and that his suffering no usurers in his dominions was a proof of his being a sincere Christian; which was reflecting, says Matthew Paris, on the court of Rome, where that vice was known to prevail. He owned, that the emperor suffered the Saracens, who had settled in his dominions before his time, to continue there unmolested, that he might employ them in his wars, and thus spare the blood of his Christian subjects. He absolutely denied the charge of the emperor's keeping any Saracen women, or his having any criminal commerce with such of them as were about the court.¹

In the second session, held eight days after the first, that is, on the 5th of July, the bishop of Carinola, in Apulia, who had been banished by the emperor, vented his rage against him in a most furious and abusive harangue, pretending that he believed neither in God nor the saints; that he had several wives at the same time; that he was a great friend and favorer of the Saracens; that he corresponded with the sultan of Babylon; that he had been heard to repeat the blasphemous saying of Averroes, namely, that three impostors had deceived the world, Moses the Jews, Christ the Christians, and Mahomet the Arabs; that he had

imprisoned, and even put to death, several ecclesiastics, and had nothing less in view than to reduce the bishops of the church to the poor and uncomfortable condition of the primitive times. The bishop of Carinola was seconded by several Spanish bishops, charging the emperor with heresy, sacrilege, perjury, and many other crimes. But Thadeus of Suessa rising up, confuted, in a long and elegant speech, all the accusations brought by those bishops against his master, as proceeding from malice or a spirit of revenge, quite unbecoming men of their characters. He charged the bishop of Carinola in particular, with many crimes, for which, he said, a less merciful prince would have condemned him to perpetual imprisonment or to death, instead of obliging him only to quit his dominions, where he could not himself live, nor would suffer others to live in peace. He ended his speech with entreating his holiness to put off the third session till the arrival of the emperor, who, he said, was come to Turin, in his way to the council. The pope replied, that if the emperor came he would retire, as he was not disposed to suffer martyrdom, or to be confined for life to a jail. However, he was prevailed upon by the ambassadors of the kings of France and England to grant the desired delay; and the second session having been held on the 5th of July, the third was put off till the 17th of that month. But the emperor, finding that the pope was determined, at all events, to condemn him, thought it advisable not to appear before so partial a judge, and this resolution he communicated to his ambassadors at the council.

The third session was thereupon held on the 17th of July, when the pope, after publishing some constitutions for the relief of the Holy Land, caused all the privileges, immunities, and exemptions, granted by the emperors and other princes to the apostolic see, to be publicly read, and confirmed by all the prelates who were present. In the next place were heard the English ambassadors, complaining of the insupportable exactions of the court of Rome, and the illegal proceedings of one Martin, who called himself legate of the apostolic see, and as such took upon him to dispose of the vacant benefices, to the prejudice of the patrons, and confer them chiefly upon foreigners. The pope put off inquiring into those matters to a more proper season, as it belonged not to the council, but to the apostolic see, to redress the grievances the ambassadors complained of. He then entered upon the quarrel and the causes of the quarrel between him and the emperor, when Thadeus, concluding from the first words of his speech that he was determined to condemn the emperor, appealed, in his name, to a more general council. Innocent answered, that the present council was a general one; that all the

¹ Concil. tom. 11. p. 636. M. Paris. Acta Vaticana.

The emperor excommunicated and deposed. He writes to all the Christian princes. Interview between the pope and the king of France;—[Year of Christ, 1246.] Henry, landgrave of Thuringia, chosen king of Germany.

bishops had been invited to it, and that those who had not attended had been diverted from it by the emperor. The pope then, addressing himself to the fathers of the council, gave them an account of all that had passed between the emperor, his predecessor, Gregory, and himself; enlarged on his indefatigable endeavors, and the great pains he had taken to establish a lasting peace between the church and the empire, complained of the emperor's obstinacy in rejecting all terms, and expressing great concern at his being obliged to proceed against one as an enemy, with whom he had once lived in the greatest friendship, he pronounced the sentence of excommunication against him, deprived him of the empire, of all his other kingdoms, dignities, and dominions; absolved his subjects from their allegiance, forbidding them, on pain of excommunication, thenceforth to obey, or lend him any assistance whatever. At the same time the electors were ordered to proceed forthwith to the election of a new emperor.¹ This sentence was delivered, in writing, to all the bishops, was publicly read, and by them all approved and confirmed.²

The emperor no sooner heard of this sentence than he acquainted all the Christian princes with it, showing, in the letters he wrote to them on that occasion, that the power claimed by the pope over the temporal dominions of princes was a manifest usurpation; that though he consecrated and crowned the emperors, he had no better right to depose them than every other bishop had to depose the king whom he had crowned or consecrated; that though it should even be allowed that he was really vested with such an extraordinary power, yet the sentence lately pronounced would be null, by what number of bishops soever approved and confirmed, as being contrary to the known laws or canons of the church; that he had not been lawfully summoned; that the crimes laid to his charge had not been lawfully proved; that very few bishops had deposed against them, namely—one of Apulia, whose brothers and nephew he had caused to be hanged for crimes of high treason, and two Spanish bishops, who were at too great a distance to be rightly informed of what passed in Italy. He added, that were the crimes even fully proved, the pope could only inflict spiritual punishments; and closed his letter with exhorting all princes to join him in a cause common to them all. Frederic wrote in particular to the king of France, Lewis IX., afterwards sainted, referring to him the points in dispute, and promising to stand to his judgment and that of his peers. The king interposed accordingly; but the pope would hear-

ken to no terms, however reasonable, saying, that the emperor had deceived him so often, that neither his promises nor his oaths were to be relied on. The king replied, that it was the duty of every Christian to forgive seventy-seven times; that it was in vain to think of the recovery of the Holy Land, which his holiness had so much at heart, without the assistance of the emperor, and that they could not expect he should lend them any so long as the quarrel between his holiness and him obliged him to keep his troops at home to defend his own dominions. The pope persisted obstinate in his former resolution to agree to no terms, as the emperor, he said, had sufficiently shown that he would stand to none. The king finding that the obstinacy of the pope was proof against all he could urge in behalf of the emperor withdrew greatly offended, says Matthew Paris, at his not finding in the servant of the servants of God the humility answering that title.¹ This passed at an interview between the pope and the king in the monastery of Cluni, whither Lewis had repaired to meet the pope and offer his mediation.

Frederic being thus deposed, the pope wrote to the German princes, requiring them to choose a new king of Germany, to be afterwards crowned by him emperor, and recommending to their choice Henry, landgrave of Thuringia and Hesse. The pope's letter is dated at Lyons, the 21st of April, in the third year of his pontificate, and consequently in 1246. Most of the German princes highly resented the proceedings of the pope, whose only business, they said, it was to crown the emperor; and, instead of withdrawing themselves from his obedience, renewed their allegiance, and entering into an association, declared they would stand by him to the last, and maintain, even at the expense of their lives, the just rights of the empire. However, some of the electors, especially the ecclesiastical princes, and among them the archbishops of Cologne and Mentz, meeting at Wirtzburg, chose the landgrave king of Germany, on the festival of the ascension, which, in the present year, fell on the 17th of May.² The pope expressed the greatest satisfaction upon receiving the news of that election, communicated to him by the archbishop of Mentz, and in his answer to that prelate returned him the thanks of the apostolic see for the share he had in so happy a revolution, exhorted him to gain over as many as he possibly could to the party of the new king, and promising to back his pious endeavors with all the authority of the holy see, he empowered him to pursue such measures in his name, as should seem to him the best calculated to defeat the wicked designs of

¹ Concil. tom. II. et Bullarium.

² Vit. Innocent. c. 14.

¹ Mat. Paris ad hunc ann.

² Krantzius Saxonia, l. 8. c. 13.

Several edicts published by the emperor against the monks and the clergy. The new king of Germany killed;—[Year of Christ, 1247.] William, earl of Holland, chosen in his room. War carried on in Germany and Italy;—[Years of Christ, 1248, 1249.] Death of the emperor Frederic;—[Year of Christ, 1250.]

such as still adhered to Frederic, heretofore emperor. This letter is dated at Lyons, the 9th of June.¹ At the same time the pope wrote to all the German princes, declaring such of them as continued to favor Frederic cut off from the communion of the apostolic see and the catholic church, as the friends of an avowed enemy to both.²

In the mean time Frederic, still acknowledged by most of the German princes, issued several edicts in Germany as well as in Sicily, against all, without distinction, who should pay any regard either to the sentence or the menaces of the pope, ordered the magistrates throughout the kingdom of Sicily to punish, as rebels, all who should observe the interdict, and refuse to perform divine service, or to administer the sacraments, banished most of the monks, and obliged the clergy to pay the third part of their income, and, besides, all the taxes imposed on the laity. To prevent any of the monks, whom the emperor looked upon as so many spies of the pope, from going to Rome, he forbade them, upon the severest penalties, to travel from one place to another without a pass signed by some of his officers. Frederic, having settled his affairs in Lombardy in the best manner he could, and left there his natural son Entius with a competent force to watch the motions of the disaffected Lombards, marched himself into Apulia to suppress the disturbances raised there by some of his barons, gained over by the pope, which he easily compassed. But a most bloody war was, in the mean time, carried on in Germany between the landgrave of Thuringia and Conrad, the emperor's son, with various success. But Conrad having engaged the enemy with a force vastly inferior to theirs, he was defeated and driven quite out of the field. The landgrave, elated with his victory, laid siege to Ulm; but was killed soon after he had invested the place. The pope no sooner heard of his death, than he despatched cardinal Caponius into Germany with the character of his legate *a Latere* to the German princes who had adhered to the late landgrave. The cardinal, upon his arrival in Germany, applied to the archbishop of Mentz, one of Frederic's most bitter enemies; and by his means a diet was assembled at a place called Nussia, and William earl of Holland was there unanimously elected king of Germany by the few bishops and princes who attended that assembly. This happened, according to some, on Michaelmas-day 1247,³ according to others a few days after that festival, and the pope, upon the news of William's election, wrote anew to the archbishop of Mentz, thanking

him in the name of the whole catholic church for the zeal he had exerted in so important an occasion, when the welfare of the church as well as the apostolic see was at stake. His letter is dated at Lyons the 19th of November.¹

The two following years a most destructive war was carried on in Germany between Conrad and the new king of Germany, and in Italy between Entius and the rebellious states of Lombardy, supported by the pope. The Bolognese had till the year 1248 sided with the emperor; but being that year gained over by the pope, they joined the rebels, and engaging Entius gained a complete victory over him, cut most of his army in pieces, and even took Entius himself prisoner, and carried him in triumph to Bologna, where he remained to the hour of his death; the Bolognese having made a decree, that he should never be set at liberty, and they therefore refused vast sums of money offered them by the emperor for his ransom. He is said to have lived twenty-two years in that city, entertained like a king at the public expense, and to have been buried with the greatest pomp in the church of the Dominicans.

The emperor, having quieted the disturbances in Apulia, and by the death or banishment of such of the barons as had revolted, restored that kingdom to its former tranquillity, was preparing to march with a powerful army into Lombardy, to set his son at liberty and stop the progress of the Lombards, who had reduced several important places, and the city of Modena among the rest, a city that had distinguished itself from the beginning by a steady adherence to the imperial cause. But while the military preparations were carrying on throughout the kingdom, Frederic was taken ill in the castle of Fiorentino, not far from Lucera, and died there in a few days. Some writers suppose him to have been poisoned by Manfred, prince of Taranto, his natural son, who aspired to the kingdom. His death happened on the 13th of December, 1250, in the fifty-seventh year of his age, when he had reigned as emperor thirty-seven years, as king of Sicily fifty, and twenty-eight as king of Jerusalem. Some writers tell us, that on his death-bed he expressed great contrition for his disobedience to the pope, and the little regard he had shown for the clergy, making no distinction between them and the laity when guilty of the same crimes.² But other writers take no notice of his repentance with respect to his quarrel with the pope; but only say that he repented of all his sins, begged pardon of God, made his confession to Bernard, archbishop

¹ Rainald. ad hunc ann. Num. 5. ² Idem ibid.

³ Joan. a Leidis in Hist. Comitum Holland.

¹ Apud Rainald. Num. 5.

² Laurent. de Podio. Anonym. in Vit. Frederic.

Character of Frederic. Frederic succeeded by his son Conrad. Several cities in Apulia revolt, but are reduced by Conrad;—[Year of Christ, 1251.] Innocent offers the kingdom of Sicily to several princes; [Years of Christ, 1252, 1253.]

of Palermo, was absolved by him, and received the eucharist at his hands.

As to his character, the Gueff writers paint him as a monster of wickedness, as one destitute of every moral and Christian virtue, as a lawless tyrant, without faith or religion. Salimbene, a Franciscan friar, who lived in those times, tells us in his chronicle, that when Frederic first saw the promised land, he could not forbear laughing, and turning to those about him, "If the God of the Israelites," he said, "had seen the kingdom of Naples, he would not have set such a value upon his promised land." But Frederic was no friend to the monks and friars, his avowed enemies, and he had banished great numbers of them, and even caused some of them to be hanged. No wonder, therefore, that they should have charged him with many crimes, of which no mention is made by other less partial writers. On the other hand, the Gibelline writers paint him as a prince endowed with every princely virtue, bestowing upon him the highest commendations for his firmness and constancy in maintaining the undoubted rights of the imperial crown against three successive popes, Honorius, Gregory, and Innocent. No prince ever paid greater regard to the ecclesiastics than Frederic did while he lived in friendship with the popes. In the beginning of his reign he so warmly espoused the cause and promoted the interests of the church and the apostolic see, that he was styled by Otho, his rival in the empire, "the king of priests." Many of the constitutions he published in favor of the ecclesiastics and the ecclesiastic jurisdiction, are still extant and observed to this day. But upon the rupture that ensued between him and the apostolic see, he changed his conduct, and treated all who adhered to the pope with the utmost severity. As for the imputation of heresy or infidelity, no prince less deserved it, as appears from his famous constitution, *Inconsutilem*, &c., ordering such as held or taught doctrines declared by the church heretical, to abjure them, or, if they declined it, to be burnt alive. However, Aligerius Dante, the father of the Italian poetry, who flourished in the beginning of the following century, misled by the monkish writers, has placed Frederic in that part of hell where the sin of heresy is punished. It is observable, that Frederic by his last will ordered all the rights and privileges of his "holy mother the Roman church" to be inviolably preserved, provided she in like manner preserved the rights of the empire. He was a great encourager of learning, leaving none unrewarded who distinguished themselves in any branch of literature whatever. Hence more learned men flourished under him than under all the princes of his family together,

as appears from the catalogue Alacci has given us of them.¹

Frederic was succeeded by his eldest son Conrad. But as that prince had been excommunicated, Innocent pretended that he had thereby forfeited all right to the kingdoms of Sicily and Apulia; and that as fiefs of the apostolic see they devolved to the church. He therefore left Lions upon the news of Frederic's death, and arriving at Genoa he repaired after a short stay there to Milan, where he received the deputies of the confederate or Gueff cities of Lombardy, renewed his alliance with them, and then leaving Lombardy went to reside at Perugia, as he did not think it yet safe to return to Rome, where the new emperor had many friends, and among the rest the two senators whom the Roman people had chosen to govern them, and had vested them with an absolute power. The pope, during his stay at Perugia, prevailed by his emissaries upon several cities in Apulia, and among the rest upon the cities of Naples and Capua, to revolt from Conrad and set up the standard of the church. But Conrad arrived in the mean time from Germany, at the head of a numerous and well appointed army of Germans, and being joined by a considerable body of Saracens, who had been allowed by the late emperor to settle in Sicily, he soon obliged the rebellious cities to submit. The city of Naples alone would hearken to no terms. But their obstinacy cost them dear; for the town was taken by storm, after a most obstinate resistance, and given up to be plundered.

Innocent, finding he could not withstand Conrad with his own forces alone, resolved to engage some other prince in that undertaking, by offering him the kingdom of Sicily, upon condition he drove out Conrad, and with him the whole race of Frederic. With that view he dispatched Albert of Parma as his nuncio into England, to offer the kingdom of Sicily to Richard earl of Cornwall, and brother to Henry III., a prince of an unbounded ambition, and possessed of great wealth. Richard did not reject the offer, but insisted upon terms which the pope would not agree to; and thus the negotiation broke off. In the mean time Charles, earl of Anjou and Provence, and brother to Lewis IX. of France, who was afterwards canonized, hearing of the offer Innocent had made to Richard, and at the same time of his refusal, dispatched ambassadors to Perugia, where his holiness still resided, to beg he would grant to him the kingdom that Richard had refused, upon what terms he should think fit to prescribe. As Charles had distinguished himself no

¹ Alacci Neapolis illustrata.

Conrad dies, and Manfred, his natural brother, guardian of his son Conradin during his minority;—[Year of Christ, 1254.] The pope acknowledged by most of the barons. His army defeated by Manfred.

less by his wisdom and prudence in peace than by his valor in war, the pope wrote, without loss of time, to Albert, who was then in France, ordering him to close with the earl, and, if he agreed to the terms that had been offered to Richard, to grant the investiture in the name of the holy Roman church, of which the kingdom of Sicily was a fief. However this treaty too, for the present, came to nothing, Charles being diverted, says a contemporary writer, from engaging in so perilous an undertaking by his friends and relations, all to a man opposing it.¹ This second disappointment gave the pope the greatest uneasiness, and he now despaired of being ever able to compass his end. But while he was quite at a loss what other prince to apply to, he received, to his inexpressible satisfaction, a letter from Henry, king of England, begging he would grant, upon what conditions soever he pleased, the kingdom of Sicily to Edmund his son, as the whole offspring of Frederic had forfeited all right to it by their disobedience to the apostolic see. Upon the receipt of this letter Innocent wrote immediately to his nuncio Albert, then in France, ordering him to repair, without delay, to England, and acquaint the king that the apostolic see complied with his request, and would grant the investiture to the young prince, upon his promising to stand to the conditions that should afterwards be prescribed by his holiness, by cardinal Ottoboni the pope's nephew, by the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Hereford, the bishop elect of Lions, and the earl of Savoy.²

During these transactions Conrad died, in the flower of his age, being but twenty-five years old; and his death is, by most of the contemporary writers, ascribed to poison administered to him by his natural brother, Manfred, prince of Taranto. He left behind him but one son, named likewise Conrad, and called by the Italians, after their mode of speech, Conradino, or little Conrad, being scarce three years old at the time of his father's death. If Conrad was poisoned by Manfred, he did not know it, nor did he in the least suspect him; for on his death-bed he appointed him guardian of the young prince, and regent of the kingdom of Sicily during his minority. Conrad, in his last will, ordered Manfred to procure, if he possibly could, by any means consistent with the dignity and independence of the crown, the friendship of the pope, and engage him in the protection of his pupil. Manfred, in compliance with that order, dispatched, as soon as he had performed the exequies of the deceased king, a solemn embassy to Innocent, to acquaint him therewith, and earnestly entreat his holiness to forbear all hos-

tilities, and take, as the common father of all orphans, the young king into his protection. But the pope, looking upon this embassy rather as a sign of the weakness of the royal party than an act of respect, and resolved not to let pass, unimproved, the favorable opportunity that the death of Conrad, and the minority of his son, offered him to get possession of the kingdom, received the ambassadors with great haughtiness, and returned them the following answer: That the kingdom of Sicily had devolved to the apostolic see, and he was therefore determined to possess himself of it; but would, nevertheless, when the young prince was of age, examine his pretensions, and he should meet with favor, if found to deserve any.¹

From the pope's answer Manfred concluded that a war was unavoidable, and having thereupon caused the frontier places to be all fortified, he raised what forces he could, to repel force by force. In the mean time the pope, removing from Assisi, whither he had gone to pass the summer, to Anagni, to be near at hand, and give proper directions for the reduction of the kingdom, summoned from thence Manfred, and likewise Barthold, marquis of Hohemburg, commander of the German troops, as well as the rest of the barons, to appear before him and resign the kingdom to the church. With this summons the greater part of the barons readily complied, choosing rather to submit to the pope than see a war kindled in the bowels of the kingdom. Manfred himself, finding his army vastly inferior to that of the pope, commanded by William, cardinal of St. Eustachius, the pope's legate, thought it advisable to yield to the times. He therefore repaired with the rest to Anagni; and there resigning the power and authority with which he was vested into the pope's hands, acknowledged his right to the kingdom, which Innocent was so well pleased with, that he not only absolved him from the censures he had incurred, but reinstated him in all the honors and titles that he had enjoyed in his father's life-time. In the mean while the pope's army advanced into the very heart of the kingdom, and as they met with no opposition, nor expected any, the cardinal legate, by the advice of Manfred, in whom he placed an entire confidence, sent large detachments from his army into the different provinces to receive the submission of the people. The legate's army being thus considerably weakened, Manfred unexpectedly left it, and hastening to Nocera, a city chiefly inhabited by Saracens, put himself at the head of those infidels, and falling upon the legate when he least expected it, gained a complete victory over him.

This signal victory was obtained by Manfred on the second of December of the pre-

¹ Nicol. de Curbio, in Vit. Innocent, c. 32.

² Idem ibid, et Raimund. ad ann. 1253.

¹ Anonym. de reb. Fred.

Death of Innocent. The cardinals confined till they elected a new pope. Alexander IV. unanimously elected.

sent year; and Innocent, who had advanced as far as Naples, and thought that he had no enemy to contend with, was so affected with it that he died on the seventh of the same month, when he had governed the church eleven years, five months, and thirteen days.¹ He was buried in the cathedral of Naples, as we read in Nicholas de Curbio, who was present at his funeral, and not in the church of the Minorites, as is supposed by Platina, Panvinius, and most of the more modern writers. He strictly adhered, and, during his whole pontificate, acted up to the principles of Gregory VII., which divided Italy into two opposite factions, and involved that unhappy country in endless calamities. Innocent was certainly a man of great learning, was perfectly well acquainted with the divinity of those times, and the best civilian of his time. In the midst of the cares of his very troublesome pontificate he wrote the "Apparatus" on the five books of the decretals, a work still in such request among the canonists, that he is styled by them "the father of the canon law." He wrote several other pieces, and among the rest one entitled "Apologeticus," calculated to maintain the jurisdiction of the apostolic see over the empire, in answer to the

famous Petrus de Vineis, secretary to Frederick II., ascertaining the independency of the empire upon the apostolic see, and the dependency of the apostolic see upon the empire. Innocent was a great encourager of learning and learned men, and it was at his request that Alexander Hales, a native of England, wrote his "Commentary upon the Four Books of Sentences," and several other theological works, which procured him the title of "Doctor Irrefragabilis." Innocent was the first that distinguished the cardinals with the "red hat," and that mark of distinction he granted them in the council of Lions; but they first used it, as de Curbio informs us, the year after the council, that is in 1246, on occasion of an interview between the pope and Lewis IX. of France. That the cardinals were allowed to wear red shoes and red garments in the time of Innocent III., raised to the see in 1198, appears from several writers who flourished at that time; but by what pope that privilege was granted them is uncertain. We have a great number of letters written by this pope on different occasions, and a decree allowing the Sclavonians to perform Divine service in their mother tongue, contrary to a decree of Gregory VII.

ALEXANDER IV., THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-EIGHTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[JOHANNES LASCARIS, MICHAEL PALÆOLOGUS, *Emperors of the East*.—RICHARD, *Earl of Cornwall*, ALPHONSUS, *King of Castile*, *Kings of the Romans*.]

[Year of Christ, 1254.] The victory gained by Manfred, and the rapid progress he made in the reduction of such places as had revolted to the pope, so terrified the cardinals, that they were preparing to quit Naples as soon as they had performed the exequies of the deceased pontiff, and returning into the territories of the church. But Bartoline of Parma, whom Innocent had appointed governor of Naples, having in vain endeavored to divert them from that resolution by apprising them of the evil consequences that would attend it, thought himself sufficiently warranted, the welfare of the church being at stake, to employ force. He accordingly shut them up under a strong guard in the house where Innocent died, declaring that not one of them should stir from thence till they had agreed in the election of his successor. The cardinals were thus put under confinement three days after the death of the late pope, that is, on the 10th of December, and on the 12th of the same month, Raynald, bishop of Ostia, was

unanimously elected, after a vacancy of five days.¹ Blondus writes, that Bartoline, not satisfied with confining the cardinals, ordered the portion of victuals allowed them to be every day lessened, that hunger might oblige them, if nothing else could, to hasten the election.² Antoninus, Trithemius, Villani, and several other writers, suppose the see, upon the death of Innocent to have remained vacant near two whole years. But these writers must never have read either Nicholas de Curbio, who had been Innocent's chaplain and confessor from the time he was created cardinal to the hour of his death, was at Naples when his successor was elected; and gives us the above account of his election; nor Sallas Malaspina, who lived at this time, and tells us that the cardinals met upon the death of Innocent, and contrary to their custom, chose, without delay, Raynald bishop of Ostia.³

Raynald was a native of Jenne, a small

¹ De Curbio Vit. Innoc. cap. ult. Blond. lib. 2. Decad. 7.

² Idem ibid.

³ Apud Baluzium, tom. 6. Miscell.

¹ De Curbio in Vit. Innoc. c. 42. Raynald. Num. 69.

Alexander writes to all the bishops. All Calabria and Apulia reduced by Manfred. Agreement between him and the pope's legate ;—[Year of Christ, 1255.] Alexander espouses the cause of the Dominicans against the university of Paris ;—[Year of Christ, 1256.]

village in the diocese of Anagni, and is therefore called Anagninus, was descended from the illustrious family of the counts of Segni, and by his father, nephew to pope Gregory IX., who first created him cardinal deacon of St. Eustachius, and afterwards preferred him to the see of Ostia. At his consecration he took the name of Alexander IV., and a few days after wrote a circulatory letter to all the bishops, recommending himself, with great humility, to their prayers; that by their intercession he might be enabled to govern the church as a worthy successor of St. Peter. He wrote at the same time to all the leading men of the Guelf faction in Lombardy, encouraging them to continue steady in the attachment they had hitherto shown to the apostolic see, and oppose, with all their might, the tyrant Eccelin, who, putting himself at the head of the Gibelines, committed most dreadful ravages in the Marchia Trevisiana, imprisoning, banishing, and even putting to death such as continued in that province to adhere to the pope. He spared not even his own brother Alberic, governor of the city of Trevigi; but, upon his refusing to join him against the pope, drove him from his government, and declaring him a rebel, confiscated his estate. To him, therefore, the pope wrote a most friendly letter, to comfort him in his distress, and appoint him commander-in-chief of the army which he intended to send, without delay, to the relief of that unhappy province. These letters are all dated the 22d of December.¹

In the mean time Manfred carried all before him: most of the cities of Apulia and Calabria submitted to him, as soon as he appeared with his victorious army before them; and such as did not submit of their own accord, he reduced by force. Alexander, therefore, and the cardinals, apprehending themselves in imminent danger of being shut up in the city of Naples, and falling at last into his hands, resolved to propose terms of agreement between him and the apostolic see. Deputies were accordingly sent to treat of an accommodation. But Manfred, insisting upon the pope's acknowledging Conradin for lawful heir to the crown of Sicily, and himself not only for regent, but next heir, should the young prince die without issue, the treaty was soon broken off, and Manfred set out that moment on his march to Naples. But being, in the mean time, informed that the inhabitants of Brundisium had revolted from him and murdered their governor, he very unadvisedly directed his march to that city, and while he was employed in the reduction of the place, the marquis of Hohemburg, whom the pope had created great seneschal of the kingdom,

got together, with incredible expedition, a sufficient number of troops to oppose any attempt of Manfred upon the city of Naples. At the same time Octavianus, cardinal deacon of St. Mary, in Via Lata, putting himself at the head of a numerous body of troops raised in the territories of the church, took the field, and advancing against Manfred, offered him battle. But the regent wisely declined it, contenting himself with ravaging the neighboring country, and intercepting with his parties all the enemy's convoys. Thus was the legate's army reduced, in a short time, to the utmost distress, and he obliged to propose new terms of agreement. Hostilities were therefore suspended on both sides, and after several conferences between their respective deputies, it was agreed that Manfred should be left in the quiet possession of all the cities and provinces in Italy that belonged to the crown of Sicily, except Terra Laboris, (in which province stood the city of Naples) that was to be ceded to the pope.¹

Alexander being now at leisure to attend to the duties of his office, undertook, with great warmth, the cause of the "preaching friars," or Dominicans, against the university of Paris. These friars had opened two schools of divinity in the university, but would not take the oaths that were required of and taken by all the other professors. The university therefore, by a solemn decree, published in all the colleges, cut them off from their body, declaring them, at the same time, excluded from all the privileges, exemptions, and immunities, enjoyed by the other members. The Dominicans, on the other hand, appealing to the pope, declared the decree to be null till it was approved and confirmed by his holiness. The affair being thus carried to Rome, a bull was immediately issued by Alexander, annulling the decree of the university, and reinstating the Dominicans in all the privileges enjoyed by the other professors. The pope wrote at the same time to the bishops of Orleans and Auxerre, engaging them to declare all who should oppose the execution of his bull suspended, till they complied with it, both from their offices and all their benefices. As these two prelates, unwilling to proceed to extremities, endeavored to reconcile by more gentle means the contending parties, the pope, by a bull, dated the 18th of June, 1256, excommunicated, by name, the four chief authors of this rebellion, as he called it, divested them by his apostolic authority of all their dignities and offices, forbade all on pain of excommunication to frequent their schools, and ordered them to be banished the kingdom of France. The archbishop

¹ Raynald. ad ann. 1254.

¹ Raynald. ad ann. 1255, Num. 2; et Anonym. apud Rayn. Num. 3, et seq.

The book of William de Sancto Amore condemned at Rome;—[Year of Christ, 1257.] William, earl of Holland, and king of the Romans, murdered. Two elected in his room;—[Year of Christ, 1257.] Crusade against Eccelin.

of Paris was charged with the execution of this bull. But in the mean time several persons of great distinction, and the king himself, Lewis IX. interposing, the members of the university were prevailed upon to re-admit the Dominicans into their body; but it was upon condition that in all public assemblies they should sit in the last place, even after those of all other religious orders.¹

The most strenuous opposer of the Dominicans in this controversy was William de Sancto Amore, so called from the village of Saint Amour in the Franche-compte, the place of his nativity. To be revenged on the Dominicans for the trouble they had given to the university, of which he was a chief member, he published a book against them, and the mendicant friars in general, entitled, *De Periculis Novissimorum Temporum*, “of the danger of the latter times.” The main drift of that piece was to prove, that all who are able to earn a livelihood by their labour are bound to do so; and that they are in a state of perdition who live in idleness at the charge of others. The mendicants, instead of answering the many arguments alleged by the author against the lazy indolent life led by the friars, complained to the pope of William’s insolence in condemning institutions approved and confirmed by the apostolic see, and sent a copy of the book to Rome to be examined by his holiness. Alexander appointed four cardinals to examine it; and upon their report it was condemned as “wicked, damnable, execrable, containing false and abominable doctrines, derogatory to the power and authority of the apostolic see, and calculated to bring the religious orders, founded by holy men, into contempt; all were forbidden to read it, and they that had it were ordered, on pain of excommunication, to burn it in eight days’ time.² This bull is dated at Anagni the 13th of October, 1256, and we have no fewer than forty bulls of the same pope relative to this controversy.

Innocent had prevailed upon the German princes to elect William, count of Holland, king of the Romans, in opposition to the emperor Frederic, whom he had deposed, as has been related in the life of that pope. But as William had not yet received the imperial crown, Alexander invited him this year to Rome to be crowned there with the usual solemnity. With that invitation the prince readily complied; but he was unexpectedly attacked by the Frisons as he passed through their country, and barbarously murdered. Upon his death several of the electors were for choosing Conradin, the son of Conrad, and grandson of the emperor Frederic, to succeed him, which the pope

no sooner heard, than, prompted by the irreconcilable aversion he bore to the whole race of Frederic, he wrote to the archbishop of Mentz as the first of the electors, commanding him to oppose the election of Conradin to the utmost of his power, and let the other electors know, that all who should concur with their suffrages in electing him should be, *ipso facto*, excommunicated, and the election be declared null. This letter is dated at Anagni on the 28th of July in the second year of Alexander’s pontificate, or in 1256.¹ Conradin, who was yet a child, being thus excluded, the electors, not agreeing in the election of a German, resolved to choose one of some other nation. But here they were again divided. For by the archbishops of Mentz and Cologne, and Lewis, count Palatine of the Rhine was elected, on the 13th of January 1257, Richard, earl of Cornwall, and brother to Henry III., of England. But the archbishop of Treves, the king of Bohemia, the duke of Saxony, the marquis of Brandenburg, and with them many other German princes, not agreeing to the election of Richard, chose, about the middle of Lent the same year, Alphonsus, king of Castile. Both sent ambassadors to Rome, begging his holiness to confirm their election. But Alexander, alleging that the affair required the most mature deliberation, wisely declined declaring for either till he saw which of the two was most likely to prevail.²

In the mean time Eccelin continuing his ravages with unheard of barbarity in the Marchia Trevisiana, in Æmilia, and in Lombardy, the pope ordered the monks, the friars, and all the ecclesiastics to preach a crusade against him, as a more dangerous enemy than the Saracens themselves. Thus was a numerous army raised, and the command of it given to Philip, archbishop elect of Ravenna. Under him served a Minorite friar named Curellus, who, having obtained of the archbishop the command of a large detachment, marched with it to Padua, the place of his nativity, then held by Eccelin, and advancing to the walls with the banner of the cross displayed, so encouraged his men, that in a very short time they made themselves masters of that important city, though defended by a numerous garrison under the command of Ansidisus, Eccelin’s nephew. The friar and his men were received by the inhabitants with the greatest demonstrations of joy; which so provoked Eccelin, that he caused all the Paduans who were in his army or in the cities under his jurisdiction to be murdered. We are told that no fewer than twelve thousand were massacred on that occasion. The tyrant

¹ Nangius in Gestis Ludovici IX. Wadingus ad ann. 1255.

² Wadingus ad ann. 1256.

¹ Apud Raynald. Num. 3.

² Monach. Paduan. ad ann. 1257.

Disturbances in Rome. Alexander retires to Viterbo. Manfred master of all Apulia and Sicily. Crowned king of Sicily;—[Year of Christ, 1258.] Manfred excommunicated, and with him several prelates. The pope's legate defeated by Eccelin, and taken prisoner.

did not even spare his own nephew, but charging him with cowardice, ordered him to be racked to death.¹

At this time great disturbances reigned in Rome. Brancalione, a native of Bologna, whom the Romans had chosen for their senator, and vested with an absolute power over them, declaring for Manfred, and paying no regard either to the commands or excommunications of the pope, either imprisoned or put to death all who opposed him, banished from Rome some of the first nobility with their families, and even caused two of the pope's relations to be publicly hanged. Alexander therefore finding his authority both spiritual and temporal entirely disregarded, thought it advisable to leave Rome and retire to Viterbo. In his absence Brancalione, assisted under-hand by Manfred, demolished and levelled with the ground all the castles that belonged to the nobility of the opposite party to the number of one hundred and fifty.²

A treaty had been concluded, as has been related above, between Manfred and cardinal Octavian the pope's legate, by virtue of which the province of Terra Laboris with the city of Naples was to be yielded to the pope, and Manfred was to hold undisturbed all the other provinces belonging to the crown of Sicily. But Alexander, withdrawing from Naples, refused to confirm the treaty, declaring it unjust, iniquitous, and highly prejudicial to the interest and dignity of the apostolic see. Manfred therefore recommencing hostilities, drove the pope's troops every where before him, made himself master of the Terra Laboris, or Terra di Lavoro, as it is now called, and the city of Naples opening its gates to him, he now found himself in the quiet possession of the whole country. From Naples he crossed over to Sicily, drove from thence the pope's legate with all his adherents, and upon a false report of the death of Conradin, who was then in Germany, caused himself, as the next heir to the crown, to be crowned in Palermo king of Sicily. The writers of the Guelf faction will have this report to have been spread by Manfred himself, who, they say, had aspired to the kingdom ever since the death of his father Frederic; had poisoned his brother Conrad, and attempted to dispatch in the same manner his nephew Conradin. However that be, Manfred was, upon that false report, acknowledged by all the barons and prelates of the kingdom, and on the 11th of August, 1258, crowned with great solemnity in the cathedral of Palermo.³

Alexander, finding he was not able to oppose Manfred with his temporal arms, resolved to have recourse to the spiritual, and

summoned him accordingly to appear, in a limited time, before him, and answer for his usurping a kingdom devolved to the apostolic see, and causing himself to be crowned king without his knowledge or consent. To that summons Manfred paid no regard. On the contrary, he ordered Rufinus, a "Minorite," the pope's confessor and legate in Sicily, to be closely confined, and the archbishop of Brundisium, concerned in the revolt of that city, to be loaded with chains, and shut up in a dark dungeon. Alexander, provoked beyond measure at so open a contempt of his authority, declared Manfred a rebel and enemy to the church, a sacrilegious usurper of the rights of the church, deprived him of all the fiefs, honors, titles, and prerogatives that he ever had enjoyed, and pronouncing, with great solemnity, the sentence of excommunication against him, annulled his coronation, unction, and all the other ceremonies, used on that occasion, as impious and detestable. At the same time he interdicted all the cities, castles, villages, and other places, that should receive Manfred, or acknowledge him for their king, forbid all archbishops, bishops, abbots, and other ecclesiastical persons, to perform divine service in his presence, or to receive any benefices at his hands. All the prelates who had assisted at his coronation were summoned to Rome, and, upon their not complying with the summons, excommunicated and deposed, namely, the archbishops of Salerno, Taranto, and Monreale, who had placed the crown upon his head; the bishop of Agrigento, who anointed him, and celebrated mass on that occasion; and the abbot of Monte Cassino for being present at the ceremony.¹ I do not find that any the least regard was paid, either by Manfred or by any of these prelates, to the pope's excommunications and anathemas.

At the same time Alexander received the disagreeable news of the defeat of his legate in Lombardy. Philip, archbishop elect of Ravenna, had been sent, as has been related above, with a powerful army, to oppose Eccelin, and recover the places that had been obliged to submit to him, and renounce their alliance with the apostolic see. In this expedition the legate was, at first, attended with all the success he could have wished, made himself master of Padua, Brescia, and several other cities, and drove Eccelin out of the whole province of Æmilia. But being pressed by his men, elate with their success, to offer the enemy battle, his army was almost entirely cut off, and he himself made prisoner, with the bishops of Brescia and Verona, and many other persons of great distinction, of whom some were put to death, and others confined to dark dungeons.

¹ Monach. Paduan. ad ann. 1257, et Blondus. Decad. 2.

² Nangius in Vit. Sanct. Ludovic.

³ Raynald. et Anonym. ad ann. 1258.

⁴ Anonym. ad ann. 1258.

Manfred attempts in vain a reconciliation with the pope;—[Year of Christ, 1259.] Alexander appoints a council to meet at Viterbo;—[Year of Christ, 1260.] Alexander dies;—[Year of Christ, 1261.] Urban IV. chosen. His birth, education, &c.

The legate was kept in prison, in defiance of the pope's repeated anathemas, till the death of Eccelin, who, having now no enemy to oppose him, forced all the Guef cities in Lombardy to renounce their alliance with the apostolic see, and declare for him and Manfred.¹

Manfred, desirous of being acknowledged by the pope king of Sicily, sent one Capecius, a person in whom he placed great confidence, to treat with his holiness, offering to hold the kingdom as a fief of the apostolic see, and pay yearly double the tribute that had been paid by other kings. But Alexander, insisting upon Manfred's restoring all the exiles to their honors and estates, which they had forfeited by their adherence to the apostolic see, and likewise upon his dismissing all the Saracens who served under him, and were indeed the flower of his army, the treaty soon broke off, Manfred consenting to recall the exiles, but refusing to discharge the troops that had served him so faithfully in all his wars.²

As a cruel war broke out at this time between the Venetians and Genoese, the pope was chiefly employed the following year in composing their differences, and uniting them against the common enemy. With that view he appointed a council to meet at Viterbo, on the octave of the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, that is, on the 6th of July; and leaving Anagni, where he then was, in the beginning of the year 1261, he repaired to Viterbo, to preside at the council. But,

overcome with grief at the success of Manfred, and the dissensions of the Christian princes among themselves, that proved so prejudicial to the affairs of the Christians in the East, he died on the 25th of May of the present year, 1261, having governed the church six years, five months, and thirteen days, reckoning from the time of his election.¹ He trod in the footsteps of his predecessor, pursued, as we have seen, the same plan to exclude the whole race of Frederic from the imperial crown, as well as from the crown of Sicily. In other respects he is commended by most of the contemporary writers, even by Matthew Paris, though no friend to the popes, for his charity to the poor, for his virtue and learning. It is observable of this pope, that he created not a single cardinal during the whole term of his pontificate, lest, by increasing their number, says the monk of Padua, who wrote at this time, he should increase the dissensions that reigned among them.² We have one hundred and twenty-four letters written by this pope, in favor of the friars "Minorites," and six to Saint Lewis, king of France, forbidding the royal chapels, and his dominions, or any part of his dominions, to be put under an interdict, without an express order of the apostolic see, allowing the king to imprison clerks when guilty of any enormous crime, and depriving all among them who merchandised or followed any trade, of all the privileges of their order.³

URBAN IV., THE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-NINTH BISHOP OF ROME.

[MICHAEL PALÆOLOGUS, *Emperor of the East.*—RICHARD, *Earl of Cornwall*, ALPHONSUS, *King of Castile, Kings of the Romans.*]

[Year of Christ, 1261.] At the death of Alexander the college of cardinals consisted of eight only. Yet they could not agree in electing one of their own body; but after warm disputes from the 26th of May to the 29th of August, were obliged to choose John, patriarch of Jerusalem, come to Viterbo about some affairs of his church; and him they chose with one consent, on the 29th of August of the present year. He was a native of Troyes in Champagne, the son of a cobbler named Pantaleon; which he was not at all ashamed of; but, when reproached with the meanness of his birth, used to answer, that no man was born noble, but was nobilitated only by his virtue. He studied at Paris, and being ho-

nored by that university with the degree of doctor of canon law, he was created archdeacon of Liege, and sent by Innocent IV. with the character of his legate into Poland. On his return from thence he was preferred to the see of Verdun, and in the first year of the pontificate of Alexander made patriarch of Jerusalem, and legate of the apostolic see to the Christian army in the East. At his consecration he took the name of Urban, because his predecessor died on the festival of the martyr St. Urban.⁴ He was consecrated and crowned the first Sunday after his election, that is, on the 4th of September.

¹ Stero in *Annal. Nangius*, Ptolemæus Lucensis, Martinus, Polenus, &c.

² Monach Paduan Chron. l. 5.

³ Dacher. *Spicilleg.* tom. 6.

⁴ Rainald. ad ann. 1261. Panvinius, Polonus. Longinus in *Hist. Polonie*, Massonus in *Vitis Pontific.*

¹ Monachus Paduan. lib. 2.

² Summontius in *Hist. Neapolitan.* lib. 2.

Urban creates several cardinals. A crusade against Manfred. Urban obliged to retire from Rome. Forbids the electors to choose Conradin king of the Romans;—[Year of Christ, 1262.] Excommunicates Manfred;—[Year of Christ, 1263.] Manfred's daughter married to the king of Arragon's eldest son. Negotiation between Manfred and the pope begun, and broken off.

Urban wrote the day after his coronation, that is, on the 5th of September, to all the Christian princes as well as bishops, to acquaint them with his promotion; and in that he wrote to Lewis, king of France, he granted both to him and his son Philip an indulgence of a year and forty days as often as they should assist at the dedication of any church or chapel.¹ By the same letter he granted indulgences to all who should pray for the king and kingdom of France. As the cardinals were reduced to a very small number, being in all but eight, Urban, in the month of December of the present year, created seven new ones, and, in the month of May of the following year, 1262, seven more; so that the sacred college now consisted of twenty-two cardinals, all chosen men, as the contemporary writers tell us, men who had distinguished themselves by their prudence, learning, and exemplary lives.

Urban's next care was to drive out Manfred, and subject the kingdom of Sicily to the apostolic see. With that view he summoned him to Rome, and upon his refusing to obey the summons, he first excommunicated him, as an usurper and an enemy to the church, and then caused a crusade to be preached every where against him. A very numerous army being thus raised, Manfred's army was obliged to withdraw from the duchy of Spoleti which they had seized, and likewise to abandon all Campania, Manfred not choosing to come to an engagement with an army so vastly superior to his. But in the mean time new disturbances being raised by his friends in Rome, Urban thought it advisable to recall his army to his own defence, and the defence of the city. But the neighboring country being every where laid waste by the rebellious Romans, the pope's army, for want of subsistence, by degrees mouldered away; insomuch that the pope, thinking himself no longer safe in Rome, left that city, and retired to Orvieto, about fifty miles distant, where he resided with the cardinals almost the whole time of his pontificate.²

As Germany was at this time involved in a most bloody war, some supporting the king of Castile and others the earl of Cornwall, several of the German princes, to redeem their country from the calamities which it groaned under, were for excluding both competitors, and choosing Conradin, who, they thought, had a better right than either. Of this Urban was no sooner informed, than, renewing the prohibition of his predecessor, he wrote to all the electors, forbidding them, on pain of excommunication, to elect or suffer, at any time, one to be

elect, who they had reason to believe would tread in the footsteps of his father and grandfather, and prove as bitter an enemy to the church as either.¹

Urban thinking himself safe at Orvieto, sent from thence a summons to Manfred, ordering him, on pain of excommunication, to appear before him in a limited time, and purge himself from the many enormous crimes which he was charged with. The crimes laid in that summons to his charge were, that though he had acknowledged pope Innocent for the lawful lord of the kingdom of Sicily, and even taken the usual oath of allegiance to him and his successors, he afterwards revolted from him, and with the assistance of the Saracens seized on the kingdom for himself; that he had imprisoned and cruelly murdered, or caused to be murdered, several barons, for no other crime but their steady adherence to the apostolic see; that having spread, or caused to be spread, a false report of Conradin's death, he had, to the disgrace of the royal dignity, assumed the title of king; that he had driven from their churches, had imprisoned and sent into exile, many prelates, and appropriated the revenues of their churches to himself; that, paying no regard to the authority of the apostolic see, he caused Divine service to be performed in his presence and in places under an interdict, &c.

As Manfred took no notice of that summons, but, on the contrary proceeded with more rigor than ever against all, without distinction, who favored, or were suspected to favor the pope, Urban, with great solemnity, excommunicated him as a tyrant, a heretic, and an enemy to the church.² This sentence, however, did not divert James, king of Arragon, from hearkening to a proposal of marriage between his eldest son and Constantia, the daughter of Manfred by Beatrix, daughter of Amadeus III., earl of Savoy. Urban did all in his power to dissuade the king from such an alliance; but the nuptials were nevertheless celebrated with great solemnity, the king flattering himself, that as Manfred had no male issue, the kingdom of Sicily might by such a marriage devolve one day to the crown of Arragon.

The king, desirous of bringing about a reconciliation between the pope and Manfred, sent Raymund Pennafort, a man held in great esteem for the sanctity of his life and his learning, to know upon what terms his holiness would receive Manfred into favor. As the pope insisted upon Manfred's appearing before him, and clearing himself from the crimes specified in his summons, the king prevailed, in the end, upon Manfred to send ambassadors to acquaint his ho-

¹ Dacher. tom. 5. p. 418.

² Summontius in Hist. Neopolitana, l. 2.

¹ Rainald. Num. 45.

² Summontius ibid. Anonym.

Urban endeavors to put an end to the war in Germany. He resolves to bestow the kingdom of Sicily upon some other prince. The kingdom of Sicily offered by the pope to Charles of Anjou, who accepts the offer; [Year of Christ, 1264.]

liness that he was ready to comply with his summons, provided he was allowed to come attended with such a force as might secure him against any attempts of his enemies.—The pope would not consent to his entering the territories of the church with more than eight hundred men, and even of them one hundred only were to be armed. This Manfred would not agree to, and thus was the negotiation broken off almost as soon as begun.¹

As the war between the two competitors for the empire was carried on with a great deal of bloodshed on both sides, to the utter ruin of that unhappy country, Urban wrote to both princes, exhorting them to submit their pretensions to the judgment of the apostolic see; which, he says, they had formerly declined, but now seemed disposed to acquiesce in. He therefore summoned them to appear, by their deputies, at his tribunal, on the 2d of May of the following year, 1264, and have their cause there finally determined. In that letter, dated at Orvieto, the last day of September 1263, the pope bestows upon both princes the title of “king of the Romans elect;” and orders it to be by all given to both till the apostolic see had determined which of the two had the better right to it.² At the appointed time Alphonsus sent his deputies to plead his cause for him. But Richard begging that the trial might be put off to a further term, on account of the troubles that then prevailed in England, the pope put it off accordingly to the second of May of the following year, but died before that time.

Innocent IV. had granted the kingdom of Sicily to Edmund, the second son of Henry III., king of England, as has been related above. That grant Alexander IV., the successor of Innocent, confirmed, and on the 6th of November, 1259, the young prince received the investiture, by a ring, at the hands of the pope’s legate, sent for that purpose to England. But the king not being able to raise the necessary money for such an undertaking, and disturbances ensuing, occasioned chiefly by his monstrous extortions for the relief, as he pretended, of the Holy Land, the pope resolved to apply to some other prince. Having therefore assembled the cardinals, he put them in mind of the many injuries done to the church by Frederic, and his sons Conrad and Manfred; represented it as absolutely necessary for the welfare of the church, as well as the safety of their own persons, to extirpate that impious and accursed race, and pathetically exhorting them to deliver the church from the tyranny it had groaned under for the space of fifty years and upwards; told them that they could by no other means attain so happy an end than by bestowing the king-

dom of Sicily, devolved to the apostolic see, upon some brave and powerful prince, who should, at his own expense, drive out the perfidious tyrant, and restore the oppressed people to their ancient liberty. He added, that if the cruel tyrant pursued his wicked undertakings against the church and them with the same success as had hitherto attended him, they would all, ere it was long, be put in chains and confined in dungeons.¹

The kingdom had been offered to Charles of Anjou by Innocent, in 1253, but he had been persuaded by his friends to reject the offer, as has been said in the life of that pope. However, as he had distinguished himself in the war with the infidels in the East under the banners of his brother king Lewis IX., and was possessed of great wealth, being by right of his wife lord of all Provence, Languedoc, and great part of Piedmont, the pope and cardinals resolved to make him a new tender of the kingdom. They therefore despatched, without delay, Bartholomew Pignatelli, archbishop of Cosenza, into France, to acquaint Charles with the resolution of the pope and the whole college of cardinals, ready to assist him to the utmost of their power, though he would scarce stand in need of their assistance, the people being every where disposed to shake off the yoke they groaned under, and join the first that should undertake to redeem them from their present bondage. At the same time another legate was sent into England; and his commission was to get the king and his son Edmund to renounce the right they might claim to the crown of Sicily, by virtue of the investiture granted to the young prince by Alexander. This the legate easily obtained, the king having too much business upon his hands at home to think of any foreign conquests. As for Charles, he considered the difficulty of the undertaking; and as he knew that Manfred, whom he was to drive out, had distinguished himself on many occasions by his courage and military knowledge, he was for some time at a loss whether he should accept or reject the offer; the rather, as the king his brother had always been averse to his engaging in so chargeable an undertaking, when the issue was so very uncertain, and he might, instead of acquiring new dominions, lose or ruin his own. However he was, in the end, prevailed upon to accept the offer, in a great measure, as we are told, by his wife Beatrix, who, not able to brook her being only a countess while her three sisters were queens, the one of France, the other of England, and the third of Germany, joined the legate, and jointly with him got even the king to consent to his brother’s accepting the invitation.²

While the legate was returning to Italy to

¹ Rainald. ad ann. 1263.

² Idem ibid.

¹ Anonym. ad ann. 1263.

² Idem, 1264.

Urban dies. The festival of Corpus Christi instituted by him.

acquaint the pope with the success of his negotiations, he received on the road the news of his death, which happened on the 2d of October of the present year 1264, when he had governed the church three years one month and four days. He died at Perugia, to which city he had but a little before removed from Orvieto, and was buried there in the cathedral. The Guelf writers all speak of Urban as a saint, and he was in some places honored, soon after his death, as a saint. But the inveterate hatred he bore not only to Manfred, but to Conradin, who had never given him the least provocation, is, one would think, no proof of an extraordinary sanctity. He instituted the festival of Corpus Christi on the following occasion, as we read in St. Antoninus, archbishop of Florence. A priest having spilt at mass some of the consecrated wine, it appeared upon the corporale (that is, upon the piece of linen on which the chalice and host are placed by the officiating priest) like so many drops of blood.¹ But Diestemius,

prior of the Benedictines at Liege, tells us, that the priest being staggered in his belief of the real presence, blood flowed from the host into the chalice and upon the corporale.¹ The corporale being brought bloody, as it was, from Bolsena, where the miracle was supposed to have happened, to Orvieto, the pope, after examining the priest and all who were present, was convinced of the miracle, and thereupon appointed the solemnity of Corpus Christi to be annually celebrated. The people of Orvieto, to preserve the memory of so stupendous a miracle, built afterwards a most magnificent church, of which the first stone was laid by pope Nicholas IV. in 1290. Urban built and richly endowed a church at Troyes, his native city, in honor of St. Urban, the first pope of that name, repaired many others, paid some of the debts contracted by his predecessors, and is said to have been very generous to the poor. We have several letters of this pope, but none very interesting.

¹ Antonin. part. 3. l. 29. c. 23.

¹ Diest. Commen. ad ann. 1496.

END OF VOLUME II.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01218 5221

